

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Some Aspects of Y'Mot Hamashiah and Olam Habo in
Tannaitic Literature with Particular Reference to
Akiba and Ishmael"

written by Nathan Bark
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: ()
cannot be considered for publication: (✓)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: ()
may not be loaned by the Library: (✓)

Eugene Mihaly
(signature of referee)

Eugene Mihaly
(referee)

February 23, 1954
(date)

mic. 5778

RESTRICTION REMOVED

4-7-70

Date

MUB

Initials

SOME ASPECTS OF Y'MOT HAMASHIAH
AND OLAM HABA IN TANNAITIC LITERATURE
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO AKIBA AND ISHMAEL

by

Nathan Bark

Submitted in partial fulfil-
ment of the requirements for
the Master of Hebrew Letters
Degree and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
February, 1954

Referee:
Dr. Eugene Mihaly

Thesis Summary

The general Messianic expectations during the first centuries of the Common Era and prior assume two basic patterns which are distinguished from one another by virtue of the emphases placed upon one or another aspect for a Messiah and Messianic Age.

These emphases were either on the national restoration of Jewish independence or were more apocalyptic and eschatological in character. The problem of this thesis is to try to link these two fairly distinct manifestations of the Messianic hopes with two distinct schools of Jewish thought. This problem is dealt with as follows:

First we try to establish that Akiba viewed Bar Kokba as the Messiah who was to usher in an imminent *חילוק נין* which was to effect Jewish independence from Roman domination.

Secondly we try to establish that both Akiba and Ishmael represent different classes in their society; namely, Akiba, the plebeian as opposed to Ishmael, the patrician.

On the basis of this, we conjecture the following: Since for Akiba the *חילוק נין* involved a political and social upheaval (i.e. the national-political view), we should expect that Ishmael will

hold to an opposing view (i.e. the apocalyptic-
eschatological view), more in line with the
interests of his class. Our conjecture, among
other data and assumptions, is based upon a state-
ment of difference between Akiba and Ishmael
regarding the $\aleph_2 \omega$ ρ/γ and $\omega_5 \omega$ ρ/γ : Ishmael
thinks in terms of just these two contrasting
worlds; Akiba makes room for an additional one —
the $\aleph_2 \omega$ ω/γ , which constitutes a distinct
period between the two.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Thesis Summary

Introduction

Chapter	I:	Olam Haba and Y'mot Hamashiah in Tannaitic Literature	1
Chapter	II:	A. Bar Kokba and Rabbi Akiba ...	11
		B. Akiba's View of the Y'mot Hamashiah	16
Chapter	III:	R. Akiba and R. Ishmael as Representatives of Distinct Socio-Economic Classes	24
Chapter	IV:	Akiba and Ishmael's Views Concerning the Y'mot Hamashiah and the Olam Haba	31
Notes to Chapter I			37
Notes to Chapter II			53
Notes to Chapter III			60
Notes to Chapter IV			66
Bibliography			

Introduction

A general statement of the plan of this thesis is already contained in the summary above and in the conclusion below. However, it remains for us, in this introduction, to make some additional remarks concerning the use of sources and to make necessary acknowledgments.

To investigate ideologically and theologically the concepts *בזד פלף* and *א'לנד מלל* involves a field of inquiry so enormous as to place it beyond the ability of anyone other than a scholar who is an authority in the vast ocean of Talmud and Rabbinics. Fortunately, our sphere of investigation is limited specifically to the establishing of an historical point. Where, however, the ideological and theological aspects are relevant to the development of our historical point, we have naturally relied on a recognized authority in the field. In this case we have accepted in toto the definitions and schematizations of Strack and Billerbeck. Although we are aware that their work is not universally accepted and other scholars and authorities have expressed different attitudes, we obviously feel it beyond our purpose to try to reconcile the conflicting attitudes and certainly beyond our ability independently to arrive at definitions and schematizations of these concepts. We feel it as unnecessary to challenge any statement of

Strack and Billerbeck as we find it unnecessary to dispute any statement of either Schürer or Moore. The first chapter, therefore, is nothing more than a slightly modified translation of Strack-Billerbeck's 'general view of the World to Come and the Days of the Messiah', although the rendering into acceptable and understandable English of the technical, intricate and highly involuted German sentences was, in itself, a task. From their exhaustive notes, we have culled only sufficient examples to make their points clear. These notes have been compared with the sources and are quoted in Hebrew in the notes to Chapter I.

Our thesis proper, then, begins with Chapter II, where Akiba is linked with Bar Kokba and the political motivations of Akiba's view of the *אֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ* are developed. In this connection we must add our indebtedness to Dr. Isaiah Sonne, whose seminar on the Bar Kokba revolt not only exhaustively treated the sources involved, including those made use of in the beginning of our second chapter, but also suggested a possible line of further investigation, which we have attempted to develop in the succeeding pages.

Chapter I

Olam Haba and Y'mot Hemashiah in Tannaitic Literature

In this chapter we shall concern ourselves primarily with defining the terms *הַיָּמִין* and *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא* as briefly as possible.

In the Tannaitic literature prior to the year 70 C.E., we find but few references to the term *הַיָּמִין* and its contrasting concept *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא*.¹ In two of these references we find the two worlds associated with the ideas of Resurrection and Retribution.² From the year 70 C.E. on, however, we find increasing examples of the use of these terms, due to the general increase of Rabbinic source material from the Palestinian schools.

The view of the Rabbis concerning the two worlds and concerning the Messianic Age are essentially the same as that of IV Ezra.³ The Messianic Age which the Rabbis called *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא* could no longer be applied to the ultimate, eternal eschatological age, because the *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא* were too intimately linked up with the present era (*הַיָּמִין*) to be able to bring about a complete salvation. The ultimate eschatological age, therefore, had to come about in a completely different age, following the *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא*. This new age was called *הַיָּמִין*, and the *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא* was but a transitory period of salvation preceding this new age.⁴

Unlike the Apocrypha and older Pseudepigrapha which set up an עוֹלָם בְּרִיָּא in contrast to an eschatological הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא , the Rabbis of the Tannaitic period set up an עוֹלָם בְּרִיָּא and an הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא as the great antithesis.⁵ The present era of misery and conflict will last but a limited time until it is relieved by the coming era. This new era will come about at the same time that the Resurrection and final World Judgment will take place.⁶ In this new era, the righteous will be given the full measure of happiness in a יְרוּשָׁלַיִם which will be situated near Jerusalem. The הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא , then, was the ultimate eschatological age, the scene of which was to be Earth. Such was the dominant view of the Tannaim.

There were, however, Rabbinic circles in the Tannaitic period who conceived of the הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא as being of short duration. Rabbi Akiba (died c. 135 C.E.) thought them to be of no more than forty years' duration.⁷ He saw them as a parallel to the forty years of wandering through the desert. Just as these forty years were a transition period full of struggle and hardship which finally led to the possession of the Promised Land, so Akiba saw in the forty-year Messianic Age a period of stress and strain which was to prepare the way for the advent of a more perfect future through the overthrow of the hostile nations of the world.

It is obvious that such a Messianic Age, being too much bound up with the present world order, could not bring about the fulfilment of the earlier Biblical prophecies. Rabbi Akiba, however, saw no difficulty in applying the term קצת עולם to the perfect future which was to follow the brief אמרו מלך and bring about the fulfilment of the earlier prophecies.⁸ The term עולם קצת which originally referred to the final eschatological age following the אמרו מלך , was now broadened to include a large part of that period which heretofore was considered as part of the אמרו מלך .

We conclude, however, from the few Baraitot which express this view, that the foregoing conception of the קצת עולם was apparently shared by only a few.⁹ The majority of Tannaim conceived of the אמרו מלך as being in sharp contrast to the present world order. However, they still believed that the אמרו מלך were to fulfil the early prophecies and culminate in the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth. However, since the Kingdom of God on earth had nothing in common with the kingdom of this world, these Tannaim, therefore, also made a clear distinction between the אמרו מלך and the עולם קצת . They no longer saw one great antithesis — the עולם קצת on the one hand and the קצת עולם on the other — but they now conceived of three distinct spheres: (1) the קצת עולם , (2) the אמרו מלך , and

(3) the דגדג פלל . The distinction between the דגדג פלל and the דגדג פלל is similar to that expressed in the Apocrypha and older Pseudepigrapha; the Rabbis, however, for whom the דגדג פלל no longer constituted the ultimate eschatological age, divided the דגדג פלל again, in order to allow for an קלל פלל which would be the ultimate eschatological age. In other words, what lay on one side of Resurrection and World Judgment belonged to the דגדג פלל ; what lay on the other side belonged to the קלל פלל . The דגדג פלל were accounted neither to the דגדג פלל nor to the קלל פלל , but were an independent period dividing the two.¹⁰ We can find this majority view-point expressed wherever (1) the war of Gog and Magog follows the דגדג פלל ¹¹ and (2) wherever the דגדג פלל is set in opposition to both the דגדג פלל and the קלל פלל ¹² as a third independent period of time.¹³

While during the Tannaitic period this concept [whose basic pattern is simply (1) דגדג פלל , (2) דגדג פלל and (3) קלל פלל] was prevalent, two other concepts made their appearance at the beginning of the Amoraic period: One follows in the tradition of Rabbi Akiba and is represented by Samuel (died c. 254 C.E.). But unlike Akiba, Samuel did not believe in a short-term דגדג פלל but rather that it will last four thousand years. Furthermore, Samuel explained that the sole

difference between the *ה'לנ"ד ש"נ'* and the present period (*ד"ד פ"י*) is that in the former era Israel will not be subject to foreign powers.¹⁴ Thus, for Samuel the Messianic Age throughout bears the impress of the present world order and belongs to the *ד"ד פ"י*. The result is that the same dilemma which faced Akiba arose now again regarding the fulfilment of the Biblical prophecies. It could only be solved by relegating the time of fulfilment of these prophecies to a period following the *ש"נ'* *ה'לנ"ד*.¹⁵ Thus, we again encounter the same extension of the idea of *ה'לנ"ד פ"י* that we found earlier with Akiba.

The second of these two concepts evolved to a similar conclusion although in an entirely different manner. In the beginning of the third century the idea arose that the dead of Israel will arise in the *ש"נ'* *ה'לנ"ד*. This opinion found a strong support in the famous statement of Johanan (died 279 C.E.) that, "All the prophets prophesied only in respect of the Messianic Age," which is to say that the prophecies will find fulfilment in the *ה'לנ"ד ש"נ'*.¹⁶ As these prophecies include also the Resurrection of the dead, so it follows that this (Resurrection) will also take place in the Messianic Age. Thus, the formerly held opinion concerning the sharp line of demarcation between *ה'לנ"ד ש"נ'* and *ה'לנ"ד פ"י* has vanished: The Resurrection of the dead,

which had been placed on the other side of the dividing line, is brought forward from the *קצת פסח* to the *מלך* *העולם*, and the Messianic Age is placed on such an elevated level that it is difficult to distinguish it from the final eschatological age (*קצת פסח*). In popular usage the concepts were confused: One often referred to the *העולם הזה* as *קצת פסח* and one spoke of the *קצת פסח* when he actually meant the *העולם הזה*.¹⁷ Although in some contexts it is possible to decide whether a Rabbi used the term *קצת פסח* in the narrow sense as referring to just the final eschatological age or in its broad sense as including also the *העולם הזה*, in many cases, however, a clear-cut delineation of the term is impossible.

This above-mentioned broadening of the term *פסח* *קצת* did not preclude the further extension of this concept. Sometime during the middle of the first century C.E., the Hellenistic belief in Immortality found recognition and acceptance in Rabbinic circles, and the Rabbis used the term *קצת פסח* in reference to the heavenly world of souls as well as to delineate the ultimate eschatological age.¹⁸ This striking fact can only be explained by assuming that the heavenly age of the souls and the eschatological age on earth were considered as two phases of the same great *קצת פסח*. This great *קצת פסח* has now its place in heaven, where the

souls of the righteous go at the time of death to a temporary Immortality. This is the first phase of *פְּלִיטָה* *קִלְדָּה* which is defined as the world of the souls (repository of souls). The second phase begins with the Resurrection of the dead, which brings them into a complete earthly bliss.

If we now take the above-mentioned extension of the concept of *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* as it includes the *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* we find that the term *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* is used by the Rabbis in a tripartite sense: (1) the ultimate eschatological age, which is its earliest meaning, (2) the Messianic Age, a meaning given to the *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* during the Tannaitic period, but used more generally from the third century on, and (3) the heavenly world of the souls, an Intermediate (Between-times) *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה*, a meaning which arose in the middle of the first century C.E. The colorless term *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* is used as a synonym for *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* in the same tripartite sense, except that this term is even more vague and can refer to almost anything that belongs to the future.¹⁹

It has already been pointed out above how difficult it is to decide in many cases whether *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* means Messianic Age or the final eschatological age. It is often even more difficult to determine in any given reference whether *קִלְדָּה פְּלִיטָה* refers to the world of the

souls or the Age following Resurrection. Sometimes the context can help determine what is actually meant. The period and the view-point of the author of a statement can help one to decide. For example, when Hillel the Elder (c. 20 B.C.E.) said, "One who has acquired Torah has acquired for himself the life of the world to come," he referred to the life that will be earned through the Resurrection, at the beginning of the ultimate eschatological *קלד פלד*, for in his time the doctrine of Immortality had not yet entered Rabbinic circles.²⁰ Or when Rabbi Johanan, who denied the doctrine of Immortality, said, "...but as for the world to come, 'The eye hath not seen, O Lord beside Thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him,'" he did not mean the world of souls but the Age of Resurrection as the time and place of this reward.²¹

The several meanings for *קלד פלד* which make the term ambiguous were a difficulty for the Rabbis as well as they are for us. They, therefore, tried to substitute more accurate expressions. For the *קלד פלד* which means world of souls, they used the expression *קלד פלד* or *קלד קלד* 'That world', a term already used in the Slavonic Enoch,²² as well as *לדא* 'There'. In one place we find the term *לדא קלד פלד*, 'The world whither one goes', but more often the world of the souls is referred to as 'The world which is completely good'.

Similarly, the eschatological *קדמ פלג* is called 'World that is very long'. In contrast to this, the expression 'World that is completely Sabbath' can refer to both the Between-time (intermediate) as well as the ultimate *פלג* *קדמ*. The single term *קדמ פלג* was applied to both the world of souls as well as the Age following Resurrection. The confusion which this entailed made the Rabbis seek two distinct terms, each to express one of these concepts. They, therefore, called the world of souls the 'Grave or death condition' and retained the expression *קדמ פלג* for the Age following Resurrection.²³ In other cases they did just the reverse, calling the world of souls the *קדמ פלג* and the Age following Resurrection *קדמ פלג* or *קדמ פלג* (New World).

In attempting to define the terms *קדמ פלג* and *פלג* and in trying to see what views concerning them were prevalent in the Tannaitic period, certain facts which will be expanded in the subsequent chapters have already been indicated; namely, that Akiba held to a view of the *פלג* *פלג* which removed it from the larger, eschatological *קדמ פלג* and set it up as an independent, though short, interim period of great activity on earth between this Age and the ultimate eschatological age. This view of *פלג* *פלג* which was a minority opinion was in sharp conflict with the more accepted view which conceived of the *פלג* *פלג* merely as an indistinguishable

part of a greater *הנהגה*, which in general was a
period antithetical to the present world order or *הנהגה*
הנהגה.

In the next chapter we shall try to investigate
the political motivations underlying Akiba's minority
view of the *הנהגה*.

Chapter II

A. Bar Kokba and Rabbi Akiba

There are many interesting, if historically obscure, aspects of the Bar Kokba revolt such as, for example, the very name, its origin and significance, of the leader himself. For our purposes, however, we need investigate but one aspect of the rebellion and that is to try to establish, with as much certainty as possible, just what was the attitude of Rabbi Akiba to Bar Kokba. This Akiba-Kokba relationship is so central to the development of our thesis that we are obliged to analyze in some greater detail and reevaluate those sources which at present seem to be almost universally accepted as sound historical data.

Before proceeding to an examination of this material, however, we should say something concerning the general nature of the available source material for this period in Jewish history:

The paucity of historical source material for our period in Jewish history of the type which Josephus' histories provide, or even of the sort which many sections of the Bible yield, is a recognized fact,¹ and we are left to cull from the wealth of legends the kernels of historical truth. But for us and for our specific area of investigation the problem of sources is even

more complicated. For unlike Bar Kokba himself of whom mention is made in Eusebius, Jerome, Syncellus, Orosius and Justyn Martyr in connection with the rebellion, and unlike the very fact of the rebellion to which reference is made in Dio Cassius and other non-Jewish sources,² of Rabbi Akiba and his connection with Bar Kokba or with the revolt itself, there is no corroborative evidence to be found outside of the Rabbinic literature. Furthermore, this material consists solely of three different versions of a particular legend about Bar Kokba and Akiba. It is these versions which we shall now proceed to analyze.

In Talmud Jerusalmi we find the following version of this legend:³

מִי כ' שְׁמֹנֶה עָרֵי יְהוּדָה דְּקִיבָה רַבִּי, הֵיךְ דִּירָה דְּרַק
כֹּכַב מִדְּקָרָא - דְּרַק כֹּכַב אֶמְרָא. רַבִּי דְּקִיבָה
כֹּכַב הָאֵל חָמִי בִּרְכָא דְּקִיבָה אֶמְרָא דִּין הָאֵל מִכָּא
מִשְׁחָא. אֶמְרָא רַבִּי יוֹחָי בֶּן יוֹרְגָא דְּקִיבָה יַעֲלֵה
עֲלֵיהּ בְּחִיָּה דְּרַק בֶּן דְּרַק אֶמְרָא.

The three elements in this Haggadah are:

(1) R. Simeon b. Yohai relates that his teacher Akiba used to interpret the phrase from Numbers 24:17, "A star [kokab] will arise from Jacob," as referring to Kozibah. That is to say, Kozibah will arise from Jacob's house and Edom (signifying Rome) will become his inheritance.

(2) When R. Akiba would see Bar Kozibah, he would

exclaim, "This is the King-Messiah!" and

(3) R. Johanan ben Torta said to him, "Akiba, grass will grow on your jaw-bones and still the son of David will not come."

In Lamentations Rabbah appears the following version of this Haggadah:⁴

אמר רבי יוחנן רבי היה צריך כוכב
מיעקב אל יקרי כוכב אלא כוכב רבי עקיבא
כך הוא חמישי איה ארבעין זר כחציה הוא אמר פיינו
מלכה מלשה, אמר לו רבי יוחנן בן מרמא עקיבא יצא
עליו בלתיק וצדיק אין בא.
The three elements in this version are:

(1) Rabbi Johanan says, "Rabbi used to interpret the verse, 'A star will arise from Jacob,' [in the following manner:] Do not read 'star' (כוכב) but rather 'liar' (כזב)."⁵

(2) When R. Akiba would see Bar Kozibah he would say, "This is the King-Messiah!" and

(3) R. Johanan ben Torta said to him, "Akiba, grass will grow on your jaw-bones and still he [King-Messiah] will not have come."

The third and final version which we must consider appears in the Buber edition of Midrash Eicha Rabbah as follows:⁶

אמר רבי יוחנן כך הוא ר' עקיבא אבן כחציה
הוא אמר צריך כוכב מיעקב, צריך כחציה מיעקב,
כך מלך מלשה, איך יוחנן בן מרמא עקיבא יצא
עליו בלתיק וצדיק אין בא.

The elements in this Haggadah are:

(1) R. Johanan says, "When Akiba would see Ben Kozibah, he would say, 'A star [kokab] goes out of Jacob,' Kokba goes out of Jacob—

(2) This is the King-Messiah!" and

(3) R. Johanan ben Torta said, "Akiba, grass will grow on your jaw-bones and still the son of David will not have come."

A comparison of these three versions reveals several significant variations both textually and stylistically. For our purposes, however, we need but concentrate on the story itself and indicate the common elements contained in all three versions:

Element (1), that is Akiba's expounding of Numbers 24:17, although in both versions I and III asserts the favorable attitude of Akiba to Bar Kokba, is reported by two different Rabbis — in the case of version I it is R. Simeon ben Yohai, in the case of version III it is R. Johanan. In version II this first element is reported by R. Johanan, but does not even mention Akiba; it merely asserts the unfavorable attitude of Rabbi (Judah Hanasi? my teacher?) toward Bar Kokba.⁷

Element (2), the reference to Bar Kokba as the King-Messiah by R. Akiba, appears virtually alike in all three versions except for minor textual differences (i.e. Palestinian Aramaic is used in version I, Babylonian

Aramaic in version II and Hebrew in version III).

Element (3), Rabbi Torta's reply to Akiba's declaration concerning Bar Kokba appears substantially the same except that the term $\alpha/\beta \gamma$ is lacking in version II and the phrase $k_2 \cdot k/$ appears as $k_2 \gamma/k$ in versions II and III.

Having analyzed these three versions we arrive at the following conclusion:

Since element (1) reveals contradicting attitudes toward Bar Kokba as well as conflicting in other basic details in the various versions, we shall entirely eliminate this element from any further consideration. This does not imply in any way that we consider this element as unhistorical in itself; merely that in order to use it we should first have to reconcile the differences and establish the correct interpretation -- an investigation whose results will make such little difference to the one fact we are trying to establish as to make any effort in dealing with this problem unnecessary. For example, if we accept the interpretation of Schürer as opposed to that of Bacher⁸ and thereby face the problem of Akiba's negative attitude toward Bar Kokba, it would still not invalidate the fact that for a time at least Akiba did conceive of Bar Kokba as the Messiah. We eliminate this element, however, in order to avoid unnecessary complications and problems.⁹

Since elements (2) and (3) appear substantially the same throughout the various versions, we accept these as valid historical data. For although we can find no supporting evidence in non-Rabbinic or in non-Jewish sources, there is nothing in either of these literatures to contradict this tradition, nor even to make it appear unreasonable. In fact, Akiba's connection with the Bar Kokba rebellion,¹⁰ whether actively¹¹ or merely as a passive sympathizer,¹² would make a denial of this tradition most unreasonable.

We can therefore establish the following fact on the basis of what at present is an uncontradicted and reasonable tradition, which is in absolute agreement with what little we do know about the life and era of Akiba; namely, that Akiba considered Bar Kokba as the Messiah, a view which was not shared unanimously by his colleagues.

B. Akiba's View of the Y'mot Hemashiah

We may now proceed one step further and state the first part of our thesis; namely, that Akiba, since he viewed Bar Kokba as the Messiah, must have held to but one of the two current ideas concerning the Messianic Age -- that it is to be an imminent one and national in character.

To establish this fact we can adduce the following tradition as corroborative evidence:

Commenting on the verse, "Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us," Midrash Tehillim proceeds from *למנוחת ימינו* to *למנוחת ימינו* and then asks the question, "What is the duration of the *למנוחת ימינו*?" In the catalogue of the various Rabbinic opinions that follow we find that, "Rabbi Akiba says forty years, according to the [number of] days wherein Thou has afflicted us -- the forty years Israel served in the wilderness, as it is written, 'and He afflicted thee and suffered thee to hunger (Deut. 8:3).'¹³ This same tradition is also found in another source.¹⁴

In his study on Messianic speculations, Silver points out the significant fact that the Rabbis who lived before, during or immediately after the Bar Kokba revolt, all conceived of the Messianic Age as being of comparatively short duration, whereas those who lived after the uprising and in the succeeding generations ascribed relatively long terms for the duration of the Messianic Age. The reason for this, Silver suggests, is that the earlier Rabbis took the term *למנוחת ימינו* to mean the days preceding the advent of the Messiah and expected the Messiah to appear in the very near future because their calendaric calculations led them to believe that they were living in the final cycle of the fifth millenium.¹⁵

Furthermore, the belief was popularly held that the Messianic Age was to begin at a time when the fortunes of the people were at the very lowest. The social and political conditions during the first and early second centuries were such as could easily fill this requirement and so lend support to what their millenarian chronology already led them to believe.¹⁶

Akiba, too, believed that the Messianic Age was near and he is quoted by Rabbi Nathan as basing this hope on the text in Haggai (2:7), "Yet a little while longer and I will shake the heavens and the earth."¹⁷

Having established the fact that Akiba viewed the Messianic Age as being very near at hand, we proceed to try to establish that the nature of this Messianic Age was political in character and involved the restoration of Jewish independence:

Meyer Friedmann states that, "In the first generation after the destruction...the hearts of the leaders and sages in Israel were filled with hope that in but a short time the visions of the prophets will be fulfilled, such as those of Ezekiel and the rest of the prophets."¹⁸ The significance of Friedmann's remark lies in the character of the Messianic hope prevalent in the second century. If it was to fulfil the prophets' dreams, then the national characteristics of this hope become

apparent. Certainly there were elements of a universal or ethical nature inherent in Prophetic Messianism, but the national or political aspect predominated as is amply demonstrated even in the few prophetic quotations which Friedmann extracts.¹⁹ This view is confirmed by Schürer who states, "The older Messianic hope...is nothing else than the hope of a better future for the nation....Even in later times, the old hope of a glorious future for the nation maintained the supremacy."²⁰

Moore also states, "The national, or as we might call it the political, expectation is an inheritance from prophecy. Its principal features are the recovery of independence and power, an era of peace and prosperity, or fidelity to God and His law, or justice and fair-dealing and brotherly love among men, and of personal rectitude and piety. The external condition of all this is liberation from the rule of foreign oppressors; the internal condition is the religious and moral reformation or regeneration of the Jewish people itself."²¹

That the Messianic hope that prevailed among the Rabbis of the first and early second centuries was national in character and that the *Bar Kokhba* soon to be ushered in was indicative of a redemption from Roman domination and a restoration of political independence is also apparent from the Talmudic statements of second century Rabbis which characterize the demoralized

political and social conditions of their times as being Messianic in character. The fall of Jerusalem, the defeat of Bar Kokba and the subsequent Hadrianic persecutions were regarded as the *1000*, the travail pains which prefigured the imminent birth of the Messianic Age.²²

The political and national nature of the Messianic Age hoped for in this period is also apparent from the expectations of the general defeat of Rome: We know that speculations concerning the Messiah and the Messianic Age were rife.²³ The book of Daniel particularly and Scripture generally were searched for descriptions of his nature and indications of his advent.²⁴ We have already mentioned that their calendaric calculations based on a Millenarian Chronology fanned the flames of these speculations. Along with these mystical searchings for "signs of the times", we must also mention the expectation concerning the defeat of Rome.²⁵ Thus, when Jose ben Kisma, an eye-witness of the Bar Kokba revolt, was asked by his pupils when the Messiah was to come, his answer was based on his belief that the Romans would soon be defeated by the Parthians. Before he died he asked his students to bury him in a deep grave, "for there will be no palm tree in Babylonia to which the horses of the Parthians will not be tied, and no coffin in Palestine from which the horses of the

Medes will not feed."²⁶ This belief is even more vividly portrayed in R. Simeon b. Yohai's statement, "If you see a Persian (Parthian) horse tethered to a grave in the land of Israel, keep watch for the coming of the Messiah. Why so? Because it says (Micah 5:4), 'And this shall be peace, when the Assyrian (-Persian) comes into our land and treads upon our soil....'"²⁷

The defeat of Rome was the necessary prerequisite for Jewish independence and the people of Israel naturally were more than a little interested in whatever country was waging war against Rome. In the second century, as we have seen, the Rabbis put their hope in Parthia who at this time was at war with Rome.²⁸

Such being the general conditions, we might assume that these attitudes were also shared by Akiba. We make this assumption on the basis of the following reasons:

First, Akiba, like many others of the second century Rabbis who speculated concerning the Messianic Age, had a decidedly mystic bent --- he was one of the four who entered the $\odot 3 \odot \odot$ of esoteric philosophy; he was a student of the theosophical $\odot 2 \odot \odot \odot \odot \odot$; ²⁹ and he has been regarded by later generations as the author of several mystical texts.³⁰

Secondly, Rabbi Akiba, like Rabban Gamaliel before him, was very favorably disposed toward the Parthians,³¹

probably because they treated the Jews favorably³² and certainly because they threatened the domination of Rome.³³

Finally, the very fact that the tradition embodied in the three versions already dealt with, all agree that Akiba referred to Bar Kokba not merely as the Messiah, but as the King-Messiah, indicates too that in Akiba's mind the term 'Messiah' had a decidedly national connotation.

Of course, no one single fact of those already mentioned is alone sufficient to substantiate anything; but the several facts taken together, plus the fact that they all fit so readily into an understandable and reasonable historical context, do provide a sound basis on which to make a conjecture; namely, that Akiba held to a definite view of the *מלכות משיח* as being not only imminent but also involving a complete upheaval of the existing political situation in Palestine at that time.

Having dealt with the political factors which can reasonably explain Akiba's view of the *מלכות משיח*, we may proceed to search for similar motivations in the social and economic spheres which also affect man's thinking and wherein we might also expect to find reasonable explanations for Akiba's view. Moreover, we can also now set up Ishmael as representing that majority view of

אלה נדון א"נ' which, as we have seen, was in sharp conflict with Akiba's view. The socio-economic factors provide the first basis for a sharp division between the two views of אלה נדון א"נ' which is further to be expanded upon by an actual statement of difference between Akiba and Ishmael on this issue in the final chapter.

Chapter III

R. Akiba and R. Ishmael as Representatives of Distinct Socio-Economic Classes

Jewish as well as non-Jewish historians have already indicated and discussed the class struggles and factional strife in Palestine prior to and during the period of our investigation.¹ Louis Finkelstein sees a double struggle within Judaism already as far back as the Maccabean period; first, between the organized patricians or Sadducees on the one hand and the scholars or Pharisees on the other, and, secondly, within the Pharisaic Party itself, between the patricians and provincials and the plebeians.² He even goes so far as to trace this secondary cleavage through the schools of Hillel and Shammai³ down to Akiba and Ishmael.⁴ Such a development, however, is beyond our concern. We must try to examine whatever evidence is available at present to see whether or not Akiba and Ishmael are distinguished from one another in regard to social and economic attitudes.

Of the few real facts that we know of Akiba's background, one is that he was a shepherd⁵ and another that, at one time, he was an *ḥakam pṛ*, a mortal enemy of the Rabbis.⁶ As for Ishmael, we know that he was a descendant of a wealthy priestly family in upper Galilee.⁷ These

facts, however, are of little significance by themselves. They may with additional evidence support our contention. Since, however, there is no direct evidence, the obvious course to follow then would be to examine thoroughly all of the Halakhot of both Akiba and Ishmael and see whether they fall into separate patterns, each favoring a different stratum in society. Unfortunately no such exhaustive study, to our knowledge, has as yet been made. Finkelstein does indicate some of Akiba's principles in relation to class differences and gives examples of their application.⁸ Of these principles and their application, we shall extract only those in which first both Akiba and Ishmael express a point of view and secondly only those examples given by Finkelstein which are also substantiated by the sources.⁹

Principle I: "Whatever be the inequalities which we find in the world, we must not permit them to intrude on the worship of God. Hence, ceremonial law must be interpreted so as not to exclude the weaker social groups from participation, or to demand too heavy sacrifices from them. This implies that no opportunity may be given to the more fortunate to invent ceremonies or refinements of ritual which the poorer cannot imitate. Nor, on the other hand, may expensive devices be utilized as evasions of burdensome laws."¹⁰

Example a: If a man sold his fellow a place to build him a house (So, too, if a man received it from his fellow to build him a bridal house for his son or a dower-house for his daughter), he must build it four cubits by six --- so says R. Akiba. R. Ishmael says: This is a cattle shed! He that would build a cattle-shed should build it four cubits by six; a small house --- six by eight; a large house --- eight by ten; an eating-hall --- ten by ten. The height thereof should be the (sum of) half its length and half its breadth.¹¹

Example b: Akiba permitted the spending of the second tithe on such (plebeian) dishes as locusts and mushrooms; Ishmael was opposed to this.¹²

Example c: Akiba objected to Ishmael's exhortation to beautify the commandments by the purchase of a fine lulab, fine fringes, fine phylacteries and a fine sukkah.¹³

Example d: Since the destruction of the Temple, the Levites had no more official function. Akiba felt that their tithe should cease to be binding on small farmers. He therefore ruled that grain which has not been garnered in time is free from the tithe; Ishmael admits the principle but holds that the yard must actually be unprotected.¹⁴

Principle II: "So far as the civil law is still fluid and open to interpretation it is just to use this as a means for the rectification of social inequalities. Hence, the rules of law should favor the oppressed groups: the plebeian, the artisan-merchant, the shepherd, the slave, the women and children."¹⁵

Example: The cost of the daily sacrifice in the Temple was defrayed from the voluntary annual tax of half a shekel paid by each adult male Jew. Toward the end of the second commonwealth there was generally an annual surplus which Temple officials invested in oil, wine and flour to be sold to pilgrims at a profit. This was an infringement on the rights of private traders; for Temple commodities had the advantage of convenience and prestige and were in all probability cheaper.¹⁶ Ishmael defends this practice on grounds of precedent. Akiba opposes it.¹⁷

Principle III: "It is especially important that the prerogatives of the priests be limited, and that the gross inequality between them and the Levites be minimized."¹⁸

Example: It was customary for the priests to bless the people after the Temple sacrifices. Ishmael remarked that while the priests are blessing the people, God Himself blesses the priests. Akiba objected to this

ascription of special privilege to the priests and was not even willing to agree that the blessing of the people was entirely dependent on the priests.¹⁹

This view of Akiba and Ishmael as representing different social and economic interests in society seems most plausible for it explains the very basic facts in an understandable and familiar pattern. Thus, for example, it becomes easier for us to understand why Akiba "emunciates his conviction that the mode of expression used by the Torah is quite different from that of every other book..., [and why Akiba] perceived [in every peculiarity of diction, every particle, every sign] indications of many important ceremonial laws, legal statutes and ethical teachings,"²⁰ and why Ishmael insisted *פסק יז העב מיה מררר*.²¹

That the Bible was used to sanction the established social order and maintain the difference of levels within the society is an historical phenomenon already familiar to us from past history. Zeitlin has pointed out how the whole Religious and Secular struggle for leadership in the Jewish state was responsible for the acceptance by some and rejection by others of the sources of authority, the Bible and the Oral Law.²² If the Torah was utilized in Akiba's day for the same purpose, namely by one element in society to sanction its leadership and

maintain its interests, then we should expect the other elements in society to strive for a change in the social structure. This would require one of two courses of action: (1) complete rejection of the Torah, which would require the setting-up of a new source of authority to sanction the new social order, or (2) merely a new interpretation of the Torah that would effect the same result. Akiba's system of hermeneutics was so elastic, in fact, as to permit almost any kind of new interpretation. As Louis Ginzberg characterizes it, "...convinced both of the unchangeableness of Holy Scripture and of the necessity for development in Judaism, he [Akiba] succeeded in reconciling these two apparently hopeless opposites by means of his remarkable method [of interpretation]."23 This would also account for Ishmael's great opposition to Akiba's method.²⁴ It would also explain the statement made about Ishmael by his colleagues; namely, "Ishmael the priest favors the priests."²⁵

In view of the foregoing and also in view of the fact that there is nothing in the literature to controvert this contention, we cannot assume with reasonable assurance that Akiba and Ishmael each reflects a different socio-economic orientation and interest: Ishmael, the pro-priestly and pro-patrician; Akiba, the plebeian. Thus we find still another basis for understanding the

different points of view of Akiba and Ishmael concerning the *אֱלֹהֵי אֲנִי* . In the next chapter we shall treat of the actual statement of difference between them; that is, the only source upon which we can conclude what our investigations thus far have only indicated.

Chapter IV

Akiba and Ishmael's Views Concerning the

Y'mot Hamashiah and the Olam Haba

"....There is an intimate connexion between crushing oppression, which leads to despair of the present, and the hopes of men for divine intervention, for the judgment to come (first of all, upon their oppressors), and a golden age in the future. This is proved by the form which eschatological speculation took in Judaism. It was no accident that apocalyptists dreamed of the world to come under the figure of a banquet, a Messianic feast, a time of rejoicing and plenty, of freedom and prosperity, with the hungry filled and the mournful and disheartened comforted. Or that they placed in the forefront of their vision, in times of acute political distress, a divine intervention and chastisement of their enemies. Or that the more spiritual guides and interpreters of the common hope, men who realized that their 'hope was laid up in heaven', and that the consummation lay in another world than this — that these men retained the crude symbolism of the political-economic dream which fired the hearts of the poor and oppressed, giving it a higher interpretation. The forms taken by this expectation were no accident; one of the surest of psychological laws, the very one

that governs all dreams of the hungry and persecuted, of all persons with repressed desires -- the prisoner's dream of deliverance, the fever-stricken man's vision of cooling waters, the famine sufferer's dream of bread -- rendered inevitable their choice of imagery. And in... [Jesus'] time the people were not only hungry for bread, and restless under the political restraints of the Roman occupation; they were yearning for the actual realization and establishment of the first premise of their priestly religion, the theocracy, the regnum dei in terra, the actual, tangible, visible manifestation of God's supreme power upon earth and the conformation of this world's affairs to His divine and perfect will. This premise was not yet actually realized. The Kingdom of God has not yet 'come'. And the longer it remained unrealized, the more vividly, it seems, were its coming and the consequences of its coming pictured.¹ Thus an historian sums up the social, economic, political, psychological and religious stimuli which aroused the widespread Messianic expectations prior to and during the period of our investigation. In his conclusion, however, he describes only one of the two basic manifestations of the Messianic hope -- the Apocalyptic-eschatological form.

This form, which derives from a monotheistic premise² is larger in scope and more religious in character.³

It is the consummation of the *מלכות*, God's Kingship on earth.⁴ This view is best expressed in the prophet's words, "On that day the Lord shall be One and His name shall be One," or as it appears in the Sibylline Oracles, "Then He will raise up a kingdom to all eternity over man, he who once gave a holy law to the godly, to whom he promised to open all the earth, and the world, and the gates of the blessed, and all joys, and an immortal soul (*νοῦς*) and eternal happiness."⁵ A clear and more-or-less consistent expression of this view is found in the Gospels of the New Testament.

The second form which the Messianic expectations assumed derives from Biblical prophecy and is the national-political one which we have already mentioned:⁶ "The expectation of a golden age of the Jewish nation attached itself to the prophecies of liberation from foreign dominion, and restoration of independence under the rule of a wise and good king of the old line of kings of Judah, an age crowned with all the blessings of God...."⁷

"....The prophets abound in idealizing descriptions of the golden age to come, with its political, social, and economic blessings. The Jews drew on all this imagery in their pictures of the future, and embellished them with new traits discovered by ingenious midrash in other parts of the Scriptures...."⁸

This distinction between the two forms which the Messianic expectations assumed is the starting point for the conclusion of our thesis:

We have already established with reasonable certainty that Akiba viewed Bar Kokba as the Messiah who was to usher in the imminent מלכות משיח which he expected, a view not shared by all his colleagues. We have also reasonably established that this מלכות משיח involved a political upheaval -- the overthrow of Roman domination and the restoration of Jewish political independence. On the basis of this we have concluded that Akiba held to but one of the two current views regarding the משיח מלכות ; namely, the national-political one in contrast to the apocalyptic-eschatological one.

Secondly, we have assumed on the basis of Finkelstein's work on Akiba (at present, the only work with such an approach), the fact that Akiba represented one socio-economic stratum in his society and Ishmael another. We have made this assumption on the validity of such an approach in other similar historical situations as well as its plausibility in this one, more so than on the actual evidence of Finkelstein, which leaves much to be desired. In addition, the fact that this approach is not controverted by any of the sources is another factor in its acceptance.

On the basis of this we shall now try to demonstrate our conclusion; namely, that since Ishmael represents

the interests of a particular class in society different from that which Akiba represents, Ishmael also must hold to a different view of the *ימות המשיח*; namely, the second of the two forms which the Messianic expectations assumed, the apocalyptic-eschatological one.

The sole evidence which we have are two similar passages in Sanhedrin:

a)9 ואמן דאמר מעבדך ד"ר חייא כבד במוצאי שבת
אכדגניא פכר פכר פכר במוצאי שבת
אזילא פכר פכר פכר ד"ר חייא. אמר לו רבי ילמלא
ופלא כבד נאמר ונכרה ובי שלשה דומים יל אלא ונכרה
במוצאי שבת פכר פכר פכר במוצאי שבת ונכרה
כאן בן אבא.

b)10 כהנא פכר פכר פכר במוצאי שבת
כ"ד אל כי ילמלא ופלא כבד נאמר אה פ' הוא
מעבד ונכרה ובי שלשה דומים יל אלא ונכרה במוצאי
שבת במוצאי שבת פכר פכר פכר במוצאי שבת ונכרה
כאן בן אבא.

These passages reveal an important difference of opinion concerning the number of worlds or periods of time. From Ishmael's rhetorical question to Akiba, "Are there then three worlds?" we can infer that Akiba held to a pattern described earlier¹¹ -- one in which the *ימות המשיח* figured more prominently as an independent period of upheaval and activity. From Ishmael's interpretation of the verses we gather that he held to that view of the *ימות המשיח* which saw it as part of a greater *אזילא דהא* -- a majority view which, broadly speaking, saw one great antithesis between *אזילא דהא* and *אזילא דהא*.¹²

That such a distinction should exist between Akiba and Ishmael is understandable in view of what each saw in the *אֶלֶן דִּן*. Akiba saw Bar Kokba as the Messiah who was soon to usher in a Messianic Age that would achieve political independence and effect social and economic changes, and he therefore saw it as a distinct period of great activity and accomplishment. Ishmael, who would understandably oppose any social and political upheaval and any threat to the position of leadership of his class, saw the *אֶלֶן דִּן* in the older, more conservative and traditional light, merely as part of a greater, more remote, eschatological *קִדּוּם פְּסוּל*.

This conclusion is, of course, no more than a conjecture. But to repeat an already well-emphasized principle, since this conjecture is based on a reasonable foundation, since it is not contradicted by any of the sources, but is rather based on a view of history which time and again is validated by other similar historical situations, we make our conjecture with a reasonable measure of assurance.

Notes to Chapter I

All references to Strack and Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Munich, 1928), are to volume IV, part 2. For methods of citation to primary sources, see Bibliography.

1. Mishna Abot 2:7 — קנה למ מור קנה לעצמו קנה לו
צרכי תורה קנה לו חיי מלאך הבא

Bereshit Rabba 14:5 (I,129) — ויצר ב' יצירה יצירה
(i.e. at Resurrection) בעולם הזה ויצירה לעולם הבא
ז"ל וז"ל ש"ל אומרים לא כלם ליצירה בעולם הזה
כך יצירה לעולם הבא בעולם הזה ממהיל בעור
ובבשר וגומר בגידים ובעצמות אלה לעצמם אלא
(עולם הבא) ממהיל בגידים ובעצמות וגומר בעור
ובבשר לבד אומר במה יחזקאל ראית והנה
עליונים גידים ובלבד עולם אחר רבי יוחנן אין אמרין
ממה יחזקאל ואמר הן ממה יחזקאל דומים אלה
לפני נכנס אמרתי מה לפה פוסט ראשון הוא
אבל אחרון ז"ל אומרים לכלם ליצירה בעולם
הזה כך יצירה בעולם הבא בעולם הזה
ממהיל בעור ובבשר וגומר בגידים ובעצמות
כך אף לעצמם אלא ממהיל בעור ובבשר וגומר
בגידים ובעצמות לכן אילו אומר פה כאלו
ממילא ה"ל אמרין אין כ"כ כאן אלא
(i.e. in the future, at Resurrection) ממילא
ובבשר ה"ל אמרין אין כ"כ כאן אלא

הקפ"אני עור וזר פלגלני אין כתיב
כאן אלא גלגלני עזמול ולידי סוככני
אין כתיב כאן אלא גסוככני ...

(i.e. Since bones and sinews are here men-
tioned last, it follows that they will also
be last at the future creation of man.) See
also Leviticus Rabba 14:9, for parallel
passage.

Tosefta Peah 4:18 (24) —

מחלף בזנב פמלק
למחלף בזנב פל אוכלותו לענין שפול
או בשני זכרות שלחו או אחיו ואמרו או
אבלות גנז אוכלות ופוסקים על של
אבלות ואמר עומד וזכר של ושל אבלות
אמר לפי אבלות גנז אוכלות אמר ואני גנז אוכלות
אמרה (heavenly world of souls =) גנז אוכלות
גנז אוכלות נשקף אבלות גנז
אוכלות במקום שפול יכולת לשלוח ב
ואני גנז אוכלות במקום שאין פול
יכולת לשלוח ב גנז אוכלות צדיק ומשפט
מכון כסאק ואני אבלות גנז אוכלות
שאין עולם פירח ואני גנז אוכלות לשלוח
פירח גנז אוכלות צדיק כי טוב כי
פירח מלאכה יאכלו אבלות גנז אוכלות
של מחון ואני גנז אוכלות של נשמה
גנז אוכלות פירח צדיק על חיים וקיום נשמה
אכל אבלות גנז אוכלות ואני גנז

אצמ' שטאמ' וואס גע'ה' צדקה אבא'...
 אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' אצמ'
 אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' אצמ'
 צדקה אצמ' אצמ' אצמ' ...

Olam Haba in this passage refers to the
 world of souls. See Strack and Billerbeck,
 pp. 816, note a., and 832-833, note q.

2. Mishna Berakot 9:5 —

כל חומ' ברכא' לכו
 במקדש ה' אומ' מן העולם השקראו המנין
 (i.e. Sadducees and those who denied Resur-
 rection and Retribution) ואמרו אין
 עולם אלא אחד המקרא לכו אומ' מן
 העולם השקראו.

Since this formula is a reaction against the
 denial of Resurrection, the meaning of the
 second עולם (= עולם השקראו) in this context re-
 fers to the eschatological עולם השקראו which is
 to be ushered in by the Resurrection and
 World Judgment. The parallel passage in
 Tosefta Berakot 7:21 (17) reads — כל חומ' ברכא' לכו

ברכא' למקדש ה' עולם השקראו
 שקראו המנין ואמרו אין עולם אלא
 אחד המקרא לכו אומ' מן העולם
 השקראו ומ' צדקה לכו אומ' מן
 העולם השקראו.

(i.e. Just as one naturally goes from the anteroom into the dining room, the *פסוק* *כז* in the above reference cannot refer to the Final Age which begins with the Resurrection, but rather refers to the World of Souls into which the soul of a man naturally enters after death. Here we have an example of how the dual meanings of the expression *כז פסוק* lead to two entirely different interpretations of a particular reference.)

3. See Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (New York, n.d.), Division II. vol. 2., pp. 177-183, and George Foote Moore, Judaism in the First Two Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge, 1927-30), vol. 2., pp. 338ff.

4. See Schurer, II. 2., pp. 177-179, and Moore, 2., p. 378.

5. Mishna Sanhedrin 10:3 --- *כז פסוק*
i.e. the Age beginning with *כז פסוק*
פסוק (the Resurrection
פסוק *כז* *פסוק* *כז*
פסוק *כז* *פסוק* *כז*
פסוק *כז* *פסוק* *כז*
פסוק *כז* *פסוק* *כז*

אר"י מאד רעים בעולם הזה וחסדאין
 לעולם הבא... מרגלים אין אר"י חלק לעולם
 הבא שנאמר וימלאו פאנשים מלפניו צבא
 האל כדע במעשה אשן ה' וימלאו בעולם הזה
 במעשה בעולם הבא... עבד קרח אינה
 עמידה לעולם שנאמר וטבס עליהם האל
 בעולם הזה ויאבדו מהם הקהל בעולם
 הבא צבא ר' עקיבא

Sanhedrin 90b --

הניא א"ר אליעזר ז"ל יאסו צבא
 כה ז"ל ספרי מניין לשון אומרים אין
 חיי"ל פומים מן פגורא אמר אר"י
 ז"ל מן מורכב ולא העליג בידכם
 כלום שמה אומרים אין חיי"ל פומים
 מן פגורא דרי פא אומר הכרה
 הכרה פנשל דפ"א עונה זה הכרה
 הכרה בעולם הזה דונה זה זאי"מ
 (i.e. at Resurrection) אלא בעולם הבא
 אמר לו רב פפא זאב"י ולימא דר
 גרודין משכרה הכרה אינן פא אומרי
 איה צברה מורה כלשן בני אדם כנאי
 הכרה הכרה הכרה בעולם הזה הכרה
 לעולם הבא צבא ר' עקיבא אמר לו ר'
 ילמדא ופא כבד נאמר אה"ה פא
 מעבד ונכרה ובי שלש דומים יל
 ונכרה בעולם הזה הכרה לעולם
 הבא הכרה הכרה צברה מורה
 כלשן בני אדם.

Niddah 16b ---

הניא א"י יחלש כואה אני את צרי
 ז"ל אמרו לו גמלין רבי כחש
 פארכה ענין אמר אדם מוטב לאאריק
 עליכם בעולם דעה כבי ליאריכו יחלש
 לעולם דבא.

Jer. Haggiga 77c ---

... בזאתה לעד זכה אילש ונפטר
 ומת ופיה כי מאיר למח בלז ואומר
 בזאתה למחוק גלגלה נפטר כי מן
 דקרבניות ירדה האש מן השמים
 ושלשום את קברו אגון ואמון לר"מ
 הא קרביה דרבך אייקר נפק בעי
 מבקרתיה ואשכח אייקר מה עבר
 נסב גלגלה ופכסיה ענין אע"פ
 פליה ואי יני בעולם דעה לבימה
 אילש ופיה בזוקר דה בעולם דבא
 לכאלו בזוקר אס יאק טב יא
 דה דקדש לטא טב דכחג
 ביה טב ד' אכל וביחמין דר
 כל מעלן ואס לא יחשול לאק
 אלאמיק אנכי חי ד' ואיט"ל

Sota 12a ---

הניא דמחם גבול דבור דה כיון
 (לכאד לאמר) פכדש דכלש כל דבן
 דילוד דיאורד גליכופ אמר אלא אני
 דמלין דמח אכל את אשמו דמח כולן אגל
 את גלייתפן אמר לו זל אבא קלש
 דצירוק יומי מלך פכדש לפכדש לאגל
 אלא דה דככרים ואתה גברת דה דככרים
 אלא דנקיבול פכדש לא גבר אלא בעולם
 דעה ואתה בעולם דעה אדולס דבא.

(i.e. Those who were killed through Pharaoh's decree can be won back for the world to come through Resurrection, but those who follow Amram's advice preclude the possibility of the world to come for their unbegotten children.)

6. In the Mishna Sanhedrin 10: 1-3 (see above note 5) are enumerated those individuals and generations who are to have no share in the קלל עולם . Two categories are sharply defined in relation to these people: Concerning one group (e.g. the Generation of the Flood) it states: $\text{קלל עולם קלל עולם קלל עולם}$ $\text{קלל עולם קלל עולם קלל עולם}$, 'They have no portion in the world to come, nor will they stand in the Judgment.' The reason for this is that since they have already received their punishment in this world, they are no longer considered for the final judgment nor for the קלל עולם . Later, however, R. Johanan concluded something entirely different. He states (Gen. Rabba 28:8 and Koheleth Rabba 9:14) that the generation of the flood, having received its punishment, will have a portion in the world to come.

Concerning the second category (e.g. the men of Sodom) it states: $\text{קלל עולם קלל עולם קלל עולם}$ $\text{קלל עולם קלל עולם קלל עולם}$, 'They have no share in the world to come,

but they do stand in the Judgment. ' The reason for this is that since they have not received their complete punishment, they receive the final judgment, but are thereby excluded from the *K2D P/18*. These statements in Mishna Sanhedrin indicate the close connection between *K2D P/18* and the final judgment: The final judgment concludes the present era and ushers in the future era in which the righteous will have a share. As for the Resurrection, however, the Mishna in Sanhedrin makes no mention of it.

In a parallel passage, the Tosefta [Sanhedrin
13:1ff. (434)] cites all the conflicting opinions to-
gether: 'They enter into the world to come': תיבין עולמא דאתידן
... כדכתיב ... This establishes .. אמר ר' יוחנן כל הילולא דחיה
the Resurrection of the children who are under age.
Further on, the opinion of the Mishna concerning the
generation of the flood is repeated ואלו הן בני נח
but whereas the Mishna adds ואלו הן בני נח
the Tosefta adds instead ואלו הן בני נח
Concerning the generation of the
Tower of Babel and the men of Sodom, the Tosefta
similarly states: ואלו הן בני נח
But when R. Akiba wants to extend this to cover also

Korah and his band and the generation of the wilderness, R. Judah b. Bathyra retorts (in agreement with R. Eliezer) $\text{כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ} \text{ שֶׁן } \text{יִכְל}$; namely, after they have taken part in the Resurrection. Thus we see that just as the Mishna speaks of the final judgment in close connection with the כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ , so the Tosefta closely connects the Resurrection with the כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ . Both the Resurrection and the final judgment presuppose the כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ , for without them the כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ cannot come upon earth. Whoever then takes part in the Resurrection and is saved from the final judgment will enter into the כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ . The converse is true regarding those about whom it is written $\text{כִּי יִהְיֶה אִתָּם חֵן וְרַחֲמִים} \text{--- they will have no share in the } \text{כִּ2ן רִפְּוּ}$.

7. See below Chapter II, p. 17 and notes.

8. Bereshit Rabba 44:22 (I, 444-45)---

$\text{בְּיָמֵינוּ הָיוּ עָלֵינוּ עֲשָׂרִים מַלְאָכִים וְעַתָּה בְּיָמֵינוּ שְׁנָיִם בְּלָדֵינוּ וְשֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וְעַתָּה בְּיָמֵינוּ שְׁנָיִם בְּלָדֵינוּ וְשֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וְעַתָּה בְּיָמֵינוּ שְׁנָיִם בְּלָדֵינוּ$

Gen. 15:19-21 mentions the ten nations whose conquest God assured Israel. According to Deut. 7:1, however, Israel conquered but seven of these ten. The question then arises, When will the remaining three be put in Israel's possession? R. Johanan b. Zaccai believes it will take place during the latter part of the

present era (*דור פסח*), which is the *מלכות*
אברהם — thus his statement *דור פסח*
הוא, for herein the prophecies in Gen.
 15:19-21 will be completely fulfilled. Rabbi
 Akiba, however, believes to the contrary;
 namely, that the prophecies will find ful-
 filment in an era beyond the present one.
 Rabbi Akiba calls this era beyond the present
 one simply *דור פסח*. Furthermore, R. Akiba
 divides the period, which for R. Johanan b.
 Zaccai is the *מלכות*, into two periods: The
 former period of stress and strain he calls
 the Messianic Age; the latter period, which
 is one of undisturbed conquest and possession,
 during which the ten nations will be possessed
 by Israel, he calls the *דור פסח* — thus his
 statement *הוא דור פסח דאברהם דאברהם דאברהם*.

9. Tosefta Sota 4:2 (298) —

*זכרונות פסח דאברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם
 בלשון זכר אברהם בלשון זכר אברהם
 ופסח דאברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם
 אברהם אברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם*

Tosefta Ta'anit 4:14 (221) —

*אברהם דאברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם
 דאברהם דאברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם
 וישראל אברהם אברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם
 אברהם דאברהם וישראל אברהם אברהם*

Mekilta, Exodus 15:26 (II, 96-97)---

כל המהלך אשר למד במצרים לא
אלם עליך ומה גל כי אני ה' ופאק
אמר המוקד למשה אמר לפי זילגאל
צבתי תורה למדתי לך חיים פס לך
למאמר כי חיים פס למצאיהם ורמאה
היא לך למאמר ופאק משה ולסיק
וליקו לעצמותיך רבי יצחק אמר פאק
אין בזה משה משה פס צדיק ורמאה
אז כל המהלך אשר למד במצרים לא אלם
עליך ומה ואם אלם כי אני ה' ופאק

Mekilta, Ex. 16:25 (II, 119)---

ויאמר משה אכילתו פאק כי למד פאק פה
פאק לא למד אפס בלדה ... רבי אליעזר
חסמא אומר בעדוק פס אין אדם מוצא
אמו אב אדם מוצא אמו אדוק פס

Baba Batra 122a---

היא עומדת אצל יורגל למחלק ולעלה על
לביס לבגמול לא נחלקה אלא לענין על
לביס ... ולא כחוקה על דוק פס חוקה
לדוק פס פס פס אדם יל לו לדה
לזן אין לו לדה פס פס לדה פס אין לו לדה
לזן דוק פס אין לו אדם אחד ואחד שאין לו
פס לבסוף ופס ...

Ketubot 111b---

אמר לא כדוק פס פס פס פס
פס יל בן צד לבד ופס פס פס
מביא דוק אדם בקרין או בספינה בזאת בית
ומסוק פס פס כפס פס פס פס פס
פס פס פס פס פס פס פס פס פס
פס פס פס פס פס פס פס פס פס
פס פס פס פס פס פס פס פס פס

The above Baraitot expresses those expectations of the *מלך המשיח* that were to be fulfilled in the *מלך המשיח* according to Johanan b. Zaccai and the majority of his colleagues as well as all who shared their point of view. Rabbi Akiba, however, since to him the *מלך המשיח* was hardly a period of calm possession and enjoyment, but rather one of great turmoil and struggle, postponed the fulfilment of the above expectations to

a period following the actual Messianic Age, a period he called *קדש*.

10. The Mishna Berakot 1:5 [and its parallel passages in the Tosefta Berakot 1:10 (2), Mekilta, Gen. 13:3 (I, 135), and Sifre, Deut. 16:3 (130, 101a)] is an example of the *ימות המשיח* contrasted with the *קדש*

— *הכבוד*

מכירין ימיא מברין בלילות... בין זמא
[ברך] שגאמר אמן מברך את יוסף בראך
מאכל מברין כל ימי חייך ימי חייך המות
כל ימי חייך בלילות ומכאן אומרים ימי
חייך בעולם הזה כל ימי חייך לעבדא

Cf. Schurer II. 2., p. 178,) *ימות המשיח*

where he cites this Mishna to identify the

ימות המשיח with the *קדש*. Strack-

Billerbeck, p. 829, note q. considers this unfounded.)

For other such examples see references in Strack-Billerbeck, pp. 826-828, note e.

Sanhedrin 99a (and its parallel passages in Berakot 34b and Shabbat 63a) provides an illustration of the *ימות המשיח* used contrastingly with the *קדש* :

אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן ב
פניאין כוון לא נמשא אלא לילית המשיח אבא
לעולם הזה עין לא ראתה אלהים בלתי...

Also Sanhedrin 91b (parallel passage in Pesachim 68a)—

רבי אבהו דא רבי כהנא אמר רבי חייא בר אבא
מאן ה' בראות אבא ומה אור הנה כהנא פהמה

ואור החמה יהיה לזמנים כאור לבנה המאיר
 קלא כאן איננו פאליא כאן אדערס פרא אלמאד
 צאטע אין בין פערפ"ז אינא פאליא אלא לעזב"ז גלויא
 בלעזאל קלא כאן במחנה צדיקים כאן במחנה ג'נה

For additional references to the Midrashim see Strack-Billerbeck, pp. 828-829, note f.

11. Cf. Revelations 20:8 and 9. See also Strack-Billerbeck, p. 833, note r.

12. We have already seen (see above note 10) that the Mishna sets the *מלוא המלך* in sharp contrast to the *מלך המלך*. Furthermore, we have also seen that in Sanhedrin 10:1-3 (see above note 6) the *מלך המלך* becomes clearly distinguished with the beginning of the final judgment and thereby assumes the basic pattern: This world, Messianic Age, and world to come.

13. A tripartite division of time is found in the following:

Tosefta Arakin 2:7 (544) —

רבי יוחנן אומר לבד נתיב בכול זמן המה
 (פערס פרה) גאטע לעזע למחול אר פניק אינא
 פאליא למחנה ג' למחנה ג' למחנה ג' נתיב למחנה
 לעזע לבד (פערס פרה) לעזע ג' פאליא ג' בכול זמן המה
 Zebahim 118b—

בתיא חושף ג' זה מקדש ראשון זה
 זה מקדש ג' וכן כתיבין לכן ג' ימא פאליא
 רבי אומר חושף ג' זה פערס פרה זה פאליא
 ג' ימא פאליא וכן כתיבין לכן זה פערס פרה.

Shabbat 113b—

מנא ומאכל (כח) בעלזא
 אלעזר וימא פמלח ומאכל אדמרי
 אלכא (בעלזא פמלח)

For additional examples in the Midrashim see Strack-Billerbeck, pp. 829-830, note i.

14. See above Sanhedrin 91b in note 10.

15. Midrash Echa Rabbati 3:66 (140) —

תבואה זכא אלמדיס ימיה אמר גרדוף
 זכא אלמדיס ומלח אמר כי מלח
 אמר אמר זכר דמלך ממלח פלמי
 למלך אמר דמלך כמלמל זכר זכ פמ
 Thus Samuel אמר בעלזא פמלח

repeats an anonymous interpretation found

in Mekilta, Ex. 17:14 (II, 148) —

דמלך לזכר דפזיק אמר ילגד אכזב דמקא
 --(ח"י דמלך פמלח ומלח דמלך) --
 which is similar to Akiba's interpretation.

Both their interpretations (Samuel's and Akiba's) postpone the total destruction of Amalek to the זכא פמלח, whereas the usual view expected Amalek's destruction to take place in the מלח פמלח. Cf. also Revelations 20:5.

16. Sanhedrin 99a. See above latter half of note 10.

17. In the Mishna Berakot 1:5 (see above, beginning of note 10) we have found that the Rabbis interpreted

פ"ח ו' as referring to the פ"ח פ"ח and פ"ח
 פ"ח as including the פ"ח פ"ח. In the parallel
 passage in the Jer. Talmud (Berakot 3d), however, we
 find the following variation: פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח
 פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח
 This deviation from the Mishna פ"ח פ"ח
 indicates a later point of view; namely, that the
 פ"ח פ"ח already belongs to the פ"ח פ"ח or, ex-
 pressed differently, that the פ"ח פ"ח includes the
 פ"ח פ"ח. It is therefore not surprising to find
 these two periods often confused.

For further illustrations of such ambiguous state-
 ments see the references cited in Strack-Billerbeck,
 pp. 830-832, note p.

18. See Moore, Judaism, 2., pp. 292-93; L. Finkelstein,
Mobo le-Massekot Abot ve-Abot d'Rabbi Natan (New York,
 1950), pp. 213ff. (Hebrew section) and pp. xxxii and
 ff. (in English section).

19. Mishna Berakot 9:4 indicates how vague and indefinite
 indeed is this term פ"ח פ"ח :

פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח
 פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח
 פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח
 פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח פ"ח

See Strack-Billerbeck, p. 833, note r. for detailed
 list of citations.

20. See above Abot 2:7 in note 1.

21. See above Sanhedrin 99a in note 10.

22. Slavonic Enoch 43:3; 50:5.

23. Mishna Abot 6:9—

אמר רבי יוסי בן קסמא ...
 לבער פטירתו של אדם אין
 מיום או אדם לא כסוף ולא
 כסף ולא אבנים טובות ומגילות
 אלא מורה ומעלה טובים בלבד
 למען בהתפללך מנה אדם
 בלכתך לשמור א"י ופקי ציון
 הוא מליחך: בהתפללך מנה
 אדם בעולם הזה בלכתך לשמור א"י
 בקדו (during intermediate state)
 ופקי ציון הוא מליחך אחר
 כה
 (following Resurrection, which is
 the ultimate age.)

Notes to Chapter II

1. Simon Dubnow, Die Weltgeschichte fun Yiddishen Folk (Buenos Aires, 1951), Yivo Translation, vol. 3., pp. 469-470; Shmuel Yeivin, Milhimet Bar Kokba (Jerusalem, 1952), p. 54.
2. Schürer, II. 2., pp. 297-298 and notes 81-83.
3. Jer., Ta'anit 68d.
4. Lamentations Rabba 2, 4.
5. For this interpretation see Schürer, op. cit., p. 298, note 84; A. Wünsche, Der Midrash Echa Rabbati, p. 100; and J. Shapira, Bishvilei Hageulah (Jerusalem, 1947), p. 42. For a contrary interpretation see Bacher, "Akiba", Ozar Yisrael, VIII, p. 120.
6. Midrasch Echa Rabbati, 2:1 (101).
7. For a discussion of this first element see W. Bacher, Aggadot Ha Tannaim (Jaffa-Tel Aviv, 1920-22), vol. I. part 2., p. 39, note 2.
8. See above, note 5. In our translation we have adopted the one used by Schürer but regarded by him as unhistorical, in order to put the problem in sharper relief.

9. "The part which Akiba is said to have taken in the Bar Kokba war cannot be historically determined. The only established fact concerning his connection with Bar Kokba is that the venerable teacher really regarded the patriot as the Promised Messiah. "—L. Ginzberg, "Akiba", Jewish Encyclopedia, I, 305.
10. Schürer, op. cit., p. 375; Dubnow, op. cit., p. 50; Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews (New York, 1873), Gutheim Translation, p. 109; Bacher, loc. cit., p. 284.
11. Louis Finkelstein, Akiba (New York, 1936), p. 271, denies any active participation on the part of Akiba. L. Ginzberg, "Akiba", JE, I, 305, states, "a sufficient ground for refusing credence in any participation by Akiba in the political anti-Roman movements of his day is the statement of the Baraita (Ber. 61b) that he suffered martyrdom on account of his transgression of Hadrian's edicts against the practice and the teaching of the Jewish Religion, a religious and not a political reason for his death being given." See also above note 9.
12. Makkot 24a-b indicates the role that Akiba played in keeping alive the Jewish hope for national restoration and independence. See also Shapira, op. cit., pp. 35-36.

13. Midrash Tehillim 90:17 (393) —

למחול כמות ענינו. כימי ש'עדותו בבר
 זמני בין וזכור: צבא אחר כמות המלח,
 וכמה ימות המלח, כי אידעז אומא אלא למע...
 כי יפאלד אומא אלא... למע... כי ברכיה וכי
 פוסא צבא אחרו לל מאלא למע... כי יוס
 אומא ללמ למע... כי עקצא אומא אכצדי
 למע כמות ענינו באכצדי למע למע ילכא למע
 למע ויעק ויעצב.

14. Pesikta Rabbati 4a—

וכמה פס ילמ המלח? כי עקצא אומא
 אכצדי למע למע ויעק ויעצב וכל למע
 כמות ענינו מה ענין אלא אכצדי למע
 אלא ענין המלח כאן אכצדי למע

(Sanhedrin 99a contains two Baraitot in which this
 view of the מלח המלח as lasting only forty years
 is attributed to R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus. See
 Bacher, op. cit., p. 139ff. and notes.)

L. Ginzberg in his article on Akiba in the JE, I,
 p. 308, cites this tradition as evidence for his
 assertion that " [Akiba's] doctrine concerning the
 Messiah was the realistic and thoroughly Jewish one....
 He accordingly limited the Messianic Age to forty
 years, as being within the scope of a man's life—
 similar to the reigns of David and Solomon—against
 the usual conception of a millenium." See also Schulim
 Abi Todos (= Schulim Oshser), "Akiba", Jüdisches Lexikon
 (Berlin, 1927), I, 180.

15. Abba Hillel Silver, A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel (New York, 1927), p. 15.

16. Ibid., p. 18. See also note 22 below.

17. Sanhedrin 97b—

... רבי עקיבא ... דארל צו אהרן מר
... דא ארני מרדכי אר פלמיס אר פארר

18. Seder Elishu Rabba, ed. M. Friedmann (Vienna, 1902), Introduction, p. 21.

19. Ibid.

20. Schürer, II. 2., pp. 129 and 135. Italics are those of Schürer.

21. Moore, vol. 2., p. 324.

22. Sanhedrin 98a—

רבי אבדור בריל [אמר] אן בן דא דא צו
לילא ד פלמיס ופלמיס מילא

Sanhedrin 97a—

תניא ר' יאודה אמר דאר לבן דא דא ב
בית פלוד יפה אצול אפגיל יחב אפגיל
יאסר אנל גבול יסובב מדיר אדיר אלא יחונן
אחמא פסופים גסר אירא חטא ימאסו אפי
דאר כפי כל אפאמ נדדר ... תניא ר'
נפארי אמר דאר לבן דא דא ב נדריס ירבין
פני דקניס אדקניס ידאר אפי נדריס אב קמא
דאמא אפא דאמא אפי דאר כפי כל אר
פגן מרבייל מאביל ... תניא ר' נאמיה אמר דאר לבן
דא דא ב דאר גרבה אפיקר ידור אפגיל
מן פחיל אפיין דיקר אפפכה ד פלכא אפגיל
אין גאכא.

Sanhedrin 98a—

אמר ר' יוחנן אם באינה דור למחמץ
ופלג חכמה ללמאם ואם דם עין טליל
וא' אמר רבי יוחנן אם באינה דור ללמאם
רבוא באות דלן כנפרי חכמה ללמאם
כי בא כנפרי צב (ו) לוחי ר' יוסס ב
וסמיק יד וזא אצין אלא

Mishna Sota 9:15—

כ"א פה צול אומ מין שחרב בפתק
לכו חכמיא למפלי כספריא. וספריא
כחנא. וחנא כחמא פאדא. וחמא
פאדא פאדא ודל צדא ואין מזק ל.

"These teachers...were not describing theoretically,
in an academic vein, the conditions which would prevail
when the Messiah would come. They were concretely de-
picting the unprecedented conditions which actually
were existing in their own time, and they were sincerely
anticipating a swift change through the advent of the
Messiah."—Silver, op. cit., p. 23.

23. Silver, op. cit., p. 21; Moore, vol. 21, p. 354.

24. Silver, ibid., pp. 21-22, and notes.

25. Ibid., p. 28; Moore, vol. 2., p. 370.

26. Sanhedrin 98b—

זלדא פטירא אמר ר' פה צול א
אכין לאין פק אצק לזבב
לאין סוס פק נקלג ב ואין
אין אכין לזבב. לזבב לאין סוס
אין אכין לזבב.

See Bacher, Aggadot Ha Tannaim, I. 2., pp. 118-119,

and notes.

27. Song of Songs Rabba--

הן כלב"י אק כאית סוס פכסי קלר
 בקרבי אקל ילגל צפה ארבלו
 מלח (מכח פ') מה טדק ומה
 נה טלוק אלמ כ יבוא בארבלו
 וכי יצריק בארבלו...

See also Lam Rabba 1:13 in Soncino ed. of Midrash

(London, 1939), vol. VII., pp. 121-122, and notes

5 and 6.

28. See Eisenstein, "סג", Ozar Yisrael, VIII, 315; also

Silver, op. cit., p. 28; and Moore, vol. 21, p. 354.

See also below, note 33.

29. Haggiga 14b--

אשתניא רבי יוסי בברי יתאפה אומ
 ללש המלך אומ הן רבי יתאלד המלך דברי
 ; דל במלש המלך =Rashi

See also Bacher, Aggadot Ha Tannaim, vol. 1,

(p. 31, note 1.)
 רבי יוחנן בן נכאי רבי
 דקבא המלך אשתניא רבי יתאלד אומ
 בן הכניא המלך אשתניא רבי דקבא ואית
 רבי אלעזר בן דקבא אק אשת דקבא
 ואיתו קמה קחלל דקבא ואל איתו
 קמה אק אשת אשת אשתניא בן הכניא
 דלא איתו קמה אק אשת דקבא משה
 קמה מאן דקבא

Tosefta Haggiga 2:2 (234)--

ר' יוסי ברי יתאפה אומ ר' יתאלד
 המלך אשתניא רבי יוחנן בן נכאי רבי
 דקבא המלך אשתניא ר' יתאלד אומ
 בן הכניא המלך אשתניא רבי דקבא

Jer. Haggiga 77b---

כ' יוצה בר פז בלש כ' יוס' ב'
 כ' יוצה ב' הכזו מורח אשני
 כזן. כ' יושלע אשני כזן יוחנן ב'
 ככא' כז' עקיבש אשני כ'
 יושלע חנניה ב' הכז' אשני כ'
 עקיבא מ'ס' אהל'ק אין צדמ' נק"ש

30. See "Akiba ben Joseph, Alphabet of", Jewish Encyclopedia, I, 310.

31. Berakot 8b---

מ'יא אש כ"ד בלש' צדריס אורש
 א'י א' פמדי'ס כלמות'כין א' פבלש
 וא'ין מורכ'ין אלא ע' עזי פלח'ין כל'שק'ין
 אין נלשק'ין אלא ע' עזי פמ' וכל'שק'ין
 אין יודע'ין אלא בלש'... מ'יא אש כזן א'ת'א
 בלש' צדריס אורש א'י א' פמדי'ס פ'ן צ'נש'ין
 באכ'ין וצ'נש'ין כז'ת פכס'א וצ'נש'ין כז'ת א'ת'ר

32. See Bernhard Levy, "Persien", Jüdisches Lexikon, IV, 863.

33. Cf. Ralph Turner, The Great Cultural Traditions (New York, 1941), vol. 2., p. 700--"Bar Kockeba...aroused the Jews outside of Palestine and sought the assistance of the Parthians, the deadly enemies of the Romans."

Notes to Chapter III

1. S. Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus (New York, 1947), pp. 61-67; Ralph Turner, op. cit., pp. 700-702.
2. Finkelstein, op. cit., pp. 39ff.
3. Ibid., pp. 42-44ff.
4. Ibid., pp. 165, 294-304.
5. Yebamot 16a---

... עתה בן זכר אקלף ואלקמיה
אם לו אמר פא עקבא ... אלמיק
לכחיל אלס וצין לא פתגא לחיל
זקק אם לו רבי עקיבא אקמיה
... אכיל צאן

Yebamot 86b---

פפא חנא צפא לקיל רבי אדער
בן עזריה מאלר האלן חנה אבן ר"ר אדמיה
אמא רבי קרבי אם עקבא זבמיה
... ח"א (shepherd's wallet)

Ketubot 62b---

ר"ר רעיה צבן סבא לזר

(L. Ginzberg, "Akiba", JE, I, 304., states, "Of the romantic story of Akiba's marriage with the daughter of the wealthy Jerusalemite Kalba Sabua, whose shepherd he is said to have been, only this is true, that Akiba was a shepherd.")

6. Pesahim 49b—

הניח ארז כי עקבא כלשהו
 ער דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 מאז דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'

7. Baba Kamma 80a—

ארז כזי ילמאזא מ' ימ' ו'
 ער דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'

Hulin 49a—

ארז כי אולאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 ער דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 מאז דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'

Tosefta Halla 1:10 (98)—

כי ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 ער דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 מאז דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 ער דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'
 מאז דאזא ארזא מ' ימ' ו'

8. Finkelstein, op. cit., pp. 177ff., and appendix pp. 279-292.

9. The difficulties involved in the use of Finkelstein's work are:

(1) Since he is convinced of Ishmael's being a Sham-
 maite and Akiba a Hillelite, he often makes statements
 regarding Akiba and Ishmael for which his only proof
 is a reference dealing with the schools of Hillel and
 Shammai.

(2) Unfortunately, the notes which Finkelstein appends to statements for substantiation, often prove nothing. For example, a statement on p. 291, states, "Akiba maintained that the Biblical prohibition against uniting of milk and meat is limited to the milk of cattle. But even such a mixture might be sold to Gentiles, he said; it was prohibited only for Jews. In both these views he [Akiba] was opposed by the majority of his own faction, as well as by Ishmael." This statement is followed by a reference to note 43. This note reads: "Cf. the Hillelite opinion in Mishna Hullin 8.1." An examination of that Mishna failed to yield any mention of Ishmael or Akiba, nor did the reference deal with the case at hand. Only after searching the entire chapter 8 of this Mishna could we find the following statement: "R. Akiba says: Wild animals and birds are not [included in the prohibition] ."

Despite the difficulties, Finkelstein seems to make a case for Akiba as being sympathetic to the plebeians and as standing up for that class in his halahik statements. His references to Ishmael, though scant and only indirect, are nonetheless useful--they are the only source which views Ishmael as representing the patrician group and as opposing Akiba on that basis.

11. Mishna Baba Batra 6:4—

פאמוכר מקום אחרון ארנון ל בית
 (אכן פאמוכר אחרון ארנון ל בית)
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון
 ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון ארנון

12. Jer. Erubin 20d—

צדיק וחזק כחשן ופטריון כחשן
 עקבא נקחין בכסא משה לן כח
 למען אמן נקחין

(See parallel passage in Jer. Ma'aser Sheni 1:3)

13. Mekilta Ex. 15:2 (II, 25-26)—

אנאן רבי למען אמן וכי אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח
 אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח אשכח

14. Mishna Ma'aserot 3:5—

אינאן חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק
 למא חזק למא חזק למא חזק

15. Finkelstein, op. cit., pp. 177-178.

16. Ibid., p. 283.

17. Mishna Shekalim 4:3—

מאז ימי הלכה מה הן דולין
בין זוקחין בין יינות למתים וסלגות
והלכה הפקדול דברי רבי שמעון.
רבי עקיבא אומר אין משכבין מל
פקדול לא מלל עניים.

18. Finkelstein, op. cit., p. 178.

19. Hullin 49a—

דמיא דא גברא אה בני ילגא
רבי שמעון אומר אמרן ברכה ילגא
מש כתיב רכבים צמח לא אמרן
כלפא אומר ואני אברכ פלי אומר
כתיב גברא ילגא ופקדול מר
פא מר רכבים רבי עקיבא אומר
אמרן ברכה ילגא מש כתיב
מש גברא לא אמרן כלפא אומר
ואני אברכ פלי אומר כתיב גברא
ילגא ופקדול מר פא מסכים דא דא.

20. L. Ginzberg, "Akiba", JE, I, 307. Cf. D. Hoffmann,
Zur Einleitung in die halachischen Midraschim (Ber-
lin, 1886-87), pp. 5-12.

21. See above, Sanhedrin 90b, in Chapter I, note 5.

See also below, Chapter IV, p. 35.

22. S. Zeitlin, op. cit., pp. 6-13. See also his Reli-
gious and Secular Leadership (Philadelphia, 1943),
pp. 7-11.

23. L. Ginzberg, "Akiba", JE, I, 307.

24. Sanhedrin 51b---

א"ל דע ילמדא אחי זא זא
אני דארל א"ל וכי מסת' לאמה
דארל זא זא ונביא נא דערפון

25. See above, note 7, Hullin 49a.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. Frederick C. Grant, The Economic Background of the Gospels (1926), pp. 106-107, quoted by Ralph Turner, op. cit., p. 703.
2. Moore, Judaism, vol. 1., p. 228.
3. Moore, Judaism, vol. 2., p. 371.
4. Ibid., pp. 371-372.
5. Sibylline Oracles, iii, 767ff.
6. See above, Chapter II, pp. 7-8, and notes 18-21.
7. Moore, Judaism, vol. 2., p. 371.
8. Ibid., p. 363.
9. Sanhedrin 64b.
10. Sanhedrin 90b.
11. See above, Chapter I, p. 3f.
12. See above, Chapter I, p. 2f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. SOURCES

BABYLONIAN TALMUD. Ed. Vilna.
Cited in the usual manner.

TALMUD JERUSHALMI. Ed. Krotoshin, 1866.
Cited by page and column.

TOSEFTA. Ed. Zuckermann. Jerusalem, 1937.
Cited in the usual manner, followed by page to this edition in parentheses.

MEKILTA. Ed. Lauterbach. Philadelphia, 1933-1934.
Cited by Book, chapter, and Biblical verse, followed by volume and page number to this edition in parentheses.

SIFRE. Ed. Friedmann. Vienna, 1864.
Cited by Book, chapter, and Biblical verse, followed by Piska, page number, and side to this edition in parentheses.

MIDRASH RABBA. Ed. Vilna, 1887.
Midrashim to the Pentateuch are cited by chapter and paragraph of this edition; those to the Megillot by the Biblical verse.

BERESHIT RABBA. Ed. Theodor. Berlin, 1912.
Cited by chapter and paragraph, followed by volume and page to this edition in parentheses.

PESIKTA RABBATI. Ed. Friedmann. Vienna, 1880.
Cited by page number and side to this edition.

MIDRASH TEHILLIM. Ed. Buber. Vilna, 1891.
Cited by Psalm and paragraph, followed by page number to this edition in parentheses.

MIDRASH TEHILLIM. Ed. Warsaw, 1873.

MIDRASH TEHILLIM. German Translation by Wünsche. Trier, 1892.

MIDRASH MISHLE. Ed. Buber. Vilna, 1893.
Cited by Biblical verse.

- MIDRASH ECHA RABBATI. Ed. Buber. Vilna, 1899.
Cited by chapter and Biblical verse, followed by
page number to this edition in parentheses.
- MIDRASH ECHA RABBATI. German Translation by Wünsche.
Leipzig, n.d.
- MIDRASH LAMENTATIONS RABBA. English Translation, Soncino
Press Edition. London, 1939.
- SEDER ELIAHU RABBA AND SEDER ELIAHU ZUTTA. Ed. Friedmann.
Vienna, 1902.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

- Albeck, Ch., Untersuchungen über die halakischen Midrashim.
Berlin, 1927.
- Bacher, W., Aggadot Ha Tannaim. Hebrew Translation by
Rabinowitz. Jaffa-Tel Aviv, 1920-1922.
- Bousset, W., Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenisti-
schen Zeitalter. Tübingen, 1926.
- Brüll, J., Einleitung in die Mischna. Frankfurt a.M.,
1885.
- Charles, R. H., A Critical History of the Doctrine of a
Future Life. London, 1913.
- Drummond, J., The Jewish Messiah. London, 1877.
- Dubnow, S., Veltgeshichte fun Yiddishen Folk. Yiddish
Translation by Hades (Yivo). Buenos Aires, 1951.
- Finkelstein, L., Akiba. Scholar, Saint and Martyr. New
York, 1936.
- , Mabo le-Massektot Abot ve-Abot d'Rabbi Natan.
New York, 1950.
- Frankel, Z., Darke Ha Mishna. Leipzig, 1859.
- Graetz, H., History of the Jews. English Translation by
Gutheim. New York, 1873.
- Greenstone, J. H., The Messiah Idea in Jewish History.
Philadelphia, 1906.

- Guy, H. A., The New Testament Doctrine of 'Last Things'. London, 1948.
- Halevy, I. I., Dorot Ha Rishonim. Frankfort a.M., 1918.
- Hoffmann, D., Zur Einleitung in die halachischen Midraschim. Berlin, 1886-1887.
- Klausner, J., Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten. Krakau, 1903.
- , Harayon Ha Meshihi B'Yisroel. Jerusalem, 1927.
- Kohler, K., Jewish Theology. New York, 1918.
- Moore, G. F., Judaism in the First Two Centuries of the Christian Era. Cambridge (Mass.), 1927-1930.
- Petuchowski, M., Der Tanna Rabbi Ismael. Frankfort a.M., 1894.
- Sarachek, J., The Doctrine of the Messiah in Medieval Jewish Literature. New York, 1932.
- Schürer, E., A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by Sophia Taylor and the Rev. P. Christie. New York, n.d.
- Shapira, J., Bishvilei Ha Geulah. Jerusalem, 1947.
- Silver, A. H., Messianic Speculation in Israel. New York, 1927.
- Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Munich, 1922-1929.
- Tchernowitz, Ch., Toledoth Ha-Halakah. New York, 1936.
- Turner, R., The Great Cultural Traditions. New York, 1941.
- Volz, P., Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde in Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen, 1934.
- Weiss, I. H., Dor, Dor, Ve-Dorshay. New York and Berlin, 1924.
- Yeivin, S., Milkemet Bar-Kokba. Jerusalem, 1952.
- Zeitlin, S., Who Crucified Jesus? New York, 1947.
- , Religious and Secular Leadership. Philadelphia, 1943.

C. REFERENCE WORKS

Eisenstein, J. D., ed., Ozar Yisrael.

Hyman, A., Toldot Tannaim Ve Amoraim. London, 1910.

Jewish Encyclopedia.

Jüdisches Lexikon.