U

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN IN JUDAISM

by

NATHAN A. PERILMAN

- - - -

Thesis

- - - -

Hebrew Union College

1932

Acknowledgement is made to Professor Samuel S. Cohon to whom I am deeply grateful for advice and assistance in the preparation of this thesis.

N. A. P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

ORIGINAL SIN IN THE BIBLE

An attempt to evaluate the place and importance of a doctrine such as the Fall of Man in Judaism must make its point of departure the same as that employed by Christian dogmatists. Both Saint Paul and Augustine make the third chapter of Genesis the source of their doctrines. Certainly this chapter has in it at least some of the elements that form an important part of the doctrine. Whether the incident in Eden brought upon Adam and all his descendants the taint of sin from which they can never be saved, can be made clear only after a careful analysis is made of this starting point of the doctrine of Original Sin as it is taught in Christian religious life.

Dr. Morgenstern,(1 following Gunkel, Budde and Holzinger, points out that a very clear distinction must be made between the narrative of Creation and the independent Paradise story. Likewise the tree of life motif must be separated and treated as a separate unit that was grafted on to the two stories of Creation and Paradise. In like manner Dr. Morgenstern excludes, as do most scholars, the description of the four rivers that appears in Gen. 2:10-14. Thus, if we remove Gen. 2:9Ba and Gen. 3:22 and 24, the composite narrative is freed from the confusing problems that the Tree of Life creates for us. Dr. Morgenstern points out further: "In the remaining verses two distinct strands are readily discernible. Gen. 2:15ABa repeats unnecessarily what is previously stated in Gen. 2:8b, that God has put man in the garden. Furthermore, Gen. 2:15Bb, as also 5Bb, states that man was created in order to till the soil and care for the garden. Gen. 2:18ff. apparently agrees with this thought, since it states most clearly that the woman was created as a fitting help for the man in his natural labor. But the punishment

imposed upon the man for his disobedience, viz., that henceforth the earth is cursed on his account and will accordingly yield its produce only as the hard-won return for his bitter toil, implies that previously the man secured his food without undue effort; in other words, as Gen. 2:16 implies, he merely plucked the fruit from the trees of the garden, and thus amply satisfied his hunger. Clearly, therefore, the present Paradise story voices two altogether contradictory and unharmonizable conceptions, not only of the purpose and creation of man and his first nature, but also of the character of agricultural labor. The one conception is that labor is natural and normal, and by no means an evil condition of human life, for the sake of which man was created. The other conception is that the natural condition of man, which God intended for him, was to live without toil in a garden of trees, and eat of the fruit thereof: and only as a grievous punishment was he condemned to till the soil and eat the produce of the field, the fruits of his happy labors; the other conception was that man originally ate the fruit of the trees of the garden, for which he did not have to toil, and only as a punishment was he condemned to eat of the produce of the field."

In the same essay Dr. Morgenstern points out further internal evidences of the composite character of the chapters under consideration. One is that of the source of the water supply for the earth. According to Gen. 2:5Ba it is the rain, while according to the very next verse, Gen. 2:6, it is an אד which comes steadily from the earth. Furthermore, the two stories present conflicting views as to the nature of the sexual life between the two inhabitants of the Garden of Eden.

Freed of its editorial accretions the original garden story easily can be reconstructed. Again we may employ the exact language of Dr. Morgenstern.(2) "It told that the Deity caused a garden of trees to come forth from the earth about a copious spring. Near this, or in this,

He Himself probably dwelt. The garden was His pleasure-garden, His Gan Eden, in which He used to walk about and refresh Himself. In this garden He had placed a man and a woman. Presumably these were the first man and woman, and were made of dust, although the story nowhere explicitly told of their creation. He forbade them to eat of the tree in the center of the garden and warned them that the consequence of eating of the tree would be that they would become mortal. In this garden also was the serpent. This was not at all a divine being as Gunkel maintains but a creature similar to them in many respects. It walked erect, either on two or four feet, and possessed the power of speech, and presumably ate the same kind of food as they. But it far surpassed them in cunning. And either it did not possess immortality, as they did, or, if it did possess it, it was unwilling that they too should possess it. The former alternative is, as we have seen, the more probable. At any rate it sought to make them lose immortality, and succeeded in this by inducing first the woman and then the man to eat of the forbidden fruit tree."

"But this wonderful tree possessed another, equally significant property. By eating its fruit they acquired a new and strange knowledge, the knowledge of sex. With this came the irresistable impulse to gratify the sex instinct. In consequence the woman probably conceived. But as soon as the sexual instinct was satisfied the reaction set in. Now they realized fully what they had not considered before, that they disobeyed their Master's command, and must now fear His anger and punishment. They hid among the trees of the garden; but when He called they had to come forth and acknowledge their sin. In His anger the Deity cursed all three parties involved. The serpent was condemned to crawl henceforth on his belly and eat dust, whereas he had formerly walked erect and had eaten normal food; and perpetual relentless enmity was set between the serpent and his seed and the woman and her seed.

The woman in turn was doomed to bear children in pain, and to be eternally the subject of her husband. And, finally, the man was sentenced to earn his livelihood by bitter, exacting, and ofttimes disappointing labor, for often the accursed earth would repay his toil only with thorns and thistles; and his food, too, like that of the serpent, was changed; henceforth instead of the trees of the garden, he had to eat the produce of the field. Then he and his wife, and, apparently, also the serpent, were driven from the garden forever, out into the strange and harsh world, in order to undergo all the conditions of their punishment. But first God made for man and the woman garments of skin."

The next point that must be considered is the time when the narrative of the incident in Paradise might have been written. Here also the Bible text supplies us with significant internal evidence. When the serpent talks with the woman he always designates the deity by the term "Elohim", instead of the composite term "Yahwe Elohim". This seems to square with the use of "Elohim" in Gen. 4:25, and with the subsequent statement in Gen. 4:26b that only in the time of Enosh, the son of Seth, did the worship of the Deity by the particular name "Yahwe" begin. From this use of the composite name "Yahwe Elohim" in the garden story, and by the use by the serpent in Gen. 3:1-5 of the single term "Elohim", Gunkel (3 concludes that in the original creation story the appelative of the Deity was exclusively "Yahwe", which seems altogether logical in that the term "Yahwe" implies Creation and Creator, while in the Paradise story, as it originally stood, the term "Elohim" was exclusively used. The implication from the text is that the use of the composite title was employed by the final redactors of the Yahwistic and Elohistic documents, and that we have here a combination of these two originally independent sources. This would place the time of writing before the seventh century B. C. E.

We must now seek to find the meaning that the original writer

of this story sought to convey to the people of his own day, that is about the seventh century B. C. E. According to the Christian interpretation which has had almost universal acceptance among Christians, the story is primarily an account of a fall of the human race in its first parents; it is not merely an account of the historical entrance of sin into the world but, according to these Christian theologians, it is an explanation of the origin and universality of sinfulness throughout mankind. What does the story itself reveal?

There is no hint in the passage of the moral condition of either Adam or Eve before the incident in Eden. Nor is there any indication that their moral condition was fundamentally altered by the act of disobedience to Divine command. We are told that after the act in the garden our original parents realized their nakedness for the first time and sensed shame. The writer does not connect this sense of shame with any sin but implies that it is the result of having acquired some new knowledge. It is as if a people in a rude and primitive state of development suddenly become aware of their lowly condition, not through the entrance of sin into the world, but through the acquisition of knowledge that lifts them from their crude primitive state to higher stage of development. The changes that the people and the serpent are compelled to undergo are physical; the woman is burdened with the travail of child birth, another is forced to crawl on its belly for food, the man is burdened with the task of eking out a livelihood from the earth that has been cursed because of his disobedience. No moral change is explicitly stated, nor is it at any point implied. We have no indication that Adam differed originally from any other man as regards integrity or capacity for intercourse with God, or that his nature was perverted by his act of disobedience. The idea that his sin was the precursor of all sinfulness in the world, or in any way an explanation of it, is altogether absent from the narrative,

and so far as can be gathered from subsequent Biblical writings it was foreign even to the age that followed the writer of this narrative. The J document which emphasizes the import of sin nowhere has any adequate knowledge of the sense of universality of sin, such as was attained in later ages. Nor does this document infer that it assigns to Adam's fall any deteriorating influence upon the self-determination of his posterity. Cain's sin is not explained as having its roots in the fall of Adam; the whole of the guilt is thrown upon the sinner himself. Sin is personified and compared to a ravenous beast lurking over its prey (Gen. 4:7), but Cain is told that "he ought to rule over it." Finally, if the Yahwist compiler were interested in telling of the development of sin in the world, which may well be the case, it must be observed that the first transgression is not only not treated as different in import from the others, as if it were the most momentous catastrophe, but simply as the first of a series whose members were arranged in ascending order of magnitude; the disobedience of the parents, the fratricide of their son, the increased bloodthirstiness of Lamech, and the general corruption calling for the deluge.

Tennant (4 says, "We must conclude that the most the compiler of this story intended was to tell of the beginning of sin in the world. The writer assumes man's capacity for sin. It is indeed open to question whether the narrative was intended to primarily tell of the introduction of sin. It seems rather to be an explanation of the ills of life, which are here as in many other legends associated with the striving after knowledge and civilization. Its chief moral may be that human ills are the consequences of sin. Man's hard lot is traced to sin. The story is more emphatic in the treatment of the ills suffered than the moral consequences of the sin. It is not moral knowledge which God is withholding from man when he refuses to allow him to eat from the tree. Indeed moral knowledge

is implied when the command is given; otherwise how could man know whether to obey or violate the commandment. He must have been capable of making moral distinctions. Nor is it likely that God would have feared the acquisition of moral knowledge on the part of man lest he become as "one of us". Rather it appears that the knowledge acquired through the eating of this fruit is a general knowledge, or cleverness, which is here prohibited and which man is anxious to possess, but which the narrator thinks is the cause of man's ills. The knowledge of good and evil to which the story refers appears to be a knowledge that will make man the lord over nature, the wisdom that would make it possible for man to turn nature to human uses. It is not unnatural for the J writer to justify God's refusal to allow man this knowledge that would give man power like unto Gods. For the J writers pictured a God of many limitations. A God, subject to error; one who must experiment and even consult with man as to the proper course to take. The writer sees in the action of Adam and Eve the same culpable planning that is ascribed to the tower of Babel."

Prof. Cohon (5) sees in the Paradise story the primitive Israelitish explanation of the origin of death. After considering in logical and classified arrangement a series of views on the origin of death, as believed by modern primitives, Prof. Cohon analyzes the Paradise story and posits the conclusion that here, too, the central idea was to explain the origin of death in the world. Our immediate purpose can be served if we draw from this material which Prof. Cohon utilized in his study.

"The Zulus tell that in the beginning Unkulunkulu, the Old Old One, sent the chameleon to men, with the message: 'Let not men die.' Unfortunately the messenger moved slowly, loitering on the way to eat the purple berries of the ubukwehezane tree (or as others maintain, he climbed up a tree to bask in the sun, filled his belly full of flies, and fell asleep). In the meantime Unkulunkulu changed his mind, and

charged the lizard to proclaim: 'Let men die.' The lizard lost no time. He passed the dawdling chameleon, and arrived first among men, with the message of mortality. When the lizard was gone, the chameleon arrived with the message of immortality, but the people refused to believe him after hearing the first words. Thus through the lizard death came to men."(6

"According to the natives of Nias, an island off the coast of Sumatra, after the creation of the earth, God sent down a certain being to put the last touch to the work of creation. He was to fast for a month. But unable to withstand the pangs of hunger, he ate some bananas. The choice of food was unlucky, for had he eaten only river-crabs instead of bananas, men would have cast their skins like crabs and would never have died."(7

"The Melanesians tell a story to the effect that in the beginning of things men never died, but cast their skins like crabs and snakes, and thus renewed their youth. This happy state was changed through an old woman. Having aged, this dame went down to the river, stripped off her wizened old skin, cast it upon the waters, and watched it float till it caught on a stick. Then she went home a buxom woman. But her child did not know her, and set up such a squalling, that the woman went back to the river, fished out her cast off skin, and put it on again. Since then, men do not cast off their skins any more. In another version, the woman's two sons did recognize her, but one of them wished to marry her. Thereupon, she put on her old skin, and brought mortality upon the world."(8

"Woman plays an important part in the stories accounting for the origin of death. She is our common mother, also the common cause of woe. In the type of stories of the serpent and his cast skin, mention was made of death's coming to men through the child's screaming at the sight of its 'renewed' mother. The Baluba, a tribe living on the borders of the Congo state, say that the casting of the skin was interrupted 'by

the woman's fellow-wife (rival)'."[9]

"According to the Algonkins, the wife of the great Manito, whose heart is the sun, brought death and disease into the world. If not for her men would live forever."[10]

"The Cherokee Indians of North America say that in Creation, the sun was made first. When man was formed the creator intended that he be immortal. To this the sun objected. In passing over men, in the sky, the sun told them that there would not be room enough for them and they had better die. One day the sun's own daughter who visited with the people on earth was bitten by a snake and died. Thereupon the sun repented and said that men should live always. 'He bade them take a box and go fetch his daughter's spirit in a box, and bring it to her body that she might live. But he charged them straightly not to open the box until they arrived at the dead body. However, moved by curiosity, they unhappily opened the box too son; away flew the spirit, and all men have died ever since.'"[11]

These various myths created by the vivid imaginations of primitives living remote from one another, yet dealing in essence with the same fundamental problem, and treating the problem in much the same manner, argues for a certain propinquity on the part of man to think on the problem of death at a certain stage in his development. While we need not assume that Israel, because it was a desert and pastoral people, could not have created an explanation of the cause of death that has in it many elements of agricultural life and economy, we must evaluate the available material describing the views held by the people who lived in the same environment at about the same time. Just as there is nothing which would allow one to believe that "borrowing" has taken place among the primitives already mentioned, so we need not assume that "borrowing" had taken place in the case of Israel.

There are certain affinities between the story in Genesis

3 and 4 and fragments that have come down to us from Phoenician mythology. In one of the fragments, said to have been handed down from Philo-Byblus and preserved by Eusebius,[12] a being, Aeon, who would seem to correspond to Eve, is said to have discovered the use of the fruit of the trees for food. The first clothing is said to have been invented later, and to have consisted of skins of animals. Its use is expressly associated with the origin of animal sacrifice. These ideas would seem to be vestiges of a golden age of fruit eating which probably arose out of the sacrificial ritual. This reference does not prove much. It does however point out that in a stage of civilization similar to that in which the Genesis story became current the Phoenicians were faced with the same perplexing problems as confronted the Hebrews.

There are one or two parallels to portions of the JE document in Egyptian mythology. The conception of man as being formed out of clay is one of them. As has been pointed out, this is only implied by the Hebrew source under consideration. Another belief is that of a golden age under Ra. "Certain expressions used by Egyptian writers are in themselves sufficient to show that the first generations of man were supposed to have lived in a state of happiness and perfection."[13] But whilst this was a popular and indigenous legend there were many Egyptians who "on the contrary believed that their ancestors were born as so many brutes, unprovided with the most essential arts of gentle life. They knew nothing of articulate speech, and expressed themselves by cries only, like other animals until the day when Thot came and taught them both speech and writing."[14]

There is evidence in ancient Egypt of both the palm-tree and the serpent, but there is little that can connect these common figures in Egyptian and Israelitish mythology. Weidmann[15] refers to a tree of life which is associated with the goddess of knowledge. There is no complete story in Egyptian mythology which parallels the Fall story, but here also

there are elements which suggest that these people, too, were faced with the same problems as were the Phoenicians and the Israelites.

Allowing for the differences between the Hebrew and Greek conceptions of God, there can be noted a very strong parallel in the story of Prometheus which teaches of his attempt to acquire knowledge and that of the acquisition of knowledge through eating the forbidden fruit. Both contain the idea of the ills of human life as the punishment for man's overstepping the limits of the spheres assigned to him; both regard human knowledge and culture as something required by wrenching from a jealous deity, and whose acquisition was mediated by a superhuman being--in the Genesis story the snake, in the Greek myth a demigod; both imply that human inventiveness of desire for material advancement can be scarcely distinguished from arrogant independence or defiance, and see in it the primal cause of woe in the world.

The Prometheus story of Aeschylus is very like the story of Pandora by Hesiod. This latter story agrees with the Genesis narrative in making the woman, or feminine curiosity, mediately the source of human evils. Pandora is a Greek Eve, and her story before being used for didactic purposes, implied that the first woman, unlike men who were generally regarded as autochtonous--earth sprung--was the work of the gods. Aeschylus makes the state of man prior to the intervention of Prometheus almost bestial, while Hesiod describes the golden age of Kronos which has certain features in common with the story of Eden. In the garden of the Hesperides we have a picture of the home of the gods where Earth produced her choicest gifts and which contained a tree analagous to the tree of life.

Here again we have an instance of the psychological unity that seems to unite men under similar conditions. It is extremely unlikely that these legends could have penetrated the writers of the JE document of Gen. 2 and 3. Both the Greek and the Hebrew were thinking on the same subject

matter from somewhat similar levels of civilization, culture and ethical reflection.

Prof. Cohon, turning from the primitive accounts with which he deals to an analysis of the incident in Eden, sees the same problems confronting the Israelites, in whose milieu the writer of this narrative moved, as is prevalent among the primitive peoples in far removed lands, and living under altogether different conditions. "Turning from the Biblical accounts of the origin of death to Genesis 2 and 3 as well as to 6:1-4, we find ourselves moving in the same cultural atmosphere. Though the details and local color differ, the attitude towards the problem is very much the same. In view of these records, it is wholly out of the question to account for the Biblical story of the Fall by tracing it to Babylonian, Assyrian, Amorite or Canaanite origins. Here we are dealing with the explanation of the sad fact of mortality, as presented by the early thinkers of Israel. Whatever similarity may appear between other primitive accounts with those of Genesis cannot be logically taken as borrowing from one another, but rather as evidence of 'the identity in the mental construction of the individual man wherever he is found.'(16 Natural phenomena--sun, moon, stars, winds, storms, rains, day and night, clouds, disease and death--which are much the same everywhere, form the warp and woof of all thinking. Working on the same materials, primitive man the world over evolves somewhat similar speculations regarding the origin of things."(17

"According to the narrative in Gen. 6:1-4 no limit had originally been set on man's longevity, and presumably men were immortal. They were deemed worthy to be visited freely by the sons of God. Unfortunately, this comradeship led to endless confusion. "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; they took unto themselves wives, whomsoever they chose." Thereupon Yahwe, disapproving these intermarriages, resolved to draw a sharper line between human and divine beings. And Yahwe

said, 'My spirit shall not abide in man forever, on account of their erring; He is flesh, and his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.' Here is a more liberal span of life than the Psalmist's scanty three score ten or four score years. Mortality appears as the sad lot of all humanity, come into existence not through man's misdeeds, but rather through the miscreancy of the sons of God and Yahwe's jealousy for the honor of His divine family. Instead of restraining his ill-behaved sons, Yahwe punishes man whose only fault consisted in that his daughters were fair and attractive. The pauper was again chastised for the misbehaviour of the prince."(18

This lucid and altogether logical explaination of this sometimes accredited source for the belief in the doctrine of original sin completely exempts man from responsibility. If death came into the world because of this misalliance of the sons of God and the daughters of men, then surely man cannot be indicted. No such idea could have existed in the mind of him who wrote it. Here is clearly an attempted explanation of the entrance of death into the world. This author preferred to believe that man's mortality is purely a matter of God's election rather than any defection on the part of man.

At greater length this problem of how mortality intruded itself on mankind is treated in Genesis 2 and 3. In the childishly anthropomorphic atmosphere of this narrative Yahwe is portrayed as being on terms of intimacy with the first couple. No sooner had He moulded man out of dust and breathed the spirit of life into his nostrils, than He placed him in a specifically appointed garden abounding in lovely trees. Among them was "the tree of life in the midst of the garden and the tree of good and evil."(19) Placing man into the garden to till it and to guard it, Yahwe commanded him under the penalty of death not to partake of the tree of knowledge. When in the course of time woman was created as helpmate for man, he informed her of the tabu. Dutiful wife that she was, she observed

her husband's orders until the mischief-making serpent appeared on the scene. As in many of the primitive tales referred to above, the serpent takes delight in perverting the divine command. Undoubtedly well aware that the tabu rested only on the tree of Knowledge, the cunning serpent asks the woman whether it was true that she and her husband were forbidden to eat of any tree in the garden. "Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat," replies the woman, "but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said, 'Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.'" The serpent, aware that the tree in the midst of the garden is the tree of life upon which no tabu rested, takes advantage of the inaccuracy of the woman's report and urges her to taste of the tree of knowledge. Knowing further that the breaking of the tabu did not involve immediate death but rather the forfeiture of immortality, the serpent shrewdly remarks that the tabu was nothing more than the expression of God's jealousy, and that the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge would invest her with powers of divinity. "Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." Enticed by the hissing counsellor, the woman tastes the fruit and finds it "a delight to the eyes" and "desired to make one wise". She, therefore, gives it also to her husband. The fruit indeed had its effect. "The eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked." Together with other knowledge came sex-consciousness. When Yahwe took his usual stroll in the garden "towards the cool of the day", the man kept out of His way. As He called, "Where art thou?" the man replied, "I heard Thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked, and hid myself." This sudden sense of shame betrayed man's secret. "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" demanded Yahwe. "Hast thou eaten of the fruit of the tree whereof I commanded thee thou shouldst not eat?" The man threw the blame on his fair helpmate whom Yahwe had given unto him; she in turn blamed the serpent. Thereupon Yahwe meted out due punishment to all the

offending parties. The serpent was deprived of its upright gait and was turned into a creeping creature, feeding--according to an ancient notion--on dust. The woman was afflicted with the sufferings of pregnancy and the pains of birth--afflictions of sexual life as fit punishment of the sin by which she called forth the consciousness of sex. There was also assigned her a position of subjection to man, the least guilty part to the crime. But man did not entirely escape punishment. Because he followed the counsel of his wife, breaking the divine command, the earth was cursed for his sake, yielding thorns and thistles. Henceforth he was to obtain bread from the ground, only through the sweat of his brow. Toil and labor became his lot, until his return to the ground whence he was taken."

"Do the last words convey the impression that the origin of man explains his end, that the dust naturally returns to the dust, and that mortality is inseparable from life? This view, if at all suggested by the narrative, is extremely vague, for Yahwe is still uneasy. In alarm, He says--apparently in divine council--'Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever.' Though originally there was no prohibition against man's eating of its fruit, as a precaution 'Yahwe Elohim sent him forth from the garden (and its pleasant labor) to till the ground whence he was taken. He drove out the man, and He placed at the East of the Garden of Eden, the Cherubim, and the flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way to the tree of life.'"

"Death then appears as an afterthought of the Creator. Originally it had no room in the life of men, but--as in the myths of primitive peoples--it was introduced through an unfortunate blunder. Here we meet with the causes of the origin of death, which are quite familiar in primitive mythology, viz., the jealousy of a god, the maliciousness of a serpent, the unsuspecting innocence of man. The principal characters in the sad drama,

too, are familiar to us from other tales."

The foregoing analysis of the contents of the Garden narrative suffices to show what the early thinker in Israel intended to convey when he wove his tale of the Garden of Eden. He sought to explain the presence of human ills. He sought also to tell how death came into the world. There is no attempt made to impute to man any special moral defection. He is neither described as moral or immoral before or after his expulsion from the Garden. Too often writers have interpreted the idea of the "knowledge of good and evil" as a knowledge of that which is moral and that which is immoral in the sight of God. Here as well as elsewhere in the Bible this expression means only knowledge in its broadest sense. Nor is there any suggestion here that man delivers over to his children this bias for sin or error. The incident is related as having occurred to the first parents and no mention is made of the effect of the incident on their children. Surely in the mind of the narrator there is none of the highly developed notions of the concept of original sin beginning in Adam and remaining in his descendants for all time.

Since there is nothing in the story in Genesis 2 and 3 or in Genesis 6:1-4 to justify the notion that the elements that preceded the writing, or that even the writer himself, intended to give expression to a notion as widespread as that of original sin, we must examine the references to sin in the Bible to determine if there is anything in Biblical writings to justify such an interpretation of the Fall story. We must first inquire if the story was ever used in the Bible and if so to what extent and purpose. It will be necessary to trace the growth of sin in the canonical and non-canonical works in order to determine if the story of the fall in any manner entered into the notions of sin.

Tennant (20 points out that it has frequently been remarked that the later books of the Bible are practically wanting in references

to the "history of origins" contained in the early chapters of Genesis. The Fall story as a whole, its didactic meaning and its quasi-history of the beginnings of human life, seem never to be alluded to, unless chapter 28 of Ezekiel is directly based on the narrative in Genesis 2 and 3. Tennant says, "this is less probable than that the prophet drew from a variant of the Genesis story, less purged of its original legendary character, or else more highly embellished with foreign additions. Nevertheless we have here a reference to the story which, still floating in oral tradition, perhaps, in Ezekiel's day, had been used by the Yahwist writer as the basis of his history. The doctrinal use, if we may use the expression, of his tradition by Ezekiel, so far as connection with our subject is concerned is, however, absolutely nil."

For the rest, we only find in the Bible the isolated occurrence of conceptions which also appear in Genesis as individual details of the imagery of the Paradise narrative; and such references, on account of their fragmentary nature, are wholly unimportant. They probably imply that the legendary notions of a garden of Yahwe, a tree of life, and kindred conceptions, were living in Hebrew tradition, rather than point to literary borrowing from Yahwist history; and they throw no light on the question whether any theological use was made of the Fall story as a whole. Thus it is extremely doubtful whether there is any illusion in the whole of the Bible to the story of Paradise and the Fall, as that story is told in Genesis, though there are indications of the remembrance of the legendary traditions utilized in the narrative. The reference already mentioned, Ezekiel 28, is the only one to which great probability attaches. This may be due to the fact that the prophets were interested in the practical treatment of sin rather than in the theoretical side of it. It might be argued further that they were occupied with national questions, the salvation and redemption of Israel, rather than with the universal question, the origin

of sin. The Wisdom books, which to a certain extent deal with problems the nature of which border on the theological and philosophical, also neglect to make reference to the incident in Eden. They are as barren of reference to the origin of sin in the world as are the historical and prophetic works. The philosophical problem of Theodicy is dealt with in this literature from various points of view; and in Job, a work written to dispel the popular view that physical ills are wholly the result of sin, and in which the question of the source of human sinfulness is suggested once or twice, a reference to Genesis 2 and 3 would be in place, especially if any well-known doctrinal views had as yet been derived from the chapter.

Though it is possible to understand the absence of any reference to the Urgeschichte in the prophetic works, in that the prophets were national seers and not world philosophers, and in that we do not expect to find in them a clearly defined theological system, it is hard to explain their absence from the sapiental writings. It has been suggested that the reason for the silence is due to the fact that the story is borrowed andthe writers of the Wisdom literature avoided it for that reason. We have already seen, as pointed out by Prof. Cohon, that this argument is feeble indeed. Even if we accept the thesis that the narrative in Genesis is borrowed, so much time had elapsed for the hebraization of any borrowed material that they would have been used in any event, because they would have come to be looked upon as Hebraic from times immemorial. Nor is it true that borrowed things are wholly ignored since we do find references to the Leviathan, Rahab, etc. which admittedly are of Babylonian origin. In any case, the fact remains that the Bible supplies no trace of the existence, among sacred writers, of any interpretation of the Fall story comparable to the Christian doctrine of the Fall.

Tennant (21) says, "It has occasionally been assumed that some doctrinal inference must have been drawn by later Old Testament writers,

notwithstanding their silence on the subject, in order to account for the depth and earnestness of their sense of sin. This assumption cannot be sanctioned. It savours of attributing an association of ideas which we, with our doctrinal legacy inherited from distant centuries, require to make an effort to dissolve to an age which, so far as the scanty evidence seems to indicate, this association has not yet been effected."

"It must be concluded, therefore, that the Old Testament books of later date than the Yahwist document supply no evidence of a doctrine of the Fall having been extracted from Genesis. And whilst this by no means proves that no such doctrine or idea could not, or did not, exist in ages subsequent to the recognition of the Yahwist writing, yet, taken in connection with what has already been said with regard to the exegesis of the narrative of Genesis 2 and 3, and with results of the investigation undertaken in the remainder of the present chapter, this negative evidence points somewhat strongly towards a negative conclusion."

A second element in the doctrine of original sin is that sin is the cause of the sufferings of life. As evidence of this the Deluge is pointed out as an example. There is in the Bible something of the belief in retributive justice; because a man errs he is punished and thus far is sin responsible for the ills of life. This view is strikingly presented by the friends of Job in their discourses with the stricken man. They seek to discover some error in his life that surely must be the cause of his fallen condition and suffering. Job himself believes in this retributive justice, but as Dr. Buttenwieser (22 points out, it is of a spiritual rather than of a material nature. Job is completely assured that the wicked man knows nothing--for him the omnipotent God is a tormenting presence, threatening him with destruction. Retribution is no longer to him a matter of outer fortune but inner experience. The wicked man, notwithstanding his material prosperity and selfish enjoyment of life, pays the penalty for

his wrong-doing and wrong-thinking in his uneasy conscience and his unsatisfied soul. "The righteous man, however, whose foot 'hath held fast to His path', possesses, in the knowledge of his fellowship with God, a source of infinite happiness, which remains unaffected by bodily suffering and material privation. In other words, Job declares, as did Jeremiah two centuries earlier, that not material prosperity constitutes man's happiness, but rather the strength and peace of soul which comes to him who lives a life of righteousness and purity, and is at one with God. This at-oneness with God, Job has learned through his suffering, is the only thing that counts, and the consciousness that he possesses the supreme good has been his mainstay under a well-nigh crushing fate." Here is an answer to the perplexing problem: Why do the righteous suffer? Sin then is not the index to personal aggrandizement or destruction in the external sense. These things cannot be traced to the acts of men. They are, however, experienced in the inner man. If Job can be accepted as the spokesman of his time, and the prophets of Israel for their time, surely we can assert that neither Job nor the prophets who preceded him saw in sin the cause of the ills of man. That is, in the sense that we look upon the ills of man in connection with the doctrine of original sin, as an outward manifestation. Sins do cause ills, but these ills are ills of the soul of man. In Job's instance the ills are not the loss of wealth and family or even the sore boils that discomfited him; they are the sufferings of the spirit which now bear down upon him.

A third element mentioned by the Christian doctrinarians is that sin is not only an isolated act but a state; it is the state of sinful habit. This conclusion is drawn from the J history, which gives an ascending scale of the errors of man in his earliest stages, sins which culminated in fratricide. Inasmuch as these sins were committed during several generations, the implication contained in this element is that sins of the fathers become a part of the inheritance of the children. Not only are these sins

inherited but as they continue the sins become more magnified in proportion as the generations proceed. Such would necessarily be the implication if the source of their viewpoint is the one which Tennant ascribes to them. The most salient passage in the Bible, exploited to prove that the early Hebrews believed that the sins of the fathers were visited on the children, is Exodus 20:5, "For I the Lord God am a jealous God visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and the fourth generations of them that hate Me." Statements of a similar tone, we must admit, are frequently met with in the Bible.

We must make mention at this point that the Bible cannot be expected to yield to us, because of its composite authorship, a philosophical approach to life. At best we cannot expect a single philosophy. Its accumulated writings, gathered over many hundreds of years and representing a variety of stages of culture and a myriad of influences, contain rather a history of the thinking of the people than a single approach to life. Nor can a consistent theology be expected from the Bible for the same reason. Judaism changed in its earliest stages just as it changes today. The growing needs of life, and the advancing changes in its culture, made for additions to its body of law and rules of life. Just as it is possible for one to argue the belief that the sins of the fathers were visited on the children, and just as passages can be pointed out which substantiate this view, so it may be argued that this belief was in disrepute in the time of the prophecy of Ezekiel, and a thoroughly clear explanation for this point of view is easily to be obtained in chapter 18 of Ezekiel. Nor can it be argued that the views of the Bible are to be restricted to a particular period. If we accept the traditional belief that the Torah was given to us through Moses at Sinai, that there is no chronological sequence in the Torah, then we are confronted with the apparent contradictions that are listed almost side by side. On the other hand, if we accept the newer

interpretations and codifications of the Bible, we often find that what we consider to be higher beliefs are found at an earlier period than those beliefs which we look upon as more primitive. Thus before we can attribute to early Judaism any particular doctrine we must make certain to determine the effect of the teaching as near to its time as history can inform us.

In Jeremiah's time we find a softening influence exerted on this older principle--lovingkindness takes precedence over the iniquity of the fathers. The teachings of both Jeremiah and Ezekiel increase the dignity of human life. It could not be otherwise among a people who believed that their very breath was given to them by a God who formed them in His own image and who shared with them His divine breath. This God desires only man's happiness. He has no pleasure in the death of any man that sins, nor does he requite the innocent descendants of him who wins. He helps toward goodness by endowing man with a portion of Himself; and makes individual repentance the purging force of all sin. However deep be the sins of a man, when he does at last return to God and to the right, his errors of the past are no longer remembered; he is judged solely on his conduct in the now. This may be a weak man's arguments against duty in the minds of some people, but actually it teaches that the consequences of a man's deeds must come home to him, and to him alone. The man who sins because of his own volition must suffer the consequences of his sin, but his succeeding generations are not harnessed with the burden of his error.

A fourth element in the doctrine of original sin is that man possesses an evil disposition. Biblical authority for this belief is said to be present in Gen. 4:5 where it is written, "The Lord saw the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every 'yetzer' of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." The implication here is that the race freely brought upon itself, and deserved, the terrible punishment of the deluge. Gen. 21:8, "The imagination (yetzer) on man's heart is

evil from his youth" (note: not from his birth), however, implies that the possession by man of such a propensity towards sin was regarded by Yahwe as sufficient grounds for His showing mercy and compassion, and for His refraining from afterwards visiting the world with a similar destruction.

We have in these statements no suggestion as to the origin of this evil inclination, nor is there any suggestion that it can be passed, through heredity, down through the ages. We do have a suggestion of two qualities that characterize man: one good, one evil. Our question must now be this: What is the Biblical concept of the nature of man? The Bible holds that man is made of two stuffs, רוח and בשר , spirit and flesh. The endowment of these qualities is shared by beast and man, but man is more blessed in that his spirit is more richly endowed. The soul of the beast binds it over to its destined place, while the soul of man makes him free to develop himself that he may more closely attain the God in whose image he is fashioned. Man's creation institutes a new world. The whole of man--body and soul--has, because of its divine breath, the potentiality of a higher and nobler life. It is inconceivable that the Scripture makes of man a thorough-going dual being, giving him a carnal nature which is sinful and a spiritual nature which is pure. We are not told that man is made of an impure earthly body and a pure heavenly soul, but instead that the whole of man is permeated by the spirit of God. Both body and soul are endowed with the power of continuous self-improvement. Man's distinctiveness lies not in his body which represents the evil in him; it lies rather in the spirit that represents the good in him and which emanates from God to man, thereby lifting him to a higher realm and giving him moral freedom. Thus it can hardly be argued that from a Biblical point of view man has an evil disposition which tends toward sin. On the other hand, it could more easily be argued that man has an ingrained tendency toward the exercise of his good disposition, since this very specific quality which distinguishes

him from lower stages of life is the impelling force that urges him to aspire toward the God who breathed life into him.

Porter (23 says, "The Jews never regarded the idea that the Yetzer became evil solely through man's sin. It does not appear that its rise was traced to Adam's sin. It must rather have explained the sin. God did not make the Yetzer evil but only man, and since man made it evil, it is in his power to make it good.....But though in one sense the Yetzer belongs to man and though its evil power is great, yet it is not such as to dominate over man against his will, and there are those in whom it has no ruling power."

Thus we find that man is master over his own nature. Though certain forces are prevalent which may direct him toward wrong, man is endowed with the spirit stuff which is strong enough to overcome the evil forces. Here also we are compelled to admit that man's greater tendency is toward good rather than evil.

We may now consider some of the passages in the Bible which allude to the fact that sin is inherent in man from his birth. In Job 15:14-15 we find, "What is man that he should be clean? And he that is born of woman that he should be righteous? Behold, He putteth no trust in His holy ones: Yea, the heaves are not clean in His sight. How much less one that is abominable and impure, Man who drinketh iniquity like water!" Job is speaking here of creaturely weakness, the natural infirmity, of a being such as man, attaching to him by virtue of his finiteness and temporariness. This frailty of mankind, of which Job frequently speaks, and in which he recognizes a claim upon God's compassion rather than a provocation of His wrath, seems to be regarded as belonging to man as such, to man as he was made by God. The writer of Job looks upon human nature as corrupt but not corrupted; and the corruption is appealed to as an apology for his actual sinfulness. That which is born of flesh, and flesh is essentially

weak; as man is born to trouble, so also is he born to imperfection. Indeed, the angels of heaven, as created and finite beings, are imperfect and unclean. The holy ones are placed in this same category. Man's impurity becomes such only when compared with the purity of God. Man weak and finite is limited just as the select of God, who abide in the heavens, are weak and limited because of their finiteness.

In Psalm 51 we read in verse 5, "For I know my transgressions; and my sin is ever before me." The inherited tendency, if such the writer confesses, is not appealed to in a sense bordering upon that of excuse or plea of compassion, but rather as an aggravation of personal uncleaness and personal guilt. It matters not if the writer writes as an individual or as a spokesman of the people at large, in the form of a national confession of guilt. There is to be found here no implication of a belief in the fallen as distinguished from the sinful condition of human nature. Sin is suggested as an hereditary taint in verse 7: "Behold I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me", but not in any wise in the sense that mankind shares in that sin, or that it had its origin in the first parent. The origin of that sin is left unexplained.

Isaiah 43:28 likewise suggests a growing belief in a doctrine of the fall of man in the eyes of exponents of the doctrine. Here we read: "Thy first father sinned and thine interpreters have transgressed against me." We employ here the comment made by the New Century Bible, (24 which clarifies the question before us. "Thy first ancestor (literally, father) does not mean Adam; xli:8might lead us to identify him with Abraham, the 'friend' of God, and this seems confirmed by li:2. This view is supported by the Jewish commentator Rashi as well as by Delitzsch, Nagelbusch and Diestel. But throughout the oracles it is predominantly Jacob or Israel who is regarded as the national ancestor; see xlviii:1-4 and Hos. xii:4. It is Jacob who appears in the Patriarchal story as the crafty supplanter.

The LXX influenced probably by the plural form in the parallel clause 'thine fathers' render here 'your first fathers' and are followed by Gesenius and Hengstenberg. But this plural meaning is never expressed by a singular noun in the case of the Hebrew word for 'father'. The plural form would certainly have been employed (as so frequently in Deuteronomy)."

"The interpreters or mediators are here the prophets, who are the interpreters of God's will to men. The reference is to the false prophets as such as Isaiah denounced (29:9-10) and whom Micah confronted (1 kings 2ff.) in the ninth century (853 B.C.E.) and in more recent times Jeremiah (23:11-18; 26:8-15). No doubt priests are also included."

Rashi's comment on אבי"ך הראשון חסא is באמרו פמה אדע. This refers to Gen. 15 where Abraham asks, "By what sign shall I know that I shall inherit it?" For the second part of the verse Rashi interprets the intercessor to be Isaac who loved his enemies 'יצחק אוהב שונאו'. In either case Adam is not referred to as the "father" who is mentioned in this questionable verse.

In Hosea 6:7 we meet with the term אדם. This verse, too, because it refers to transgression, is listed as one of the verses pointing to a growing belief in the doctrine of a Fall. On this verse the International Critical Commentary and the Cambridge Bible state that it was not until P that אדם was used as a proper name. It refers here and elsewhere, when used other than in the P code or later writings, to the "common man". These "common men" who have not had the same privileges as the Hebrews have fallen into evil ways. It is expected that the Jews who have had greater opportunities for following the good life should not err as they have. Job 31:33 substantiates this interpretation for here also we find used the term אדם where most obviously it means men of commoner nature. On this verse in Job, Dr. Buttenweiser says, "This meaning of Ke'adam (collective substantive)admits of no doubt, in view of the accusative of comparison." We may now turn to the Hosea passage

to evaluate the alpha part of the verse which refers to a "covenant". The prophet is merely exhorting the people to act in a manner befitting them; not to content themselves with copying the manner of life followed by the common men less privileged than they. We have here no reference to the first man, nor indeed to the general idea of sin as contained in the doctrine of the fall of man.

We may safely conclude after an examination of these questionable passages that there is no evidence that any connection between human sinfulness and Adam's transgression had as yet occurred to the Hebrew mind. That the "divine image" was lost at the Fall is contrary to the implications, as well as the expressed statements, of the Bible. Certainly it can be stated with some degree of positiveness that no clearly defined view of the origin of sin in the world is presented. Though there are occasional references which do ascribe to man an inherited tendency to sin, this tendency is not traced to the incident in Eden. If sin is universal, it is part of the nature of man who is powerless in his finitude and human imperfectability.

CHAPTER II

ORIGINAL SIN IN THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

We turn now to a new class of early Hebrew literature to determine whether, in the day when these writings were popular, the notion was current that in the Bible there is indicated a basis for the doctrine of Original sin. There is much in the tone of the pseudepigraphic writings that make them akin to the writings of the New Testament and of the early Church. Hence, an examination and exposition of these writings is necessary for an understanding of the origin of the doctrine of human sin.

No detailed account of the origin of the pseudepigrapha can be attempted her. A few statements will suffice to show that the real origin of these writings is shrouded in obscurity. Various theories have been suggested. Porter (1 holds that these writings have their roots in Essenism. Others contend that the origin is to be traced to foreign influences. Still others trace the beginnings to the writings of the literary prophets. Babylonia, Greece, Persia, Egypt--are all described by different authorities as the fount from which the pseudepigrapha drew its ideas. There can be little doubt, however, that although it was not entirely a product of native Jewish genius, it was a direct outgrowth from later prophecy, and a development of the ideas of the later Canonical books. In Isaiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah we find passages which, in both subject matter and eschatological treatment, approach the character of the literature distinguished as Apocalyptic; while the book of Daniel is an immediate precursor of these writings if not contemporary with them.

From the close of prophecy to the Maccabean age there is no writing of this character. This may have been due entirely to the fact that there was no special need for literature of this character. The apparent failure of the visions of the prophets gave rise to a new type of prophecy

which emphasized only the "future world" aspect of the prophetic message. While offering a forecast of the future, these writers often attempted a review of the divine plan in the past history of the race as a whole, and thus supplied, what might be called, a philosophy of history. In order to include the future they reviewed the past, and in doing so they sought to satisfy curiosity more completely than did the ancient Mosaic Law. Since they attempted to describe the secrets that the future holds in store for man, they strove also to interpret the secrets that the past had thus far not disclosed, and among the problems they treated is the beginning of sin. They offered a doctrinal interpretation of passages from the Bible whose earlier significance have now been lost. For this reason an examination of this literature is valuable to us in our study.

The Bible had by no means exhausted the stock of national tradition, because it sought to weed out such material that did not lend itself to ethical interpretation. The Pseudepigrapha brings back to us some of the mythical, or rather legendary, material which were a part of Jewish life, and also includes some material that was borrowed from foreign sources. This, as Kohler[2] points out, becomes evident when we realize that the expansions of the Biblical narratives presented in the Apocrypha are haggadic in character. These writings are in fact a branch of the haggada. It is true, however, that some of them never received the official sanction of the Rabbis. Schechter[3] says, "They (the apocalyptic writings) have not the least trace in Jewish literature, and it is most probable that none of the great authorities we are acquainted with in the Talmud had ever read a single line of them, or ever heard them by their name. However strange it may seem, the fact remains that whilst these writings left a lasting impress on Christianity, they contributed--with the exception, perhaps, of the Book of Ecclesiasticus--little or nothing towards the formation of Rabbinic thought. The Rabbis were either wholly ignorant of their existence,

or stigmatized them as fabulous, or "external" (a milder expression in some cases for heretical), and thus allowed them to exert no permanent influence upon Judaism." This view seems hardly to square with the fact that rabbinical literature teems with elements of Haggada identical in the minutest detail, however fanciful or grotesque, with such as we meet in the Apocalypses.

I. THE BOOK OF SIRACH

This book is classed together with the Book of Job, a number of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Wisdom of Solomon in the Hohmah literature of the Hebrews. The Book was written during the third century B. C. E. by a man who modestly professes to be a student and teacher of wisdom. Edersheim (4 says of the Book: "It represents an orthodox, but moderate and cold, Judaism--before there were either Pharisees or Saducees; before these two directions assumed separate form under the combined influence of political circumstances and theological controversies. In short, it contains, as yet undistinguished and mostly in germ, all the elements developed in the later history of Jewish religious thinking. But beyond all this the book throws welcome light on the period in which it was written. If we would know what a cultured, liberal, yet genuine Jew had thought and felt in view of the great questions of the day; if we would gain insight into the state of public opinion, morals, society, and even manners at that period--we find the materials for it in the book Ecclesiasticus."

With regard to the origin of sin, Ben Sirach's treatment is highly instructive, but it reveals the fact that he found himself in great difficulty when he began to grapple with the subject. He mentions three distinct theories for the origin of sin in the world and treats each separately. The first he combats as erroneous.

"Say not from God is my transgression,
For that which He hateth made He not.
Say not: (It is) He that hath made me stumble,
For there is no need of evil men.
Evil and abomination doth the Lord hate,
And He doth not let it come nigh to them that fear Him."

In this portion he clearly denies that sin is from God. God, who loves righteousness, could never have created sin which He despises. He next gives evidence of his belief in free will.

"God created man from the beginning,
And placed him in the hand of his Yetzer.
If thou (so) desirest, thou canst keep the commandment,
And (it is) wisdom to do His good pleasure.
Poured out before thee (are) fire and water,
Stretch forth thine hand unto that which thou desirest.
Life and death (are) before man,
That which he desireth shall be given him--
He commanded no man to sin,
Nor gave strength to men of lies." (15:11-20)

In his use of the word "Yetzer" Sirach means "form" or "framing", i.e., that which is framed in the mind, and it therefore comes to mean "imagination" or "purpose". In this meaning he follows Gen. 6:5; 8:21. Prof. Schechter (5 holds that Ben Sirach comes dangerously close to contradicting himself when he uses the word Yetzer. "The more conspicuous figure of the two yetzers is that of the evil yetzer. Indeed it is not impossible that the expression, good yetzer, as the antithesis of the evil yetzer, is of a later date." It is, therefore, probable that Ben Sirach, when making use of the expression in the passage just quoted, had the evil Yetzer or tendency in mind; at any rate, the context shows that even if the word was used in a neutral

sense it was at least potentially the evil yetzer to which he referred.

A second theory of the origin of sin as expressed by Ben Sirach is found in 25:24,

"From a woman did sin originate,
And because of her we all must die."

Dr. Tennant,(6 in commenting on this verse, says, "It has to be borne in mind that when, in the second clause of the verse, the writer passes to the thought of death, to the relation of Eve's sin to our universal immortality, a causal connection is distinctly asserted. The use of Tehillah (beginning) in the former clause does not itself preclude the thought of such connection, in the case of sin, having presented itself to Ben Sira's mind, but it certainly does not suggest any such connection.....If Ben Sira intended to imply that Eve's transgression was the origin of human sinfulness, he was venturing further than was his wont beyond the letter of the Scriptural narrative which he had in mind, and was already in possession of a much deeper view of the first transgression than is to be met with in Jewish literature until we come to St. Paul's Epistles. In any case this second view of Ben Sira's only traces the history of sin from the time that it first existed in humanity without trying to trace it any further back."

Finally a third view is indicated, though not specifically stated, in 21:27-28,

"When the fool curseth his adversary (lit., Satan)
He curseth his own soul;
The whisperer defileth his own soul,
And is hated wheresoever he sojourneth."

By the expression, "The whisperer defileth his own soul", Ben Sirach seems to imply that the evil in man is a matter of his own making. The "adversary" referred to is the ungodly man's own self. This view is strikingly like that expressed in Enoch 98:4, "I have sworn unto you sinners, as a

mountain hath not become a slave, and a hill does not become the handmaid of a woman. Even so sin hath not been sent upon the earth, but man of himself hath created it. And under a great curse shall they fall who commit it."

The three views thus expressed may be summed up in the following manner: He implies, though he does not definitely assert it, that the creation of sin is due to God, yet in the passage stated he strongly combats this theory. He teaches, further, that so far as the human race is concerned, the origin of sin is to be found in Eve; but he does not attempt to trace its history back any farther. This, of course, was unnecessary in that his third view indicates that sin originates in each individual in the exercise of his own will. Ben Sirach does not explain away the part of his second view that blames Eve for death in the world. His treatment of the entire problem from these three angles makes his view on sin a very contradictory and uncertain one.

III

THE (AETHEOPIC) BOOK OF ENOCH

This book has been ascribed to the second century B. C. E. In its groundwork, chaps. 1-36, we find an elaborate treatment of the Elohim-legend found in Gen. 6:1-4, concerning the descent to earth of the sons of God, and as we will presently see, it traces the existence of sin on earth to this incident. In the Book of Enoch they are referred to as the "sons of heaven", "sons of the holy angels", or "watchers".

The purpose of the Watchers in coming to earth was to possess themselves of wives from among the sons of men. These women were "taught charms and enchantments, and acquainted with the cutting of roots and woods" (7:1). The offspring of these unions were giants, who "turned themselves against mankind in order to devour them," so that "the earth complained of

the unrighteous ones." (chap. 6). In chap. 8 we have a more complete statement of the teaching of the arts to men. In this activity Azazel takes a very active part. In 9:6 we read the plaint, "See then what Azazel hath done, how he taught all the secret things of the world which were wrought in the heavens." Still more definitely is human sin ascribed to this visit of the angels in 10:6-7, "And heal the earth which the angels have defiled, and proclaim the healing of the earth, that I will heal the earth, and that all the children of men shall not perish through all the secret things that the watchers have disclosed and have taught their sons. And the whole earth has been defiled through the teachings of the works of Azazel; to him ascribe all the sin." The passages thus far referred to imply that the angels descended to earth from lust; their descent being something of a moral fall. They further suggest that the waters were the cause of all the sin in the world, and the bearers of human corruption by means of a hidden knowledge that man should never have known. This knowledge of the earts and sciences, of warfare and of nature, serves as the basis of all human ailments. They were introduced on earth by these visiting celestial beings. Thus the first dream of Enoch treats of the problem of the origin of sin.

In his second vision Enoch presents a complete history of the world from Adam down to the final judgment and the coming of the Messiah. After the manner of the Book of Daniel the writer uses figurative language and symbolizes his characters by animals--the fallen waters are symbolized by the stars. While nothing is said of Adam's sin, it is distinctly taught that the corruption of the earth which the Deluge punished, the first great judgment, was due, not to the sin of Adam, but to that of the angels who visited the earth. In 98:4 occurs a statement which might be, and often has been, interpreted as contradictory to this general view that the angels were guilty of the presence of sin on earth. "Even so sin has not been sent

sent upon the earth, but man himself has created it, and into great condemnation will those fall who commit it." We must recall that it was at the instigation of the watchers that man accepted the teaching which ultimately led to human sinfulness. Judaism invariably insisted on man's freedom, however it may have regarded sin to have been introduced. The angels brought the sin, and man, free to select his own way, chose to follow the instruction which led to error. Nor can it be argued that the writer includes the "watchers" merely because of his interest in angelology. Their influence is repeatedly connected with sin and its consequences, with divine judgments and the ordering of the world. In 88:2-8 the writer regards the course of nature as dependent on, and modified by, sin. The miscarriage of the functions of nature are here attributed to the sin brought into the world by the watchers; "And He will summon to testify against you the cloud and mist and dew and rain; for they will not all be withheld by you from descending upon you, and that because of your sins."

Only once is reference made to the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. In 32:3ff. Enoch narrates that on entering the Garden he saw amongst other trees "the tree of wisdom, which imparts great wisdom to those who eat of it. And it is like the carob tree; its fruit is like the clusters of a vine, very beautiful; the fragrance of the tree goes forth and penetrates far. And I said, 'This tree is beautiful, and how beautiful and attractive is its look!' And the holy angel Rafael, who was with me, answered me and said, 'This is the tree of wisdom, of which thy old father and thy aged mother, who were before thee, have eaten, and they learnt wisdom and their eyes were opened, and they recognized that they were naked, and they were driven out of the garden.'" Dr. Charles points out here: "Adam's sin is not regarded as the cause of man's fall and destruction in the Deluge." Indeed, that sin seems to have been altogether ignored by the writer of Enoch as accounting for the universality or beginning of

human corruption. In the above citation there is no mention of the sinful character of Adam's act of disobedience.

Allusion is also made to the tree of life. Here the author transplants the tree of life and the earthly paradise, Eden, to the New Jerusalem, and the fruit of this tree is to confer not immortality but long life such as the Patriarchs are endowed with. "Then will they rejoice with joy and be glad; they will enter the holy habitation; the fragrance thereof will be in their limbs, and they will live a long life on earth, such as their fathers have lived" (25;6).

That these details of the Paradise story, its inhabitants and its wondrous trees should be recorded by the writer of Enoch, and yet point no allusion to Adam's sin as involving consequences for the race, although his mind is filled with the problem of sinfulness and its judgment, is strongly indicative of the absence of any such notion among the people of his time. The writer employs the legend of the celestial visitors on earth in his explanation for the sinful tendency in man. Nor, as Prof. Cohon (7 points out, is sin to be eternal in the world. "The final chapter, which forms an independent addition to the book of Enoch, confidently announces that, in the last days, they that have done good shall see the end 'of those who work evil, and end of the might of the transgressors.' Sin shall then pass away, 'for their names shall be blotted out of the book of life and out of the holy books, and their seed shall be destroyed forever, and their spirits shall be slain, and they shall cry and make lamentations in a place that is a chaotic wilderness, and in the fire they shall burn, for there is no earth there.' Thus the punishment that is the due of the sinner is not to be visited upon the saint. The individual is not burdened here with the guilt that was brought into the world by the 'angels' if he chooses for himself the righteous way of life."

III. THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

This work, which is contemporaneous with the book of Enoch, is an example of the haggadic midrash. Like Enoch, it contains the allusion to the descent of the angels. One variation, however, is noteworthy. Instead of the angels bringing sin to mankind by teaching them the laws of nature, and other knowledge which leads to sin, the angels are seduced by the daughters of men. The crafty women change themselves into men in order to have relations with the angels (Test. Reuben V). In Test. Daniel V occurs the passage, "and in every form of wickedness will the spirits of seduction be active among you." This last implies the Biblical and holder notion that the angels were responsible for the existence of the unnatural unions.

IV. THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

This work is not an apocalypse but an haggadic commentary on Genesis written by a Pharisee of Palestine. Its date has been variously set between the first century B. C. E. and the first century C. E. It is the first example of haggadic treatment of the Biblical narrative that we possess.

Here also we find an interesting variant of the Enoch treatment of the legend of the descent of the angels. "The angels of God which are called watchers" are said to have descended to earth in order to teach the children of men how to practice justice and righteousness on earth (4:15). This is somewhat like the notion in the Test. of Reuben, but it does not ascribe to the daughters of men the seduction of these heavenly visitors. Only later, according to Jubilees, did the watchers begin sinning by marrying the women on earth (4:22). This brought the Deluge as punishment to man. The sins after the deluge were caused by the offspring of these unnatural unions. There is no effort made here to connect the visit of

the watchers with the beginning of sin in the world. It is merely treated, as in Genesis, to explain the corruption which immediately preceded the flood.

The writer is not unfamiliar with legends concerning the first parents. Adam and Eve, we are told, lived for seven years in the Garden of Eden before they transgressed. The account closely follows the narrative in Genesis. The serpent is called by the name "serpent", and no attempt is made to connect him with Satan. Satan is, however, mentioned elsewhere in the book (23:9). The Genesis story is embellished with the explanation, "the mouths of the beasts and cattle and birds and things which walk and move ceased to speak, for they all talked one with the other, one tongue and one language." 3:29 tells us that the animals were turned out of Eden along with Adam and Eve. The book says nothing of the moral consequences of Adam's act. There seems to be no attempt to attach weight to the teaching which represented the first sin as fraught with lasting and universal consequences for mankind. Adam is said to have learned, from this experience in Eden, modesty; he realized his nakedness and covered his shame, and from that time forward continued to wear garments.

V. THE APOCALYPSE OF MOSES

This is an account of the Fall as told by Eve. It follows closely the Biblical narrative though its style is somewhat more expansive. The tempter is Satan, and his motive in bringing ruin upon Adam and Eve is envy. The "adversary" used the serpent as his medium, but in the account of the meeting with Eve the serpent is forgotten, and Eve is accosted by Satan in the form of an angel (17:2). The serpent in addition to receiving the punishment mentioned in Genesis is here described as losing his feet, ears, wings, and other members, because it had allowed itself to become "a vessel of shame" (26:1).

As regards the entrance of death into the world, the answer in this work is clear. In chapter X Eve cries bitterly, "Woe is me, if I come to the day of resurrection, all those who have sinned will curse me saying: Eve hath not kept the commandment of God." A little farther on, when Adam is about to die he turns to his wife and says, "Eve what hast thou wrought in us? Thou hast brought upon us great wrath which is death. Call all our children and our children's children, and tell them the manner of our transgression." Then follows Eve's description of the temptation to which she succumbed at the instigation of Satan garbed as an angel.

It cannot be certain if the writer intended here to express anything more than the fact that Eve was the cause of death in the world. It is not clearly evident that he wanted to fasten upon her the responsibility of universal sin or the hereditary taint which Christian dogmatists have ascribed as dating from her. It is clear, however, that here, as elsewhere, the responsibility for the sin in Eden is laid at her feet rather than at the feet of her husband.

VI. THE APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH (The Syriac)

Of this work Charles[8] says, "It is a composite work of the first century of the Christian era. Its authors were orthodox Jews and it is a good representative of the Judaism against which the Paulian dialectic was directed." In this work we have almost the last noble utterances of Judaism before it was plunged into the darkness that came with the destruction of the second Temple. It was written while Jews still remained in the happier era of independence. The original manuscript, written in Hebrew, has been completely lost. It has been preserved through translation.

Sin in this Apocalypse is described as being a conscious breach of law, a deliberate departure from the proper way of life. Thus we find in 15:5, "Man would not rightly have understood My judgment,

unless he had accepted the law, and I had instructed him in understanding. But now, because he transgressed wittingly, yea, just on this ground that he wot (thereof) he shall be tormented." The law and the messianic expectation were the two centers around which Jewish life gravitated at this time. Baruch does not make much of the Messianic expectation, but concentrates his tendency on the glorification of the Law. Unlike the earlier works, Adam is here described as the starting point of all transgression. When Adam fell, his name became symbolic of all the power of darkness, opposing the power of light, which is the Law. "He that lighted has taken from the light, and there are but few who have imitated him. But those many whom he has lighted have taken from the darkness of Adam, and have not rejoiced in the light of the lamp." (18:1-2). The law is light and Adam is darkness, the primary source of human unhappiness and transgression. On this verse Charles (9) says, "This passage agrees with 2 Enoch and like it does not teach the doctrine of original sin." The passage though it ascribes to Adam the power of darkness does not in any wise believe that man must follow in this power. The beta part of verse 2 of chapter 18 implies that the other choice, walking in the path of the Law, was open to all. In the Christian notion of original sin no such choice is possible.

Certain consequences followed the sin of Adam. First of all there came physical death. In this work death was brought upon man who would otherwise have enjoyed immortality. We read in 17:3-4, "For what did it profit Adam that he lived nine hundred and thirty years, and transgressed that which was commanded? Therefore the multitude of time that he lived did not profit him, but brought death and cut off the years of those who were born from him." (The following verse draws the parallel between Adam and Moses whose life was briefer though more worthy because he brought the law and life.) Likewise we find in 23:4, "Because when Adam sinned and death was decreed against those who should be born, then the multitude of

those who should be born was numbered, for that number a place was prepared where the living might dwell and the dead be guarded." Charles points out that in the Greek version of this same work Adam is not said to have brought death upon man, but premature death. This same belief seems to be the idea in 17:3 where he points out that the number of years are not important. The premature death of Moses did not in any wise lessen the usefulness of his life, which was devoted to the all-important Law.

A second consequence that came with Adam's defection was physical and psychical declension. This consequence appears very frequently, but most strikingly in 56:6 where trouble and anguish, disease and death, sensual passion and the begetting of children are traced to it:

> "For when he transgressed
> Untimely death came into being (once more a modification)
> Grief was named,
> And anguish prepared,
> And pain was created,
> And trouble consummated;
> And disease began to be established,
> And sheol kept demanding that it should be renewed with blood;
> And the begetting of children was brought about,
> And the passions of parents produced;
> And the greatness of humanity was humiliated,
> And goodness languished."

A third consequence is the spiritual evil that befell men. This is true in that man became a danger to himself (56:10a) and to the angels (56:10b). "For he became a danger to his own soul, even to the angels became he a danger." Man's physical nature became an enemy of the spiritual within him; because of it the angels fell through lust, and in

it resided the evil impulse. This fact, therefore, that man henceforth became his own worst enemy, implies that by the fall, a hereditary tendency to evil was established in man. In one passage only does spiritual death appear to be traced to Adam (43:42-50), but even here it does not follow as an inevitable consequence.

"And I answered and said:

O Adam what hast thou done to all those who are born of thee?
And what will be said to the first Eve who hearkened to the serpent? (42)
For all this multitude are going to corruption,
Nor is there any numbering of those whom the fire devours. (43)
But again I will speak in Thy presence.
Thou, O Lord, my Lord, knowest what is in Thy creature.
For Thou didst of old command the dust to produce Adam,
And Thou knowest the number of those who are born from him
And how far they have sinned before Thee,
Who have existed and not confessed Thee as their Creator.
And as regards all these, their end shall convict them,
And Thy law which they have transgressed shall requite them on Thy day."
(44-47)

The mention of fire in verse 43 indicates that the reference here is to the spiritual rather than the physical side of man. In chap. 17 and elsewhere the reference is only to the physical man to whom punishment comes. Even here this spiritual suffering is not to be construed as meaning that after the fall man no longer had the capacity for righteousness. On the contrary, it expresses the belief in man's full exercise of the will to accept or reject the example set by Adam. This is evidenced by the conclusion of this discourse that appears in chap. 48.

"But now let us dismiss the wicked and inquire about the righteous.
And I will recount their blessedness
And not be silent in celebrating their glory, which is reserved for them.

For assuredly as in a little time in this transitory world
in which we live, ye have endured much labour,
So in that world to which there is no end, ye shall receive
great light." (48-50)

We have in this entire passage a statement that resolves itself thus: Adam violated the divine command, and in so doing he brought upon himself many evils. The light that was his now becomes darkness. The generations who followed after him shall suffer the same physical and psychical torments that Adam had to undergo. On the other hand, there are those who do walk in the path of the Law, and though they are subject to sorrow and suffering in this temporary and transient world, they will have great rejoicing in that world to which there is no end. We must keep in mind the basic motive of the writer. He was writing to appeal to those who were beginning to weaken in their loyalties and attachments to Judaism, and listening to the new teachings of the rapidly growing Christian sectarians. He is seeking to emphasize the Law and how it can be redundant with blessings for him who walks in its path. He selects, as an example, the first man who went astray, and shows how his life was affected, and how all those who follow in his error will be similarly affected. On the other hand, there are the righteous in the world who are destined to that eternal joy of the world to come.

Notwithstanding the penalties that he enumerates in 46:6, Baruch holds that man is never deprived of his free will, his moral nature remains unimpaired, and the spiritual consequences of Adam's fall are in the main limited to Adam himself. Thus we find in 54:15-19:

"For though Adam first sinned
And brought untimely death upon all,
Yet of those who were born from him
Each one of them has prepared his own soul torment to come,

And again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come.
For surely he who believeth will receive reward.
But now, as for you, you wicked that now are, turn ye to destruction,
Because ye shall speedily be visited,
In that formerly ye rejected the understanding of the most high.
For His works have not taught you,
Nor has the skill of His creation which is at all times persuaded you.
Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul,
But each of us has been the Adam of his own soul."

Here we find a complete statement of individual responsibility. Man's sin and guilt are due to his own action. The evil impulse, to which Adam yielded, and to which many others yield, is not a sin unless obeyed. Like the later Talmudic view we have here the idea that sin is placed in man as a challenge to his finer nature, something to overcome in forming his life. Thus man is captain of his own soul; he guides his own destiny and shapes his own ends. The issues of right and wrong are placed before him. What is strongly reminiscent of Deuteronomy do we find in 19:1-3: "Behold I have placed before you life and death....."

Thus we may briefly conclude that there is nothing in Baruch, though he does assign the first sin to Adam, that would unite him in his viewpoint with the Paulian doctrine. There is no expressed doctrine of inherited guilt or total depravity. Man is free to follow the path of his own choosing. He is not tainted with the sin of Adam, but like Adam he has the right to select the path contrary to law. If he does so, he opens for himself the suffering that Adam had to endure. If he resists and follows the way of righteousness, the eternal reward shall be his.

VII. 4 EZRA

We have here a work contemporaneous with the Apocalypse of Baruch. Tennant[10] expresses the belief that either of the two works was written in answer to the other. They differ very sharply in their views of human sinfulness and freedom of will. Some hold that this work was greatly influenced by the Christian thought which produced the thought expressed by St. Paul. Prof. Gunkel,[11] however, holds that the writer of 4 Ezra arrived at his thinking independently. By the time this book was written Israel had been humbled to despair, compelled to brood more earnestly and introspectively than ever before in its history. Israel was now compelled to view doubtfully the efficacy of the law without, and man's capacity for good works within. It is on this point that the attitudes of the two books so sharply differ. Hence, the writer of pseudo-Ezra approximates the later Christian doctrine of sin more nearly than any other Jewish writer. In spite of his pessimism the writer believes that, all visible signs to the contrary, God loves Israel now as always. The apocalyptist never wavers in his conviction that God's love for Israel exceeds all other, and finds in this thought a source of supreme consolation. "Just as thou art unable to do any one of these things just mentioned, even so art thou powerless to discover my judgment or the goal of the love that I have declared unto my people" (5:40).

The age in which he lives is hopelessly involved in evil; it is full of impotence and sorrow. This corruptible world and all that is mortal will dissolve, and be succeeded by the incorruptible world and immortality. The entire world is sinful for none have properly observed the law. He, himself, is among the sinners: "For, in truth, there is none of the earth born that has not dealt wickedly, and among those that exist who has not sinned" (8:35).

Man's infirmity is to be traced to the evil heart which was

developed in Adam and transmitted to his descendants (3:21). For the first Adam clothed himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise all who were born of him. Thus the evil germ became inveterate; the Law indeed was in the heart of the people, but (in conjunction) with the evil germ; so what was good departed, and the evil remained. Adam clothed himself with the "evil heart" by yielding to the suggestions of the evil impulse (the Yetzer Hara of Rabbinic teaching). The "evil heart", thus developed, inevitably led to sin and death. The evil sown in the heart of Adam was transmitted to his descendants. "For a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much fruit of ungodliness has it produced unto this time, and shall produce until the threshing floor come" (4:30). All men have fallen into sin and as a result this age (the present world order) is full of sorrow and impotence (4:27); the ways of the world have become narrow and sorrowful and painful (7:12).

Nowhere is it explicitly stated how the fall of Adam and universal sin are connected, but that both are connected is clearly implied in 7:118, "Thou Adam, what has thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants." How different is this view from that already cited in Baruch 54:19. Pseudo-Ezra does agree, however, with the spirit of Baruch's writing when he points out that all share responsibility for what has happened because they deliberately clothed themselves with an "evil heart" (3:26). Thus the moral responsibility of each individual member of the race is not denied. Man does have the will to reject wrong and approve the right. Probably the idea in the mind of the apocalyptist is that Adam, by his sin, lost much of the power of resistance, and this weakness he transmitted to all his descendants. Noteworthy is the fact that nowhere does Ezra employ demonic characters as agents inciting either Adam or Eve to err. There is no mention of an

external, non-human influence urging Adam to sin.

The corruption of the human race is due to the development of something inherent in man's nature. (This is similar to the Yetzer Hara of Rabbinic theology.) The author differs from the Rabbis who follow him when he points out the weakness of the law as a force for overcoming the influence of this evil tendency. In the already cited 3:22 we read, "Thus the evil germ became inveterate; the Law indeed was in the heart of the people, but (in conjunction) with the evil germ; so what was good departed and the evil remained." According to him, both spiritual and physical death are a legacy from Adam. The influence of Adam's fall upon the spiritual destiny of the race is implied in the reflection that it would have been better if Adam had not been formed, or at least had been restrained from sinning. Thus, "I answered then and said: This is my first and last saying; that it had been better that the earth had not given thee Adam; or else when it had given him, to have restrained him from sinning. For what profit is it for all that are in the present time to live in heaviness, and after death to look for punishment." Thus man is to suffer not only in this world for the sin of the first man, but in the after death he is to be punished further for the taint he inherits. Why suffer in this world when the future world holds no promise of good?

VIII. A SUMMARY OF THE VIEWS ON THE ORIGIN OF SIN ANDDEATH IN THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

The very frequent usage of the visit of the angels to the children of men suggests that this rather than the Paradise story of Genesis 3 was the earliest basis for the popular speculation as to the origin of general sinfulness in the world. The most ancient of the materials, embodying folk-lore of a very remote period, uses the legend of the watchers with the apparent intention of ascribing to them the source of sinfulness among men. The fall of the race and the cause of the generally unsatisfactory

moral condition among men seems to be generally ascribed to this celestial visit.

Though this is generally true, there can be noted a gradual decrease, as time goes on, in the use of this source for human evil, and a gradual increase in the usage of the Paradise story. In the various books the emphasis of the influence of the watchers is noted. In the Book of Enoch alone there are important changes noted. In the first vision there is a different emphasis laid on the visit of the angels from that which is to be found in the second vision. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs the responsibility is shifted from the Angels to the daughters of men, who seduced the heavenly visitors. In the Book of Jubilees the visit of the angels was one of honorable intent. Only the protracted stay among the daughters of men brought the unnatural unions that resulted in unhappiness to mankind. In the Apocalypse of Moses Eve recounts in her own language the story of her experience, and the first sin. Here, Eve alone bears the burden of the sin of Eden. Though the writer intended to tell of the origin of death in the world, it is clear that the entire responsibility for the sinfulness is laid at her feet. By the time we reach the writings of Baruch and Ezra, we have a rather complete tendency to ascribe the cause of sinfulness to the first parents, either jointly or separately, rather than to the watchers. The Apocalypse of Baruch regards the fall as having brought upon the entire race the liability of future punishment, from which the individual can escape only by leading a blameless life, as directed by the ever-efficacious Law. Though Pseudo-Ezra's teaching is bound up with the doctrine of the "evil heart", it does in a very decided sense attribute human suffering to the first parent.

Thus we may conclude that already in Jewish writings there were to be found the seeds of the Christian dogmatic belief in the origin of human sinfulness, emanating from Adam, and reaching through him all mankind.

Though this body of writing modifies its point of view with the strong belief in individual responsibility and freedom of will, there is much in it that the Christian view could and did utilize. However, we can be certain that no such view as that finally developed by the Churchmen was held in this creative period. Too great was the belief in the efficacy of the Law, the loyalty of God to the Jewish people, and the responsibility of each individual for his own sins. Added to this, the belief in the freedom of will, to which this entire period subscribed, makes impossible a highly developed belief that Adam's sin is borne universally, and can never be wiped out. Man's destiny is guided by his own choice. No original sin shapes that destiny for him.

IX. ALEXANDRIAN WRITINGS

a. PHILO

In Philo we have the mingling of Biblical exegesis with Greek philosophy. Though Philo's philosophy may be referred to as a system, it cannot be looked upon as a unified and systematic body of theology. Although Philo is anxious to make Judaism look attractive to the intelligent Greeks of his day, he is also interested in studying the psychology and ethics of the Hebraic past. His method was allegorical interpretation. What was usually intended for history becomes very largely resolved into figurative psychology; and it is sometimes difficult to estimate how far the events described in the Book of Genesis were regarded by him as in any way actual. We may feel certain that Philo attaches historical reality to Adam, and does not mean the account in Genesis to be taken solely as descriptive of the masculine element of man's mind. His view of the story of the Fall, therefore, has both anthropological as well as psychological interest for us. He expands the story as did the Palestinian haggadists.

The Biblical statement that Adam was made in the image of God

is of fundamental importance to Philo. The similitude between man and God is only true with regard to the mind. "And let no one think that he is able to judge the likeness from the character of the body; for neither is God a being with the form of a man, nor is the human body like the form of God, but the resemblance is spoken of with reference to the most important part of the soul, namely, the mind." (Creation of the World 23). Man is both mortal and immortal; mortal, in that his body is subject to death and decay; immortal, in that his soul is part of the soul which fills the universe (Creation of the World 46).

With regard to Adam's physical excellence Philo speaks in much the same strain as the Aggadists of Palestine. Thus at the moment of his appearance, the first man found all the requisites of life prepared for him. "At the moment of his first birth man found all the requisites of life already prepared for him that he might teach them to those who should come afterwards. Nature all but crying out with a distinct voice that men, imitating the Author of their being, should pass their lives without labor and without trouble, living the most ungrudging abundance and plenty" (Creation of the World 26). Physically the first man was perfect; being superior to all his descendants as regards beauty (Creation of the World 50); and endowed with gigantic stature (Questions and Solutions to Genesis). He had converse with incorporeal beings higher than himself with whom he associated in a state of happiness (Creation of the World 52). He was free from all disease and affliction, possessed extraordinary powers of perception (ibid.), so as to perceive "the natures, essences and operations which exist in heaven", and was in ejoyment of the most perfect human bliss (Questions and Solutions to Gen. 32).

As to Adam's moral nature Philo says but little. His impression is that Adam in his original state was morally neutral, a mixed being, neither good nor bad, existing in a state of the earthly man who is in constant need

of instruction. Philo gives the example of the artist who knows his art. Such a one needs no instruction, but one who is imperfect in his art needs constant instruction. Adam, the idea, created in the image of God, is the perfect artist needing no instruction. Adam, the man of clay, being imperfect, needs guidance. But if Philo says little of the original moral state of the first man, he says much with regard to the essential moral nature of man in general. "His teaching in this connection," says Tennant,(12 "is in the main in agreement with orthodox Judaism. He did not hold any such view of the fall of Adam as would attribute to it the cause of the sinful tendency of his descendants."

Philo does not regard physical death as the inherited consequence of Adam's sin in Eden; in other words, immorality was not implied in the unfallen state, except for the soul. As to his body, the irrational part of man, it is mortal by nature and related to the rest of the physical world. In Questions and Solutions in Gen. 1:76 we find, "that existence which is perceptible by the outer senses is not good, and that such a (physical death) is not evil." The death which Adam brought upon himself was ethical; it was the death of a soul buried in evil, and consisted rather in a firmer union than in the separation of soul and body. Physical death is, therefore, the necessary consequences of corporeality, and can only be connected with a fall, if that fall occurred in a previous life. The good do not really die and the wicked are dead even while they live (Questions and Solutions in Gen. 16). The only consequence which Philo attributes to Adam's sin are the toils and labors, the loss of the untroubled and happy life in Eden. "But at present the ever-flowing fountains of the graces of God have been checked, from the time when wickedness began to increase faster than virtues, in order that they might not be supplying men who are unworthy to be benefited by them." (The Creation of the World 60).

Philo's predominant teaching is that the body is that part of

man to which sin attaches only in the sense that it is an impediment to reason and to the pursuit of wisdom, and it is to be regarded as a tomb; in spite of this, sin has its real seat in the mind. The irrational man is incapable of wickedness. Man is a mixed creature, between good and evil. Such a man was Adam, and contrary to the Christian view, which holds that birth from Adam is a curse, birth from him is more noble, and more excellent than that of any succeeding generation (On Nobility 3). Again, who is there to deny that those men who were born of him who was made of the earth were noble themselves, and the founders of noble families? Adam's sin is venial as compared to Cain's. For Philo there is no inconsistency here. He points out that Cain is not included in the geneological lists of his father. In Genesis 5 where the death of Adam and the years of his life are recorded no mention is made of Cain. Seth becomes the head of the line which follows after the first man. Philo regards Noah and the Deluge as the beginning of a second creation. Noah is equal in honor to the first man, and with the Deluge came the purging of all sin from the world. Humanity now starts afresh. Certainly in this one can clearly see that for Philo the sin of Adam, if it did taint those who followed him, did not have any effect after the time of Noah. Death and human sinfulness can be traced only to the fact that man by his very corporeal nature is weak, subject to error and liable to immortality.

b. THE BOOK OF THE SECRETS OF ENOCH

Another Alexandrian work of importance for us is the Book of the Secrets of Enoch. Its author was a Jew, living in Alexandria, who belonged to the orthodox Hellenistic Judaism of his day. He champions sacrifice and ritual, but presents only the most enlightened views concerning them. In matters concerning the origin of sin and death he allows himself complete freedom and borrows freely from every source. Charles (13 attributes Platonic,

Egyptian and Zend elements as influencing his work. The result of his work is naturally syncretistic.

God created the world ex nihilo (24:2). Man he created on the sixth day. All the souls of men were created before the foundation of the world (23:5). This would obviate any belief in a psychical effect that might have come from the sin in Eden. Man was created originally good, free will was bestowed upon him, and he was instructed in the knowledge of good and evil. But with the incorporation of the soul into the body, with its necessary limitations, man developed a bias for evil, and death came as the fruit of this sin. "For after sin what is there but death?" (30:16). This was already a part of the heritage of man before Eve was created. For immediately after this we learn that God put deep sleep upon Adam and took from him the rib wherewith he created Eve. Death then was a part of man's nature before he committed any sin. We have here the belief that man's corporeal limits made sin and transgression a natural part of his existence. Therefore death was vouchsafed for him, even before he had violated God's command. Apparently, however, every man need not sin because the righteous escape the last judgment. "There will be one eon, and all the righteous shall escape God's judgment...." (65:8). Unlike the Rabbinic view of a later time there can be no intercession of departed saints for the living. "And now my children, do not say: Our father is standing before God and is praying for our sins, for there is no helper of man who has sinned" (53:1).

CHAPTER III

THE RABBINIC VIEW OF THE ORIGIN AND CAUSE OF SIN

Before any analysis can be made of the viewpoints to be found in the Talmud, in regard to the belief in the origin of sin, we must point out something of the character of that body of literature, in order to show how extremely difficult it is to derive from it any coherent body of theological doctrine. A work of this nature, created over a period of five hundred years, representing the thoughts and traditions of a period even longer than that, containing the views of numberless teachers and disciples, cannot be expected to give a clear concept on any one question. It is not always easy to distinguish between a statement that represents an individual point of view and one that represents an ancient tradition, revered and shared by the people. The Rabbis did not limit their thinking, and consequently we meet with discordant views on particular points, as well as with an abundance of antithesis, due to the emphasis now of this, now of that, side of a question, at whose reconciliation no attempt is made, because no need for reconciliation is felt.

It is in the haggadic elements of the Talmud that one finds expressed the teachings regarding the Fall. Bacher defines the Haggada as the "exegetical elaboration of the contents of a verse, the evolution of new ideas based upon the interpretation of the Biblical text." Ideas are often reached by the imagination, or by the comparison and blending of the teaching of one passage with that of others; and the result is then "deduced" from some particular verse. The fancifulness of some of the Rabbinical statements is thus best explained by the curious methods by which the Rabbis arrive at some of their conclusions.

Perhaps the surest approach to the problem of original sin, as viewed by the Rabbis, can be obtained through an examination of their views

on the first man. In the Yalkut Shimoni to Genesis (section 80) we find that Adam was the first of God's creations. God feared, however, that man would claim a share in the glories of the Creation, and therefore created only the גולם or shell, of man. Though Rabbi Berachya, who made this statement, may have made this remark in connection with some thought other than the question of the tendency of the first man to sin, we can imply that he held the view that God realized, even in the act of creating man, that he was a creature subject to limitations. Even before he was created it was destined that he be capable of boasting and claiming to share with God the wondrous work of creation.

Genesis Rabba 8, commenting on Genesis 1:26, tells us that God consulted the angels when He decided to make man. "Let us make man." The Rabbis liked to dwell on the glory of Adam before his fall. In Sanhedrin 38b we find אדם הראשון ממזרח העולם ועד מזרחו היה "The first man reached from one end of the world to the other." So great was the effect of Adam upon the angels that they wished to call him "holy". Thus in Genesis Rabba 8, commenting on Isaiah 2:22, we find

כשעה שברא הקב"ה את אדם הראשון מעז בן מחש ובקשו
לומר לפניו קדוש. מה עשה ה' ב"ה. הפיל עליו תרדמה
וידעו הכל שהוא אדם. הה"ד (ישעיה ב') חדלו לכם מן האדם
אשר נשמה באפו כי במה נחשב הוא.

"When God created the first man the angels gazed upon him and wanted to call him 'holy'. What did God do? He caused Adam to fall into a deep sleep. Then all knew that he was but a mortal. Then God said: 'Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of.'" Thus, even in his unfallen state man's mortal nature was already known to God, and communicated by Him to the angels. Another Midrash pointing to the same conclusion is to be found in Pirke R. Eliezer XI, Tan. Pekude 3. "When all the creatures saw that God created man they began to glorify the name of his Creator and said: How great are Thy works, O Lord! He (Adam) stood up, and

he was fashioned in the image of God. They (the creatures) saw him and they thought he was their creator, and they all came to prostrate themselves before him. Adam said to them: You come to worship me, come let us go together, dressed in fine raiment and glory, and strength, and ascribe Kingship to Him who created us, just as a people make a human king who does not make himself king. Adam went first to pay homage to God and all the creatures went after him and they said: The Lord is King..." In this statement, Adam, immediately after his creation, is conscious of his duty to God. How fitting that man, made in the likeness of God, should instruct his fellow-creatures in the worship of the most high. It is not difficult to see here the belief that man's first nature is to pay tribute to the Creator.

The Torah, too, figures in the earliest moments of Adam's life. In Pirke R. Eliezer XI, we read:

אמר הקב"ה לתורה נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותינו. השיבה התורה ואמרה רבון כל העולמים העולם שלך שאתה רוצה לבראתו קצר ימים ושבע רוגז ויבא לידי חמא ואם אין אתה מאריך אפך עמו ראוי שלא נא לעולם. אמר לה הקב"ה וכי חנם נקראתי ארך אפים ורב חסד. התחיל לקבץ את עפרו של אדם הראשון מארבע כנפות הארץ.

"God said to the Torah: Let us make Adam in our image and according to our form. The Torah answered and said: Master of the Universe, this man whom Thou plannest to make is short of days, and prone to agitation, and he will fall into sin. And if you do not plan to show much compassion for him, then it would be best that he be not created. God said to the Torah: Is it then in vain that I am called ארך אפים ורב חסד. ? God then began to gather the dust from the four corners of the world."

It is not without understanding the full nature of man that God began His creation. The Torah which served as the "bill of specification" for all of creation here warns God of man's mortality, his tendency to fall

into moods of anger, and his consequent tendency to sin. God, armed with his reputation for compassion and great lovingkindness, proceeds at once to the task of creating Adam. We have here a concept that would not allow a notion of original sin as expressed by the Christian dogmatists. Man is created exactly as the Torah warned God he would be. God, willing to trust to His own personality in His relationship with man, creates him from the dust gathered from the four corners of the earth. On this point, too, Rabbi Eliezer offers an explanation that completely obviates a notion of original sin. The dust was gathered from the entire world, from all four corners, so that when man comes to the end of his days, and must leave this world, no part of the earth will refuse to accept him by saying that this earthly creature is not a part of us. All the earth will claim him! In the very gathering of the materials for the creation of man God did not overlook the possibility of trouble at his death when the earth might refuse to accept his lifeless body. Death was the natural end of man. His nature was planned to be such that he would have to be returned to the very substance of which he was made. No particular sin of his made him liable to such an end. It was a part of the divine plan that he should die.

In this same work (chap. 13) we find the writer expressing a view regarding the intelligence of the first man. When the angels came before God and made light of the masterpiece of creation, God pointed out to them that whereas they were the cause for disagreement in heaven, Adam was the unifying factor on earth. Not only is this to be said in favorof the first man, but he is also possessed of sufficient intelligence to name the creatures, whereas the angels had failed in their attempts to do so.

These instances will suffice to show the rabbinic attitude toward the creation and first hours of Adam. In these references three important factors are appealed to. The view of the angels toward the first man was equal almost to their reverence for the Creator. They were prepared

to worship him. Only the intervention of God, with the evidence of Adam's mortality, prevented the angels from making a deity of the first man. The creatures, too, were ready to acknowledge kingship to Adam. In this instance Adam, himself, conscious of his own limitations, and of the Kingship of God, instructs them in the worship of God. The Torah, which is conceived of as the "bill of specifications" by which God created the world, is also represented as advising God in regard to the creation of man. In all these instances one finds the implication that Adam was destined to be a creature with certain inherent weaknesses and tendencies. His mortality was assured even before he was created. His subjection to moods and the consequent tendency to sin is placed squarely before God before He gathers the dust of which man is to be formed. From the point of view of these rabbinic spokesmen, the first man is not to be shouldered with the responsibility of being the cause of human sinfulness and death in the world.

We must now turn to the rabbinic explanation of the presence of sin in the heart of man. For our purpose it is not necessary to examine the function of the serpent in the Paradise story, as interpreted by the rabbis. We are interested rather in the concept of the presence of sin, and not in the agent employed to entice man to error. This brings us to a study of the concept of the Yezers. In the treatment of this subject we must bear in mind that the rabbinic treatment of the Yezers is exegetical rather than speculative. It is based solely on the passages in Genesis 6:5 and 8:21: "Yahwe saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth and that every 'yezer' of the thoughts of his heart was only evil every day" וכל יצר מחשבות לבו רק רע כל היום . "The 'yezer' of the heart of man is evil from his youth" כי יצר לב האדם רע מנעוריו ולא אסף עוד להכות את כל חי וגו׳

The first of these verse (Genesis 6:5) is used in connection with God's resolve to destroy man. The second is used in connection with the

flood. In this second instance God resolves never again to punish man with a destruction so complete as the flood. Thus as Porter says, "We meet already the suggestion that the 'Evil Yezer (of the thoughts) of the heart of man' is in part, or in one aspect, his fault and in part his misfortune; that the evil Yezer lies on the borderland between the choice and the nature of man. This prepares us to recognize the fact that in later discussions of the Yezer the question at issue is not the speculative question of the relation of the body and the soul to the fact of sin, but the religious question of the relation of God and man to sin, and the practical question of escape and victory."(1

Of the two yezers the evil yezer seems to be the most discussed and the best known. It appears to be older than the good yezer, or rather of the belief in the presence of a good yezer in man. Very rarely is the good yezer spoken of, and the yezer usually stands unmodified and always in the evil sense. Porter points out that this is evidence against the belief that the good yezer represents the soul and the evil yezer represents the body, making them expressions of the character of two equally essential parts of man. "Rather it is the nature of man as a whole that is in mind, and in it the evil tendency, or disposition, dominates."(2 If Porter means that the notion of the evil yezer dominates in rabbinic thinking, his point cannot be denied. If, however, he holds that man is victim of the evil yezer which dominates him, he fails to properly interpret the rabbinic view. For though the rabbis do not fail to acknowledge the tendency for evil in man, they do champion the power of man to overcome this evil tendency. That this is true will be more clearly shown below when we treat the question of the conquest of the evil yezer by man.

The seat of the good and evil impulses is in the heart. Numerous examples proving this are to be found in the Bible. Both passages in Genesis 6:5 and 8:21 make this apparent. Genesis Rabba 67 explains "Esau

spoke in his heart" in this sense. In Mishna Berachoth IX:5 we find the explanation of the varied spelling of the word meaning "heart". Sometimes it appears לב , sometimes לבב . Thus the mishna says:

חייב אדם לברך על הרעה כשם שהוא מברך על הטובה שנאמר
ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך זבכל נפשך ובכל מאדך. בכל
לבבך בשני יצריך ביצר טוב וביצר רע.

"Man should give thanks for evil just as he gives thanks for good, as it is written: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy לבבך heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy possessions.' With all thy heart לבבך means, with both thy yezers, with the yezer tob and the yezer ra." In Baba Bathra 16a "my heart לבי is wounded within me" is interpreted to mean that his evil yezer has been wounded, or slain; hence, David is to be listed with the Aboth over whom the evil nature had no power.

We must now consider wherein the evil yezer affects man. There are some phases in the life of the individual in which the evil yezer is particularly strong. Sensual sins are often ascribed with special emphasis to the yezer. But the evil yezer is not limited to lust and passion alone. Jochanan b. Nuri is reported to have said: "Let one who is in anger, tears his garments, breaks vessels, casts away his money, be in thine eyes as one who practices idolatry. For this is the craft of the evil yezer; today it says to him to do this, tomorrow to do that, till it says to him: go and practice idolatry, and he goes and does it."(3) The evil yezer likewise is the cause of the Jews' failure to observe the ceremonial law, such as the prohibition of swines' flesh, of wearing goods of linen and wool mixed, the scape goat and the red cow (Sifre 86a, Yoma 67b). The yezer may cause disbelief in judgment after death. "Let not thy yezer assure thee that sheol is a house of refuge; for perforce wast thou framed and born, perforce dost thou live and die, and perforce thou art given account and reckoning ואל יבטיחך יצרך שהשאול בית מנוס לך (Aboth 4:32).

Nor is the yezer to be consider altogether evil for man. It

is not present in the world to come. "It was a commonplace in the mouth of Rab, that in the world to come there is neither eating, nor drinking, nor procreation, nor barter, nor envy, nor hatred, nor strife." (Ber. 17a). "The evil yezer," says Reuben b. Aristobulus, "comes to man at the moment of conception and lurks continually at the door of the heart. When a child in the cradle puts his hand on a serpent and is bitten, or on coals and is burned, it is the evil yezer already ruling in the child, which prevents caution before what is harmful." (4 Thus the evil yezer becomes a part of one with birth. It does not wait until the individual becomes sexually mature and the victim of sexual desire.

We must next inquire as to the origin of the evil yezer. In this the rabbis depart radically from the Biblical texts upon which they base their thinking in regard to the yezer. In the Biblical text it is quite clear that man is the creator of his impulses. Man alone shapes his thoughts and his character. There is, however, some suggestion, as we have pointed out above, in Genesis 8:21 that man is the hapless victim of his yezer. This leaves room for the belief that God is the creator of the yezer within the heart of man. Indeed this is the rabbinic view. In Berachot 61a we find, "God created man with two yezarim, the good and the evil." Nachman ben Chisda's interpretation of the two "yods" in the word yezer likewise brings out the point that God is the creator of the yezers (Erubin 18a). Man is, however, responsible for making the evil yezer more evil by submission to is power; he is also capable of putting it to good uses. The important question for the rabbis was not how the yezer came to be, but how man can master it, and how God will in the end destroy it.

The conquest of the evil yezer is a hard task because of its power, but it is possible because of man's moral freedom and especially because of Israel's possession of the Law and the help given in answer to prayer. There are those in whom the yezer, in spite of its great power,

has no ruling force. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were free from the evil yezer, and in David it was slain when he said, "My heart is wounded within me." (Baba Bathra 16a). When the yezer is regarded as a good and indispensable part of creation it is to be put to good use. When it is regarded as the impulse to sin it is to be suppressed. In Sotah 47a it is clearly stated that the yezer is not to be eradicated but controlled.

Thus, it is through the evil yezer that man stumbles into sin. It was this evil yezer which caused Adam to err and to bring to man the woes that man experiences in life. Nowhere is it suggested that man cannot overcome the evil yezer and be possessed solely of the good yezer. Indeed, as has already been pointed out, all men did not have an evil yezer. Though it is difficult, man, because of his moral freedom, can overcome the promptings of the evil within him.

Having established the cause for sin in the world and the origin of the sin of Adam, we now return to a consideration of the rabbinic view of the effect of the first sin on the first sinner and its subsequent effect upon all the generations of man who followed him. It was, of course, universally taught that the first parents brought death upon themselves as a result of their sin. The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. 3:6 says that Eve, when beside the tree, "saw Samael, the angel of death, and was afraid," and repeats the denunciation of death against Adam and Eve much as in the words of the scripture. Though the fact that Adam did not die in the day in which he ate the fruit of the tree presented a difficulty, the rabbis explained it away by saying that a day with God is a thousand years. Adam lived until he was 930, hence the life of man is limited to three score and ten (Genesis Rabba 19).

It is of greater importance for us to determine what opinions were held by the rabbis upon the relation of the mortality of the race to the punishment of Adam and Eve with death. Only in studying this problem

do we touch the important element in the Christian doctrine of the Fall. On this question there is considerable difference among the Rabbis. During the earlier centuries of the common era the prevalent view was the individualistic view of sin and responsibility; i.e., that each man dies for his own sin. In Sabbath 55 we find that R. Ammi holds that there is no death without sin. The same idea is noted in Baba Bathra 17a. To illustrate the viewpoint of R. Ammi, a legend is narrated in the Tanchuma, according to which "all the pious beings permitted to behold the Shekina before their death reproach Adam (as they pass by him at the gate) for having brought death upon them; to which he replies: I died with but one sin, but you have committed many; on account of these you have died, not on my account" (Hukkat16). Still better proof of the belief in the individualistic notion is to be found in Arachin 17a, in the opinion of R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos: "If the Holy One, blessed be He! should enter into judgment with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, they would not be able to stand before the proving (or exposure)." In Ber. 33a, in a passage referring to serpent bites, Rabbi Chanina b. Dosa is credited with saying: "It is not the serpent which kills, but the sin in us."

In Sabbath 55 cited above there is a definite clash of opinion. Rabbi Ammi's opinion that "there is no death without sin" is objected to on the ground that Moses and Aaron who had kept the whole Law had died, as did Adam. God answered and said, "All things come alike to all, there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked." Then R. Ammi claims the authority of R. Simeon b. Eleazar: "Moses and Aaron also died on account of their own sins, as is said in Numbers 20:12, 'therefore because ye have not believed.'" It is added, "R. Simeon b. Eleazar has, however, said: 'There is also a death without sin and suffering without guilt.'" This difficulty is further found in Baba Bathra 17a where a tradition is stated that "over six the angel of death had no power, viz., Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses,

Aaron, and Miriam. Likewise, four had died without sin: Benjamin, Jesse, Amram, and Chiliab. This citation of exceptions is an apparent proof of the general rule that there is no death without sin. They merely stated to prove the general rule that the responsibility is with the individual; every man is Adam of his own soul.

Rival views are, however, not absent. R. Jose (4th cent.) is said in the Sifra 27a to have said with regard to Adam, "For whose single transgression, he and all his posterity were punished with death." In the Yalkut Shimeoni the saying is thus expanded: "If thou wishest to know the reward of the righteous in the world to come, learn it from the first Adam, who had only been commanded one single law, which he transgressed; see how many deaths were decreed against him and his generations, and against the generations of his generations, to the end of his generations." In Deuteronomy Rabba 9, Moses (who was declared by Rabbi Simeon (Sabbath 55) to have brought death upon himself by his own sin) was held by Rabbi Levi to have died "because of the sin of the first man, who brought death into the world." In Pesikta de R. Kahana 118a there is a passage according to which Adam's posterity appeared to him when he ate of the forbidden tree, and he acknowledged to them that he had been the cause of death.(5 Tennant expresses the opinion that "legends once used to support the older doctrine (of individual responsibility) with regard to death were actually altered to suit an increasingly prevalent notion of original sin."(6 Tennant adds to this the statement: "We have, however, been unable to trace one instance of the occurrence, in rabbinical literature previous to the close of the talmudic period, of the idea that Adam included in himself potentially the whole race, and that his sin was the sin of all mankind."(7

The entire basis of difference between the rabbis who argued that every man is the Adam of his own soul, and those who argued that death is from Adam, is to be found in the notion of individual responsibility.

On this independent question there can be no doubt as to the stand of Jewish teaching. From the time of Ezekiel and Jeremiah the notion of individual responsibility is dominant. The formal repudiation by these prophetic teachers is voiced throughout Jewish writings. The teaching increases the dignity of human life. It could not be otherwise among a people who believed their very breath was given to them by God who formed them in His own image and shared with them His own divine breath. God desires only man's happiness. He has no pleasure in the death of any man that sins nor does He requite the innocent descendent of him who sins. He helps toward goodness by endowing man with a portion of Himself, and makes individual repentance the purging force for all sin. God repents that He placed in man the evil yezer which makes difficult for man the life of perfect righteousness that He demands of Him (Sukkah 52b).

Still another notion argues against the permanence of the taint of Adam's sin. In Sabbath 146a, and in Yebamoth 103b, are listed expressions that when the children of Israel accepted the Torah all previous sin was forgiven. Thus in Yebamoth 103b

בשעה שבא נחש על חוה הטיל בה זוהמא. ישראל שעמדו בהר סיני
פסקה זוהמתן. כנענים שלא עמדו בהר סיני לא פסקה זוהמתן.

Likewise in Kedushin 30b and Baba Bathra 16a the Torah is the purging force which cleanses the individual of the yezer ra which is the cause of sin. If one is to take the Yebomoth reference literally, the assumption is that the rest of the world is still tainted with the sin of Adam, while the Jews who have accepted the Torah are freed from this taint. With this last idea even St. Paul concurs in the very passage upon which Christian dogmatists base their doctrine of the Fall. In the Epistle to the Romans V:14 we read, "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." To this extent Paul was giving expression to sound

rabbinic doctrine.

At the very outset we pointed out the difficulty of arriving at any positive view in regard to the rabbinic view on any doctrinal question. We can, however, arrive at certain conclusions as to their viewpoint on the basis of the reaction that is to be met with in the Talmudic and Midrashic material to the various elements making up the Christian doctrine of the Fall. We may thus conclude that the following characteristic views are to be met with in the Talmud:

(1) When the statement is made that man is responsible for the increased tendency of his evil yezer, it refers to the individual man and not to the race. Each one yielding to his inclination and not seeking with sufficient indulgence to overcome it, has caused its increase of might. The ascendency of the evil yezer over the good yezer is a universally acquired habit, not an hereditary disease.

(2) Talmudic literature insists upon man's capacity to overcome his evil tendencies however strong they might be. There is no hint that his free will is diminished in consequence of the sin of the first parents. Herein lies the chief difference between the Jewish and Christian view. For the Christian dogmatist, the individual is helpless, stamped with the taint of the first sin; for the Jewish thinkers, every individual is endowed with a might to overcome the evil tendencies that assail him. The rabbis did not fail to recognize the general sinfulness of humanity, yet they did not abandon the idea that man could be sinless.

(3) The yezer ra, which for the rabbis is the cause of all sinfulness, is nowhere explained in connection with the incident in Paradise, nor is it hereditary in nature. The evil inclination was planted by God in Adam. It did cause his sin, and it was planted in every human being since Adam, but not from Adam. Here again the Jewish view differs from the Christian. The Christian view is that the evil nature is limited to the

physical being of man, and can therefore be transmitted from parent to child throughout the generations. The Jewish view is that passion and sin is the product of the whole man, of body and soul. In Sanhedrin 91ab, we find the parable of the blind and lame, where both body and soul are indicted for causing sinfulness. For the rabbis, the yezer ra was in man, throughout his being, permeating and sometimes dominating him, but it was not considered to be limited to that part of the individual that is transmitted in birth.

We must conclude, then, that the only consequence of the first sin in Eden was the removal of the supernatural adornments of Adam and his death. No diminished freedom of will, no permanent ascendancy of the yezer ra, was guaranteed for the future generations as a result of this sin. Nor do we find any idea of all the race being in Adam, when he sinned. Thus the future generations were in no wise affected by the sin of the first man. If by employing their powers of resistance over evil which suggested itself to them they were free from any dangers which the God-given yezer ra might cause them to inflict upon themselves.

CHAPTER IV

THE POST-RABBINIC VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN

The view of the medieval Jewish commentators and thinkers in regard to the sin of Adam can best be obtained from an examination of their comments on verses of the scripture which have been cited as indicating a belief in the doctrine. We may consider first the passage in Isaiah 43:27, אָבִיךָ הָרִאשׁוֹן חָטָא . We are concerned only with the alpha part of this verse, "Thy first father sinned." Rashi's viewpoint cited above is expressed in his interpretation of אָבִיךָ הָרִאשׁוֹן חָטָא . This refers to Genesis 15 where Abraham asks, "By what sign shall I know that I inherit it?" If Isaiah 43:27 is to be regarded as indicating a belief in the doctrine of original sin, we must conclude that Rashi looked upon Abraham as the first sinner. Redak (David Kimchi) commenting on Isaiah 43:27 says:

אביך הראשון חטא והוא אדם הראשון כי האדם מושחת בחטא כי יצר לב האדם רע מנעוריו.

"Thy first father sinned, refers to (Adam) the first man's very nature is sinful, for (it is written), 'The inclination of man is evil from his youth.'" On Genesis 8:21 which he quotes as evidence of his opinion, Rashi says: "It is written 'from his youth' because when the child stirs to go out of the womb of its mother the evil inclination is given to him." Apparently Redak held that Adam sinned because of an evil tendency which he possessed from his creation. From this it would not follow that he would consider him responsible for the presence of sin in the world, nor the source of all sin throughout the ages. מאודם דוד commenting on this same verse in Isaiah say: "Adam was a sinner even though he was created by My hand, how much more full of sin are you who are born of men and women." Here the interpreter recognizes no relationship between the sin of Adam and the sins of the later generations. He is fully aware of Adam's guilt even though

he was created by God, but does not see in the guilt of the later generations any relationship to the sin of Adam. Ibn Ezra sees in this verse a reference to Jereboam who when chosen by the Israelites to be their king became king without the consent of God. R. Joseph ibn Caspi points out that "Adam" may refer to a variety of things in numerous classifications. It may even refer to Adam, but he believes that the beta part of the verse obviates this. He then attempts to give a peshatic interpretation of the verse, referring to the conflict which was then raging.

On Hosea 6:7 both Rashi and Mezoodas David interpret כאדם as referring to the first man, and the transgression to be the first sin. No attempt is made to do more than identify the meaning of Adam. Ibn Ezra makes no comment on כאדם , while Redak gives it the same treatment as Rashi and Mezoodas David. It is evident that this very indifferent treatment by these commentators to a verse pointed out as pointing to a belief in the doctrine of Original Sin indicates no connection on their part to whatever beliefs they may have held to this particular verse.

These comments indicate how remote was the idea of original sin from the minds of these representatives of medieval Jewish thought. Ibn Ezra, whose treatment is usually the most scientific, completely ignores the suggestion made by the word אדם . It would appear that while the Christian world was giving much thought to the problem of original sin the Jewish world was unconcerned about it. It was not, however, unknown to the Jewish thinkers, for writings exist which indicate a criticism of the Christian point of view. We will now consider the viewpoint of Chisdai Crescas (late 14th and early 15th century Spain) who refutes the doctrine held by the Christians of his day.

In his בטול עקרי דת הנוצרים chapter 8, Crescas treats the problem of original sin. Quoting Paul's Epistles (Romans 5:12, Corinthians 15:21), Crescas states the Christian point of view in the following

manner: God created man and in the beginning dowered him with favors. In spite of this, man sinned and brought sin and death upon himself and all his descendants. Since sin and death came through a man, salvation must also come through a man. Jesus took on human form, came to earth, and suffered death to atone for Adam's sin. In his refutation Crescas points out that the punishment given to Adam for his transgression was physical, not spiritual, and also that he did not transmit his sin to his descendants. Evidence of this last is to be found in Ezekiel where individual responsibility is vouchsafed to man. Adam's sin was lighter than the sin of Cain, who was a fratricide, why then is his sin not accounted as the original sin?

The idea that Adam was given grace in the heavenly Eden before his sin, and that his descendants and he lost it by his sin, is erroneous, because immortality is not dependent on God's grace alone but upon man's moral conduct. For Crescas, the loss of immortality is likewise an individual matter, not to be linked with the sin in Eden. "How can one conceive that Noah, Shem and the Patriarchs, who were righteous, were denied divine favor and immortality? If Adam before sinning merited all this, how much the more, the Patriarchs? Though born, according to the Christians, in sin, they all led noble lives; therefore they deserved Gan Eden more than Adam before sinning."

Crescas points out further that one Christian theologian said that Abraham was taken from Gehinnom because of the merit of the Brith Milloh, but he could not enter the Gan Eden because of the original sin. He remained suspended between Gan Eden and Gehinnom. When Jesus came and atoned for the sin of Adam, by his death, Abraham and the rest of the righteous were brought into the Heavenly Garden of Eden. According to this, any Jew performing the 613 Mitzvoth is given spiritual peace in this suspended state. Perhaps Jesus will mercifully bring them also into the Gan Eden as he did Abraham who was not born a Christian.

Crescas proves that the prophets were not in Gehinnom. To prove this he relates the incident of the visit of Saul to the witch of Endor when Samuel was summoned from his resting place. When Samuel arrived he complained that his rest was disturbed. Crescas argues that if he were in Gehinnom he would have relished this disturbance rather than have complained about being taken from his peaceful rest.

Turning to a consideration of the rabbinical view of the problem of original sin, Crescas says that most of the rabbis admit that Adam was created to be immortal, and if he had not transgressed he would have lived forever. This he proves by Genesis 2:17, where Adam is warned that he would surely die if he ate of the forbidden fruit. He quotes Sabbath 55b and Baba Bathra 17a to show that even those who lead perfect lives die because of the wiles of the serpent. But some rabbis say that Adam was created to be mortal, for everything which is composed of the four elements must return to their former state of being. "Thou shalt surely die" does not appear to mean that Adam is to lose his immortality. It means that on eating of the forbidden fruit he is to become conscious of his mortal nature. With this last view Crescas is in full agreement.

Viterbo (Abraham Chaim, Venice, 18th century) follows very closely the arguments of Crescas in his Sefer Emeunas Hahaomim, chapter 1. He points out that the punishment of Adam was purely physical. All of nature had been created for man's benefit. The herbs and plants were created so that they could revitalize themselves without any effort on the part of man. Adam was placed in the Garden of Eden and was allowed to enjoy its blessings. When he sinned nature underwent a change and it was necessary for man to cultivate the earth by the "sweat of his brow" in order to exist. God did not speak of death to Adam. He did, however, say, "By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." This, then, was Adam's punishment. At creation, death and decay had been ordained, as it is written, כי עפר אתה ואל עפר תשוב

CHAPTER V

THE MODERN VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN

We turn now to a consideration of the opinions of modern students of Judaism, to ascertain their point of view in regard to Original Sin in Judaism. The opinions cited here will represent every shade of Jewish thought and reaction to the historical development of Judaism. Hence, we may hope to obtain a complete picture of the modern view of the place of the doctrine of Original Sin in Judaism.

Schechter, quoting from Sefer Mitzvoth Koton (12th cent.),(1 points out that when God was in the process of creating the world He noted the exclusively animal desires of the beasts and the absolute inability of the angels to commit sin. God was not pleased with either of these extremes, and said, "If the angels follow my will, it is only on account of their inability to act in the opposite direction. I shall, therefore, create man, who will be a combination of both angel and beast, so that he will be able to follow either the good or the evil inclination."(2 God has no desire to reign over creatures that are limited in the expression of free will. He wants to reign over free agents, and it is their obedience which He desires to obtain. Man thus becomes the center of creation, for it is only through man that God's Kingship receives full expression.

Adam, the free agent, was placed in the Garden of Eden, but in a short time he exercised his liberty to do evil. As a result of this, sin came into the world, disfiguring both man and the scene of his activity. Because of this sin and the sin of the generation of the Flood, which consisted in a denial of God's sovereignty (Abot R. Nathan 47b), the world was cast into darkness for twenty generations (Abot 5:1 and Commentaries). With Abraham the light returned (Gen. r. 3:3), for he was the first to call on the name of God, thus God returned to the world which He had forsaken (Berachoth 7b). God's Kingship was, however, insecure, because while one man (Abraham) was

preaching righteousness, violence reigned in the world. Hence, an entire people must sanctify the name of God and proclaim His unity. This was accomplished at Sinai when Israel proclaimed the universal God (Ex. r. 23:1). "This unconditional surrender to the will of God invested Israel, according to the Rabbis, with a special beauty and grace" (Midrash Agadah, ed. Buber, 171a). And by the manifestation of the Knowledge of God through the act of revelation the world resumes its native gracefulness, which makes it again heavenlike whilst God finds more delight in men than in angels (Exod. r. 51:8).(3

In this treatment of the relationship of God to man Schechter follows the Rabbinic view that all sin was removed from Israel at Sinai. He also emphasizes God's purposeful creation of man with two natures, one emulating the beasts who were created before him, and who could perform no acts of righteousness; the other emulating the already created angels who could do no wrong. God, desirous of winning the worship of a creature who could exercise some choice, created man with a will to choose between right and wrong. Thus man becomes the central and all-important figure in the world.

Not only the acceptance of God at Sinai saved Israel, for it continued to err. Israel sinned when it worshipped the Golden Calf, and in the times of Elijah, and in every generation (Ag. Ber. ch. 10). In the judgment of all these sins the Zechut Ovoth (Merit of the Fathers) came to the rescue of erring Israel. This Merit is not limited to the Patriarchs, but is a heritage by which every good father in Israel blesses his children with beauty, strength, wealth, wisdom, and long life זאת זכות לבן (Mishna Eduyoth 2:9). Should this Zechut ever disappear Israel need not fear because it can then fall back on the Grace of God which is never to be removed (Lev. r. 36:5, quoting Deut. 4:31, כי אל רחום יהוה אלהיך לא ירפך).

On the basis of these problems treated by Schechter we may conclude that he did not conceive of a doctrine of original sin in Judaism. He sees in the very nature of man's creation that freedom of will is one of the

blessings with which man is endowed. Free will cannot fit into any doctrine of Original Sin. The assurance of benefits from righteous parents and the assurance of God's eternal grace for Israel likewise precludes any belief in a doctrine which damns man from his birth. God's motive, in creating man who would acknowledge Him and His code for rightful living despite the influence of an evil nature with which he is forced to deal, was accomplished when Israel acknowledged the sovereignty of God at Sinai, and is renewed whenever Israel busies itself in the study of the Torah, and in the performance of its divine decrees. It is no reckless, unplanned world in which we live. God, forseeing man's ultimate nature, and the experiences consequent to that nature, recognizes His duty as Father of mankind in giving to man not only the blessings inherent with righteous parents but assures man of His eternal grace.

In his treatment of the problem of the Freedom of the Will, Morris Joseph points out that certain inherited traits and evironmental influences limit man's freedom. Men are not absolutely free to do as they please, but are subject to the influences of origin and training. Though humans are limited, they are free to choose between good and evil. The influences which limit man serve as the field of battle in which the individual must engage against the evil forces of life. Life confronts him with challenges and man is able to meet the contender. Thus the writer says, "We are, as it were, sculptors, and these inborn tendencies are the plastic materials with which we work. It is for us to mould them that they may yield a noble product, to create from them a moral life that shall realize our idea of goodness. Without the intervention of the sculptor the clay would never become a statue." (4 It is not sufficient that the Creator gathers together the dust of which man is formed, and moulds him in His own likeness. Man, too, must supply something to make the creature more perfect. That something is Will, the one determining factor of moral life. What man's life is to be depends on man himself.

In concluding his study, the writer says, "Human freedom is a

cherished principle of the Jewish religion. Judaism utterly repudiates such a doctrine as Original Sin, which declares that there is something inborn in all men which forces them to do wrong whether they wish it or not. It rejects the teaching which would reduce human beings to mere puppets in the hands of a cruel deity, who visits upon them transgressions for which they are not responsible. It refuses to dishonour God by picturing Him as having dowered men with a curse from their very birth. There is nothing in Hebrew Scriptures that can lend support to so strange a dogma."(5

In his essay, "Jewish Conceptions of Original Sin", Solomon Levy agrees with F. R. Tennant that "it is certainly an exaggeration to assert, as has frequently been represented, that Judaism possessed no doctrine of Original Sin." Levy, however, undertakes to show that while a belief in Original Sin was prevalent there was a radical difference in the ideas of the Synagogue and Church.

He begins with an analysis of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and Westminster Confession, and concludes that there are five principal ideas embodied in the Christian doctrine of Original Sin:

(a) There is in human nature an ingrained bias to sin.

(b) The sinful tendency of man is transmitted by heredity.

(c) Sin is the cause of suffering. Punishment is the consequence of sin. No suffering without sin.

(d) The sins of the fathers are visited upon their descendants.

(e) Adam's act of disobedience is the origin of sin and the cause of death as the punishment for sin, and the reason for the imputation of sin to posterity.

Thus, according to Christian teaching, the Fall of Adam is the real, direct and immediate cause of (a), (b), (c), and (d).

Levy points out that there are to be found in Jewish literature passages proving each of the several points listed as principal ideas in the Doctrine of Original Sin. He concludes from this that "it can scarcely be

maintained that Jewish theology contains no traces of the doctrine that Adam's act of disobedience was the origin of human sin and the primary cause of death."(6

This writer by historical treatment proves that at some time or other in the evolution of Jewish thought there existed the elements necessary to a doctrine of Original Sin. These ideas did not, however, remain with Judaism constantly. For example, in regard to (d) "The sins of the fathers are visited upon their descendants", the Bible itself rebels against the injustice of so cruel a doctrine. Hence, in the Bible there is to be found not only a tendency to soften the severity of the principle by laying stress on God's loving-kindness but, even more strikingly, there is a complete repudiation in Jeremiah 31:28 and Ezekiel 18:2-4.

From his analysis Levy concludes that though ideas existed in Jewish literature which were later embodied in the doctrine of Original Sin, there were in Judaism certain principles which arrested the progress of a complete doctrine and helped it escape the extreme form of determinism which it adopted in Christian thought. The principles of individual responsibility and freedom of will Judaism stoutly maintained. Levy can find no reference to the fact that free will or individual responsibility were lessened by Adam's sin. Herein lies the chief difference between Jewish and Christian thinking. Furthermore, the Jewish notions of the origin and continuance of sin in the world were tempered by the saving doctrine of repentance.

Thus concludes Levy: "Just as the doctrine of Original Virtue was happily saved from becoming unduly elating and relaxing by the concomitant insistence on individual righteousness, so the Jewish doctrine of Original Sin was preserved from becoming unnecessarily depressing and fatalistic by the accompanying assertions of the freedom of the will and the power of repentance."(7

Kohler, accepting fully the notion that man is captain of his

own soul, interprets the Paradise Story as an "allegorical description of the state of childlike innocence which man must leave behind in order to attain true strength of character." He sees in it the tendency, typical of all peoples of antiquity, to portray a descent of the race, from a golden age of ease and pleasant companionship with the gods to an age of baser metal with its labor and bitter woe. He says of this notion: "This view fails utterly to recognize the value of labor as a civilizing force making for progress, and it contradicts the modern historical view. The prophets of Israel placed the golden age at the end, not the beginning, of history, so that the purpose of mankind was to establish a heavenly kingdom upon the earth. In fact, the fall of man is not referred to anywhere in the Scripture and never became a doctrine, or belief, in Judaism. On the contrary, the Hellenistic expounders of the Bible take it for granted that the story is an allegory, and the book of Proverbs understands the tree of life symbolically in the verse: 'She (the Torah) is a tree of life to them who lay hold upon her.'" (8

Kohler sees in the Serpent the basis of the belief which gave rise to the Christian doctrine of Original Sin. He traces the concept of the serpent as described in the Talmud (Shab. 146a, Yeb. 103b, Ab. Zara 22b, Shab. 55b) to outside influences--to Persian and Babylonian mythology. This talmudic and apocryphal teaching that the poisonous breath of the serpent brought death into the world for the first parents and for all their descendants "prepared for the dismal church doctrine of original sin, the basis of Paul's teachings, which demanded a blood atonement for curse--laden humanity, and formed it after the pagan pattern in the vicarious sacrifice of a dying god." (9

The Jews never accepted this perversion of the Paradise story. Though the Rabbis occasionally mentioned the poisoning of the human race by the serpent, they always provided the antidote necessary for ridding oneself of the poison, viz., the Torah. "One cannot, however, discern the least indication of belief in original sin, either as inherent in the race or

inherited by them."(10 The Jewish view is best expressed by Deuteronomy 24:16 and Ezekiel 18:4, that "each man dies by his own sin", that every soul must bear only the consequences of his own deeds. Kohler notes particularly the absence of any reference to the idea of original sin in the liturgy, particularly for the Day of Atonement, where it would be certainly mentioned if the concept had any place in Jewish thought.

The Rabbis were put on their guard by the false interpretation the nascent Church put on the Paradise story and they developed the idea that "if Adam had but shown repentance, and done penance after he committed his sin, he would have been spared the death penalty" (Pes. 160b, Num. r. 13:5). That both Adam and Eve did penance and therewith set the example for all mankind is expressed in Pirke de R. Eliezer 20 and Erubin 18b. Thus, instead of transmitting the heritage of sin to coming generations, the first man is for them an example of repentance.

Thus Kohler concludes: "Judaism rejects completely the belief in hereditary sin and the corruption of the flesh. The biblical verse, 'God made man upright: but they have sought out many inventions' (Eccl. 7:29) is explained in the Midrash: 'Upright and just as is God, He made man after His likeness in order that he might strive after righteousness, and unfold even more his god-like nature, but men in their dissensions have marred the divine image' (Tan. Yelamdenu to Gen. 3:22). With reference to another verse in Ecclesiastes (12:7), 'The dust returneth unto God who gave it,' the Rabbis teach, 'Pure as the soul is when entering upon its earthly career, so can man return it to his Maker' (Shab. 152b)."(11

In another connection Kohler says, "The Christian view of universal guilt as a consequence of Adam's sin, the dogma of original sin, is actually a relapse from the Jewish stage to the heathen doctrine from which the Jewish religion freed itself."(12

We may add here a quotation from a convert from Judaism to

Christianity, who treats the entire background of Christian life and thinking. In evaluating the works of Philo, he approaches the problem of the Jewish attitude, as found in Philo, to the question of sin. Thus he states: "This leads us to the great question of Original Sin. Here the views of Philo are those of the eastern Rabbis. But both are entirely different from those on which the argument in the Epistle to the Romans turns. It was neither at the feet of Gamaliel, nor yet from Jewish Hellenism, that Saul of Tarsus learned the doctrine of original sin. The statement that as in Adam all spiritually died so in Messiah all should be made alive finds absolutely no parallel in Jewish writings. What may be called the starting point of Christian theology, the doctrine of hereditary guilt and sin, through the fall of Adam, and of the consequent entire and helpless corruption of our nature, is entirely unknown in Rabbinical Judaism. The reign of physical death was indeed traced to the sin of the first parents. But the Talmud expressly teaches, that God originally created man with two propensities, one to good and one to evil (Yezer Tob and Yezer Hara). The evil impulse began immediately after birth. But it was within the power of man to vanquish sin, and to attain perfect righteousness, in fact this stage has actually been attained." (13

Thus we find a scholar viewing the problem from a decidedly Christian point of view, as is evidenced by the very title of his work, recognizing the complete absence of the doctrine of original sin in Jewish theology.

All these studies indicate the point of view held by thinkers in Judaism today. The doctrine of Original Sin still finds no acceptance in Judaism. These scholars, basing their theories on the past, see nothing in Judaism that suggests such a belief. Approaching it from different angles, all arrive at the same conclusion.

CHAPTER VI

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Our study reveals clearly the impossibility of ascribing to Judaism a belief in the doctrine of Original Sin, such as is found in Christianity. Interested though it was in the problem of Sin, the removal of Sin from the earth, and the introduction of universal right living, Judaism does not ascribe to the sin of Adam the origin of sin in the world, and its continuance through his seed to all mankind. Such an idea could not but be repugnant to the spirit of Jewish religious teachings and the Jewish attitude towards life. Judaism's concept of God in His relationship to His creatures is too lofty to permit so pessimistic a view of life. Man is too close to God his Maker to allow the view that he is burdened at birth with the curse of a sin committed by the first parents. Judaism views man as a free agent placed in a world with the privilege of following such paths as he may incline to make for himself. Though this man is capable of doing great wrong because of a certain tendency to evil, he is equipped with a sense of the moral to rebel against this tendency within him. Every man is master of his own destiny insofar as his relation to sin is concerned.

One other great truth comes out of this study, namely, that it is utterly impossible to ascribe to Judaism a doctrinal notion such as Original Sin on the basis of one single isolated incident in the Bible. Just as certain Christian scholars refuse to ascribe to Paul such a belief because of the few verses in his Epistles on which the Christian doctrine has been based, so Judaism must reject such a practice in the evaluation of its past. Judaism has existed too long, its body of literature is too great, and its traditions too many, to permit ascribing to it a view as dogmatic as that which is contained in the Christian Doctrine of Original Sin. The thousands

of years of experience which went into the writing, thinking and living of the Jewish people do not permit one to bluntly ascribe to Judaism any hard and fast dogmatic belief. Much that is often mistaken as dogma is only a temporary and limited point of view. The obverse is also often true. Real principles of belief are lost in the overemphasis of something that is of only passing importance in the varied and lengthy history of the Jewish people. Truth can be obtained only by a reverent and modest approach to the traditions of the past, and a careful analysis of these beliefs in the changing influences in the lives of the people.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Morgenstern, J., Sources of the Paradise Story (Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy), p. 106ff.
2. Ibid., p. 227ff.
3. Gunkel, Hermann, Genesis Uebergesetzt und Erklaert.
4. Tennant, F. R., The Sources of the Doctrine of Original Sin, p. 8ff.
5. Cohon, S. S., The Origin of Death (Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy).
6. Ibid., p. 375; from Frazier, "Belief in Immortality", pp. 60-63.
7. Ibid., p. 377; from Frazier, op. cit. p. 70.
8. Ibid., p. 378; from Frazier, op. cit., p. 71.
9. Ibid., p. 379; from Hasting's Enc. of Rel. and Ethics, vol. 4, art. "Death", p. 142.
10. Ibid., p. 380; from Brinton, The Myths of the New World, p. 156.
11. Ibid., p. 381; from Frazier, op. cit., p. 77-78.
12. Tennant, op. cit., p. 32.
13. Lenormant, Francois, Les Origins de l'historie, p. 86f.
14. Maspero, G. C. C., The Dawn of Civilization, p. 156.
15. Wiedman, Alfred, The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians, p. 156-7.
16. Cohon, S. S. op. cit., p. 383.
17. Ibid., p. 383.
18. Ibid., p. 386.
19. Ibid., p. 387.
20. Tennant, op. cit., p. 90.
21. Ibid., p. 93.
22. Buttenweiser, Moses, Job 57.
23. Porter, Frank Chamberlin, Yecer Hara (Semitic and Bible Studies, Yale University 1901), pp. 118-125.
24. New Century Bible, Isaiah, vol. 2.

CHAPTER II

1. Porter, F. C., Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 1, p. 113.
2. Kohler, Kaufman, Pre-Talmudic Haggadah, J. Q. R., vols. V and VII.
3. Schechter, Solomon, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, p. 5.
4. Edersheim, Alfred, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, vol. 1, p. 31.
5. Schechter, op. cit., p. 243.
6. Tennant, op. cit.
7. Cohon, op. cit., p. 393.
8. Charles R. H., Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2, p. 470.
9. Ibid., p. 492.
10. Tennant, op. cit., p. 220.
11. Gunkel, Kautzsch's Pseudepigrapha des A. T.
12. Tennant, op. cit., p. 135.

/3.

CHAPTER III

1. Porter, F. C., Yecer Hara, Semitic and Biblical Studies (Yale University 1901), p. 108.
2. Ibid., p. 109.
3. Ibid., p. 113.
4. Aboth de R. Nathan 16.
5. Cited by Delitzsch in his treatment of Paul's Epistle to the Romans.
6. Tennant, op. cit., p. 165.
7. Ibid., p. 167.

CHAPTER V

1. Sefer Mitsfot Katan, Isaac of Korbile, 12th cent., p. 53.
2. Ibid.
3. Schechter, op. cit., p. 85.
4. Joseph, Morris, Judaism as Creed and Life, p. 105.
5. Ibid., p. 106.

6. Levy, Solomon, Original Virtue and Other Short Studies, p. 47.

7. Ibid., p. 57.

8. Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 220.

9. Ibid., p. 221.

10. Ibid., p. 221.

11. Ibid., p. 223.

12. Ibid., p. 243.

13. Edersheim, Alfred, op. cit., p. 52.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Buchler, Adolf - Studies in Sin and Atonement (Oxford 1928)

Charles, R. H. - Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Oxford 1913)

Cohon, S. S. - The Origin of Death (Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosopy, Cincinnati, 1919) vol. 1

Guttmann, M.- Maphteah HaTalmud (Adam Horishon), vol. 1 (Csongrad 1906)

Joseph, Morris - Judaism as Creed and Life (London 1919), 3rd edition

Kohler, Kaufmann - Jewish Theology (Macmillan N. Y. 1908)

Levy, Solomon - Original Virtue and Other Short Studies (London 1907)

Maspero, G. C. C. - Dawn of Civilization (New York 1894)

Midrash Rabba to Genesis 3 and 6, and quoted passages

Moore, G. F. - Judaism, vol. 2, part 3 (Harvard 1927)

Morgenstern, J. - Sources of the Paradise Story (Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, Cincinnati, 1919) vol. 1

Pirke de R. Eliezer (Warsaw 1885)

Porter - The Yecer Hara - A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin (Yale U. - Historical and Critical Contributions to Biblical Science, 1902)

Schechter, Solomon - Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York 1909)

Smith, W. R. - Religion of the Semites (London 1894)

Tennant, F. R. - The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin (Cambridge U. 1903)
- The Origin and Propagation of Sin (Cambridge U. 1902)

Wiedmann, Alfred - Religion of Ancient Egyptians (New York 1897)

Catholic Encyclopedia (New York 1912)
Adam - J. F. Driscoll, vol. 1, pp. 129-132
Sin - A. C. O'Neil, vol. 14, pp. 4-11

Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (New York 1908)
Adam - W. H. Bennett, vol. 1, pp. 84-87
The Fall (Biblical) - J. Denney, vol. 5, p. 701-705
The Fall (Ethinic) - J. A. MacCulloch, vol. 5, pp. 705-715
Sin (Christian),- H. R. Mackintosh, vol. 11, pp. 538-544
Sin (Hebrew and Jewish) - W. H. Bennett, vol. 11, pp. 556-560

Jewish Encyclopedia (New York 1901)
Adam - Louis Ginzberg, vol. 1, pp. 173-180
Fall of Man - Emil G. Hirsch, vol. 5, pp. 333-335
Sin - J. D. Eisenstein, vol. 11, p/376-379.

Jewish Quarterly Review (old series)

The Pre-Talmudic Haggada - K. Kohler, (1893), vol. 5, pp. 399-419

Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology - S. Schechter (1894), vol. 7, pp. 195-215