THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF MEDIATION.

THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF MEDIATION.

BY

THE REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.,
Jesus College, Cambridge;
Examiner in Hebrew and Greek Testament,
University of London.

LONDON:
SKEFFINGTON AND SON,
SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.
1910.

LONDON :

CHARLES CULL AND SON,
15, HOUGHTON STREET, ALDWYCH,
AND AT CHISWICK.

CONTENTS.

PREFATORY NOTE.

This volume offers, in as small a compass as possible, some of the results of an investigation into what is to be gathered concerning the doctrine of Mediation in Jewish Literature, ancient and modern.

The subject is obviously one of interest and importance on account of its bearing on the Christian doctrine of Atonement.

One object which the writer has had in view has been to try and illustrate the truth that the development of ancient Judaism leads inevitably to Christianity, unless the course of development be forced into a direction other than the natural one.

Another object has been to try and obviate, in however small a degree, some of the prejudice which so many Christians entertain towards Judaism, by showing them that in respect of the doctrine of Mediation Historic Judaism offers much that tends in the direction of Christianity.

The teaching of the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, the Targums and the later Rabbinical literature, including Mishnah, Gemara and Midrashic works, as well as the Jewish Prayer Book and some representative modern Jewish writings, have all, to a greater or less extent, been taken into consideration.

In giving some of the results of several years' study of the subject, the writer's intention has been to offer a *rêsumé* of illustrative quotations which may interest the ordinary reader, not to present anything approaching a treatise.

The Old Testament has been but slightly dealt with, for it did not seem necessary to repeat what has been admirably said by others; besides, the Old Testament everyone can read for himself. It is different when studying the subject in the other classes of literature which have been considered; the books, even in translations, which are required for this are, for the most part, not easily accessible; moreover, pages and pages have to be gone through, very often, before one comes across a relevant passage; the gathering of such passages is, consequently, rather laborious, and most people have not the inclination to do this "spade-work" even if the soil (in the shape of the necessary books) is close at hand. The writer has, therefore, devoted more space to quotations from classes of literature other than that contained in the Old Testament.

The Jewish doctrine of Mediation represents only one part of the subject, for the completion of which the doctrine in the Christian Church must necessarily be dealt with, and a sequel to this volume is obviously required; it is, therefore, the intention of the writer's friend, the Rev. G. H. Box, to publish in due course a companion volume on "The Christian Doctrine of Mediation."

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

Hatch End,
January, 1910.

INTRODUCTION.

THE principle of Mediation, in the ordinary sense of this word, is at work universally; it is a principle that lies in the nature of things; whether in the natural or the spiritual world there is always a means whereby cause and effect are brought about; the unity of nature, the solidarity of the human race, the spiritual growth in a man—all are conditioned by this principle. But it is not in this general sense that the word is to be used here. In the purely religious domain, and it is that alone with which we are now concerned, the word is used in a restricted sense, and concerns the relationship between God and men.

Two conceptions lie at the root of this *religious* doctrine of Mediation; the history of these two conceptions is co-terminous with that of man as a thinking being; and from the nature of the case, therefore, they have gone through a long process of development; and just as these two conceptions have during their history undergone modification and growth, so the ideas of the principle of Mediation have altered according to the varying standpoint of these. The two conceptions which lie at the root of the religious doctrine of Mediation are: The Idea of God, and the Sense of Sin. According as to whether the conception of God is exalted, according as to whether the sense of sin is deep, so will the intensity of the need of a Mediator between God and man assert itself. Moreover, in accordance with

man's realization of the Personality of God and his recognition of his own sinfulness, so will be the ideas which he formulates concerning the person and work of such a Mediator.

A differentiation has, of course, to be made between the principle of Mediation and the idea of Mediatorship; the latter is the logical development of the former, but still, the two conceptions are distinct. A belief in the principle of Mediation, in a wide sense, does not necessarily involve belief in a Mediator, any more than Pantheism involves belief in a personal God. In the Old Testament, for example, the principle of Mediation underlies the entire conception of the relationship between God and His people, but the idea of a Mediator is very rarely to be discerned; and, with one or two exceptions (which are, however, of a striking character) when this idea does appear it is rather adumbrated than actually presented in concrete form. This is, speaking generally, to be accounted for, in the first place, on account of the familiar relationships which were conceived of as existing between Jehovah and His people; this precluded the belief in any necessity of a personal mediatorial element; in the second place, because the elaborate sacrificial system with its supposed ample means of reconciliation with God answered all the requirements; and, lastly, because, as already pointed out, it is only when a real and adequate sense of sin has been developed that the conception of a Mediator forces itself to the front (see further below). And yet it is no exaggeration to say that the immense majority of the human race, whatever its varying forms of belief may be,

seems, sooner or later, to be impelled to cling not merely to the principle of Mediation, but also to be convinced of the need of a Mediator—that is to say, some personal being who stands between the supreme Deity and men. How is one to account for this? We seem almost to be forced to the conclusion that there is some element in the constitution of our human nature which demands some intermediary between God and men—that is to say, of course, when man's conception of the nature and personality of God has become sufficiently exalted. To realize the need of such intermediary there seems to be, on the one hand, some natural conviction implanted in men, which says, in effect, 'I cannot, and I would not dare if I could, approach God immediately'; and, on the other hand, there seems to be a natural craving implanted in him which will not be satisfied until it is assured that means to approach God exist. But all depends upon man's conception of the nature and personality of God, *and* upon man's conception of himself. There is nothing more instructive in this connection than the process through which the Jewish people, as a whole, went with regard to their belief in God,—we speak of the belief of the Jewish people as a whole, not the extremely exalted conceptions of God which were held by individual and specially inspired prophets. The main steps in this process can be described as follows:

The earlier we go back in the history of Israel the more downright are the anthropomorphisms; it was not, for example, a high conception of God which could depict Him as making coats of skins for Adam and Eve

(Gen. iii. 21), or as smelling the sweet savour of Noah's sacrifice (Gen. viii. 21)*; hence it did not appear incongruous during the earlier stages of belief that men should have been able to associate with Him, as in the case of Adam, Abraham, Moses, Joshua, etc.; such things witness to a belief in the attributes and personality of God which is not an exalted one. Under such conditions men do not feel keenly the need of a Mediator, or at the most a *man* is sufficient to act as such; if God for any reason is angry His wrath can be appeased by means of sacrifice.† What a change, however, we notice in later ages, when, to a large extent, the teaching of the prophets had influenced the people's conception of God. To give but one or two examples: *Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; what manner of house will ye build unto me?*" (Is. lxvi. 1); or, *I will extol thee, my God and King; I will bless thy name for ever and ever. . . . Great is the Lord and highly to be praised, and his greatness is unsearchable. . .* (Ps. cxlv. 1 ff.); or, once more, *My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord; for as the heaven is higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.* (Is. lv. 8-9). That such sayings could be multiplied is obvious to every reader of the Bible, and they bear witness to an immense spiritual advance, such as

* The present *form* in which these traditions have come down to us may be of comparatively late date, but they assuredly represent very antique conceptions.

† The wide use of the Hebrew root כפר (*Kaphar*) is very significant in this connexion.

we should naturally expect from the deeper knowledge of God which resulted from the inspired teaching of prophet and psalmist. The effect of this teaching, however, was not immediate; but was it likely to be? Nothing is more difficult to eradicate than popular conceptions and beliefs and practices which have the sanction of centuries, perhaps even, in this case, of millenniums, of tradition; and the prophets make it abundantly clear that for a very long time their efforts to raise the popular conceptions concerning God were in vain. Testimony of an even more convincing character than that contained in the prophetical writings, is offered in the Gospels: *Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and garnish the tombs of the righteous, aud say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we should not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye are witnesses to yourselves that ye are sons of them that slew the prophets;* and a little later on it is said: . . . *that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah, son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar* (Matth. xxiii. 29-35; see also Lk. vi. 23, xi. 47-51, xiii. 34, Acts vii. 51, 52, Rom. xi. 3, I. Thess. ii. 15, Hebr. xi. 37). The effect, therefore, of the prophetical teaching was not immediate since the prophets were slain for giving it; here and there, no doubt, there are signs of leavening, but it is quite exceptional, the rule was for a long, long, time that the people would have nothing to do with the teaching of their prophets; and therefore, the

old conceptions of God continued among the bulk of the people, with the result that Mediation, in the form of the sacrificial system, satisfied their wants, and the need of a Mediator could not assert itself. It must always be so when there is no true realization of the nature and personality of God.

Here we must make a digression in order to answer an obvious objection. It will be said that the conception of the nature and ethical character of God presented by, at all events, some of the prophets was so high that, according to the argument put forth above, they ought to have conceived, and definitely formulated, a doctrine of Mediatorship. The reply to this is two-fold. In the first place, however great the measure of inspiration may be which is accorded to men, they are, after all, but *men*, and are therefore hedged in and limited in all things by the conditions of their human nature. We are abundantly justified—and one could easily prove the contention—in asserting that the fruits of inspiration, or shall we say, the *full* fruits of inspiration, are rarely immediately manifest in man. The law, the divine law, of growth and development works here as everywhere else—indeed, may it not be said that the more precious the seed the more gradual is the process of the formation of blossom and fruit? We are, of course, speaking of things which are spiritual. And if this is so, have we any right to expect, even in the prophets, an immediate realization of what follows, when, through divine inspiration, a deeper knowledge and higher conception of God has been attained? The process may seem simple enough to us who live in the light of fuller revelation, but those who had not received this could not immediately, nor anything like immediately, become cognizant of what follows when they have realized to some extent the awful majesty, and power, and purity, and justice, the wholly spiritual essence and nature of God! For what *does* follow? First and foremost the destruction of all the now debasing conceptions of God which had been held in the past, the reconstruction on infinitely more spiritual lines, of all those anthropomorphic and anthropopathic ideas which are so derogatory to the spiritual majesty of God. This meant, in those days, perhaps more than we can possibly conceive; it touched, and touched rudely, all that was nearest and dearest in the religion of a people pre-eminently endowed with the religious

instinct; it meant to the people blasphemy; for it meant the taking away of the God Whom they had known, and Whom their fathers had known. The loss would be as cruel to them as the loss which centuries before Micah had felt and expressed in the pathetic cry: "Ye have taken away my gods which I made; and what have I more?" (Judg. xviii. 24). If this was felt less by the prophets, as, of course, was the case, still it meant a great break from time-honoured customs; and that break cannot take place all at once; it is only gradually that the ties with the past are loosened. Together with their higher conceptions of the nature of God, the prophets held many less exalted ideas, and the incongruity did not strike them. Therefore it followed that, in spite of their purer beliefs regarding the personality of God, the prophets as a body did not, and could not for centuries, realize the fundamental difference between the nature of men and the nature of God, and consequently they did not realize the distance between God and men, and again, in consequence, they could not feel the need of a Mediator. That is the first answer to the objection suggested.

The second is that, as a matter of fact, the distinct beginnings of a doctrine of a Mediatorship are observable in the writings of the greatest of all the prophets, and, this prophet was, moreover, one of the latest. This will be seen by a brief consideration of Is. liii, 4-12, which will not be out of place here.

The following is a literal translation of the Hebrew:

4. *Surely our sicknesses he hath borne, and our sorrows he hath carried them; and we esteemed him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.*

5. *And he was pierced for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace is upon him, and by his stripes we are healed.*

6. *All we like sheep went astray, each to his own way we turned, but Jehovah caused to light upon him the iniquity of us all.*

According to early Israelite belief sickness and misfortune were the visible manifestations of the wrath of God upon the sinner; the point of verse 4 is that the prophet is correcting what in this case of the suffering servant, at any rate, was an error; so much so that, as he explains, not only were the sufferings of this servant *not* the signs of God's wrath at his sins, but they were actually the signs of Divine wrath at the sins of others. The willing self-sacrifice of the servant

here recorded expresses the essence of the mediatorial office. The "sicknesses" refer to bodily suffering, the "sorrows" to mental pain; as in this passage so in Ps. xxxviii. 18 (17) "sorrows" refer to the mental pain brought about on account of sin, *i.e.*, it is equivalent to repentance; the wonderful thought, therefore, of the words is that the servant undergoes penitential grief, and suffers bodily pain on behalf of the sinful. A higher conception of vicarious suffering could scarcely be reached. In verse 5 the words "he was pierced" (pu'al of חלל) is more strictly accurate than the EV "he was wounded"; and it is possible that this passage, as well as Zech. xii. 10,* was in the mind of the Apostle who wrote John xix. 37. The thought of vicarious suffering is further brought out in the second half of this verse in the words: *The chastisement of our peace was upon him, i.e.*, The chastisement which was the means of bringing about our peace was upon Him; in verse 6 the same thought of vicarious suffering is prominent. The next passage which more especially concerns us is the end of verse 8:

Because of the transgression of my people, the stroke was his.

These words point again to the fact that the punishment ("stroke") which should have been upon the people, on account of their transgression, is endured by the Suffering Servant, although he is innocent; *he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.* But the most significant word, perhaps, in the whole chapter is "guilt-offering" (verse 10) as applied to him. This word (*'asham* in Hebrew) is also pregnant with meaning. In the next verse (11) there are some further words which are important.

The righteous one, my Servant, causes many to be righteous, and their iniquities he bears.†

It is well to emphasize the fact of how the central idea of this whole chapter is kept in the mind throughout; utterly unacceptable as the writer must have known that this teaching would be to his contemporaries, he nevertheless reiterates again and again the prime truth that the Servant takes upon himself the sins of others, with the two-fold result that the latter are made righteous, *i.e.*, become justified in the

* The words in the two passages are not the same in the original.

† There is a slight ambiguity about the Hebrew text in the passage, but the general sense is clear enough.

sight of God, while he himself becomes a sacrifice for sin. Lastly, there are the concluding words of the chapter:

And he did bear the sins of many, and for transgressors doth he make intercession.

It would scarcely be possible to single out any passage in either the Old or the New Testament which presented the essence of the idea of Mediatorship more adequately than here. Intercession is an indispensable element in Mediation, but it is a far less important element than that which makes it efficacious *i.e.*. self-sacrifice; in these words before us the more important element comes first; and this, in the higher sense, is more logical; for the obliteration of the sins of men is the necessary antecedent to the intercession being presented before God. If it should be argued that since their sins were taken away there would be no need for intercession, this would be to ignore the relationship between God and men; it is just here, as we shall see later on, that one of the fundamental differences between the Jewish and Christian doctrine of Mediation lies, and we shall cite this passage in support of the Christian presentation of the truth; now it must be sufficient to say that the obliteration of sins does not, *ipso facto*, establish what one may call normal relations between God and His creatures; in connexion with the words, "He did bear the sins of many," must be read what is said in verse 10 about his soul being a "sin-offering"; for though the text in that verse may be difficult, as it certainly is, its meaning is not ambiguous, all authorities being agreed that the reference is to a life being laid down in expiation of sin. The words before us must be regarded, quite apart from any meaning they may gain in the light of Christian teaching, as a striking witness to a belief in vicarious suffering as appertaining to the office of Mediator in its fuller meaning.

It may be hoped, then, that this necessary digression will to some extent have explained why, in spite of the exalted conception of God which the inspired prophets had, they nevertheless,. with the exception referred to, did not experience the need of a Mediator between God and men.

But a time came, as sooner or later it was bound to come, in which the prophetical teaching influenced thoughtful men more and more, and grew to fruition; and it was aided by that divinely appointed and very

significant fact of the Dispersion, which brought the Jews into contact with Greek thought and language. In this stage a doctrine of Mediatorship became definitely formulated; it is to be seen in the *Pseudepigrapha*, in the *Targums*, and in the mass of traditional belief, so much of which in its origin is pre-Christian, contained in the *Mishna* and the *Gemara*. This foreshadowed, as we believe, the fulness of the doctrine of Mediatorship as taught in the New Testament by the successors of the prophets. But to a large extent,—though not altogether, as many erroneously believe,—to a large extent official Judaism during the New Testament period did not follow the direct line of prophetical teaching; they did not go in the path indicated by the prophets; and if from that time onwards the Jewish doctrine of Mediatorship became fainter and fainter the reason must be sought not in anything that was alien in that doctrine to the genius of Judaism, nor in anything in it which was *per se* unacceptable, but in the, alas, ever growing antagonism on the part of Jews to Christianity, one of the fundamental tenets of which being the doctrine of the Mediatorship of Jesus of Nazareth. That antagonism still exists, and with it the repudiation of the belief in Christ as Mediator between God and men. But a belief in the principle of Mediation, and even a belief—modified it is true—in Mediatorship, is clearly discernible in the Jewish Liturgy of to-day; there are also here passages which altogether repudiate any idea of Mediatorship; these shall be faithfully indicated; but there is much, more than one would have expected, which points the other way.

THE TEACHING ON MEDIATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

Some Old Testament Passages considered.

It must be acknowledged that, in the strictly theological sense, the doctrine of Mediation in the Old Testament is presented in a very incomplete form ; * one very striking exception to this, however, exists in Is. liii., as already pointed out above. The *principle* is there, and is even strongly developed; but the logical working-out of the principle is only here and there in evidence. That is to say, that while the principle of Mediation is observable throughout, the presentation of Mediatorship is only rarely adumbrated. This is precisely what is to be expected ; for although the Doctrine of God in the Old Testament is, taking it as a whole, a very exalted one, more especially in the prophetic literature, nevertheless

*" Christian theologians, looking on the sacrifices of the Old Testament as a type of the sacrifice on the Cross, and interpreting the latter as a satisfaction to divine justice, have undoubtedly over-estimated the ethica lessons embodied in the Jewish sacrificial system; as may be inferred even from the fact that, for many centuries, the official theology of the church was content to interpret the death of Christ as a ransom for mankind paid to the devil, or as a satisfaction to the divine honour (Anselm), rather than as a recognition of the sovereignty of the moral law of justice," Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, p. 424 (2nd ed.)

the sense of sinfulness in man is a thing which is only very inadequately realized.

The general principle of Mediation is witnessed to by the existence of the priesthood and the sacrificial system—though in their essence neither of these things is specifically Israelite—the same applies to the prophetical office, and even to the kingship in so far as the king is entitled to perform priestly functions. But in each of these cases the idea of Mediatorship fails, if for no other reason, from the fact that each office only represents one side of mediatorial action. The essence of the idea of a Mediator between God and man is that he should represent two sides, the human before God, and the divine among men; but while, in a certain sense, the priest is the representative of men before God, and the prophet comes among men as God's representative, neither combines in himself the two offices. Therefore, strictly speaking, it is only the *principle* of Mediation which is presented in the person of priest and prophet. On the other hand, however, the idea of a mediator, in the strict sense, is not wholly absent; for example, the office of mediator is at least adumbrated in the case of the patriarch Abraham pleading with God for the cities of the Plain. He is here represented as standing between God and the wicked, and interceding for them (Gen. xviii. 23-33). The whole character of Abraham, as presented in the Old Testament, marks him out as one whose intercourse with God is much closer than that of men in general, and he therefore occupies a unique position in this respect; for this reason the pleading on behalf of men by one who is believed to be often in the presence ot the Deity denotes,

to a certain extent, a belief in the mediatorial office. But one of the classical instances of mediatorship in the Old Testament is to be found in the person of Moses. Perhaps the most instructive example of this is to be seen in the episode of the Golden Calf; here Moses appears, in the first place, as the intercessor on behalf of the people in praying that the just wrath of God might be averted: *Turn from Thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against Thy people. . . . And the Lord repented of the evil which He said He would do unto His people.** But, in the second place, a more significant element is seen in the fact that the idea of mediatorship is presented in connection with vicarious suffering, for in Exod. xxxii. 31, 32, we read as follows: *And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin— ; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of Thy book which thou hast written.*†

These words may, it is true, bear another interpretation; they may be explained as an expression of despair, meaning that if God will not forgive the people, it is useless for Moses to continue his work. But in view of the frequency with which Moses is represented as mediating between God and the nation, the interpretation given above may, perhaps, be allowed a certain amount of justification (*cf.* in this connection, Exod. xxxiii. 11-13, 17; Num. xii. 7, 8; and especially Deut. v. 5); Moses, like Abraham, occupies a special position.

A brief reference should also be made to the functions which Aaron fulfils in this connection. He does not,

* Exod. xxxii. 11-14.

† Something of the same idea is to be found in the case of St. Paul when he says: *For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh*, Rom. ix. 3.

indeed, occupy a position of intercessor in anything like the same degree that Moses did; he is rather the instrument by whose means the holiest forms of atoning sacrifice are presented to the deity, and in so far his personality may be regarded as a mediating influence; this is, however, by virtue of his office rather than (as in the case of Moses) owing to his personality. Lev. xvi. illustrates this better than any other passage; the central point here is the idea of the *sin-offering*, of a special kind, which Aaron alone may offer; but this, together with some other technical terms will have to be separately considered presently, for they have an intimate connection with the subject in hand.

It is, however, important to notice that intercession alone is by no means always regarded as a sufficient form of Mediation. In the first passage just referred to (Gen. xviii. 23 ff.) Abraham's intercession is based upon the fact that there are some righteous men in the city for whose sake the divine forbearance is sought; the existence of these is the *raison d'être* of Abraham's intercession. That is to say, he who mediates must have something to offer, in the sense of "presenting." In the same way, when Moses intercedes (Exod. xxxii. 11 ff.), it is not upon intercession alone that he relies; two other elements enter in; in the first place, there is an appeal to God to vindicate His own purposes in the words;—*Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, saying, For evil did He bring them forth, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth?* And in the second place, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are presented before the Deity by name as the

holders of a divine promise that their seed should inherit the promised land. Here again, therefore, something more than intercession is deemed necessary. This truth is further illustrated in the passage I. Sam. vii. 5 ff., *And Samuel said, Gather all Israel to Mizpah, and I will pray for you unto the Lord.* Samuel mediates here between Israel and God on account of the sin of the former; punishment for their sin is imminent—viz., a Philistine attack, and Samuel intercedes for his people in order that this punishment may be averted. But this intercession alone is clearly regarded as only one element in the *rationale* of Mediation, for we read, in addition, of three other elements—an offering, fasting, and confession of sins: *And they gathered together to Mizpah, and drew water, and poured it out before the Lord, and fasted on that day, and said there, We have sinned against the Lord.* This passage is an especially important one from the point of view of our present investigation, and merits therefore some little detailed examination. The question of water libations in the Old Testament is a difficult one; it will be well to draw attention to the general Semitic custom concerning them in order to see whether there is any special significance in the mention of pouring out water before the Lord as mentioned in the passage just quoted, and in order also to discover if there is any connection between water-offerings and the idea of Mediation as contained in the Old Testament.

Among the early Babylonians the god Ea was worshipped as the personification of the element of water; his sanctuary was, appropriately enough, situated in Eridu, a city which, in days gone by, stood at the head of the Persian Gulf; the water-god was thus worshipped in a site which looked

upon the sea. His cult was always connected, as one would expect, with "holy water." Now, among the Semites generally, there were three conceptions held regarding the element of water: the primeval waters, represented by Tiamat, the principle of disunion and harm, inspired men with the idea of water as being something terrible; on the other hand, water as the means of moistening the soil and thus assisting production, was regarded as a fertilizing agency; and lastly, as the cleansing element, water symbolized purification. It was with the last of these that the god Ea was concerned; he personified water as the element of purification. In a text, which belonged originally to Eridu, mention is made of the priest in "a garment of linen from Eridu," who stands on the threshold of "the house of purification." In another text Ea says to his son Marduk, who is interceding for a man possessed of a demon: "Go, my son Marduk, bring him into the house of holy sprinkling, break his bann, loose his bann."* It can scarcely be doubted that the pouring out of water here has to do with purification; so that if water libations were poured out in honour of Marduk, this would be analogous to other instances of offering to a god that which was specifically his own—viz., the purifying element, in this case. But it must be confessed that evidence is not forthcoming that libations of water belonged to the regular drink-offerings to the deity among the Semites; it is more probable that when water was poured out in the sanctuary it was an act which symbolized purification, or else *ipso facto* purified the worshipper. In the instance given above the possessed man is sprinkled, and thus purified from the contamination of the demon; it is well known that demons were supposed to regard with horror the element of water just on account of its cleansing properties. It is possible that in part, but only in part, the thought of cleansing was present when drink-offerings of water were poured out on graves; dead bodies were always considered "unclean," and tombs, like waterless places, were believed to be a favourite resort of demons.†

* Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, pp. 29-32, Jastrow, *Des Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, pp. 61, 62.

†The main reason of water libations being offered to the departed was connected with the oriental idea that a drink of pure water was an ideal delight; the kindest wish that could be entertained on behalf of a departed friend was that in Hades he might find plenty of pure water to drink. It was a regular prayer among the

Water libations of the ordinary kind were not, it may be safely stated, offerings to the deity, but were ritual acts signifying, or as is more likely, bringing about the spiritual purification of the worshippers; in agreement with this is the fact that in the Levitical ritual no mention is made of offerings of water. On the other hand, there is important evidence showing that ritual washing had the effect of purifying from uncleanness of various kinds (*cf.* Lev. xiv. 1-32, xv. 13, Num. viii. 7-8),* and it is scarcely too bold an assertion to say that a community of ideas underlay ritual washings of this kind and water libations such as are referred to in the passage under consideration (I. Sam. vii. 6.†)

These considerations seem to point to the fact that the pouring out of the water (i. Sam. vii. 5ff.) denoted an act of purification; it was followed by fasting and the confession of sins. It is, therefore, clear that Samuel's intercession was not regarded as sufficient; the act of Mediation required, besides the intercession, the purifying of those who were interceded for, as well as an act of self-sacrifice—viz., the fasting, and the confession of sins.

What has been said shows that, according to the teaching of the Old Testament, the idea of Mediation

Arabs that Heaven would send much rain upon the graves of their departed friends (Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidenthums* (2.ed.) pp. 182f.) An entirely different set of ideas was connected with the pouring out of water upon the altar, for example during the Feast of Tabernacles in later times; this was merely an act of imitative magic, practised (according to the Rabbis themselves) with the object of securing fertilizing rains in the following year (Robertson Smith, *Op. cit.*, pp. 231f.) This was a practice of very wide prevalence (Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (2.ed.), I. pp. 81-114).

* This subject is dealt with at length in Oesterley and Box *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp, 255 ff.

† II. Sam. xxiii. 16 appears to be something quite exceptional, though the passage witnesses to the existence of water libations.

did not consist merely in intercession. Though, perhaps, not much more than adumbrated, there seems nevertheless, to be connected with it an underlying conception of *a price to be paid.* This receives emphasis from the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, which occupies an altogether unique position in the Old Testament.*

A passing reference should also be made (especially in view of what will be said later on regarding the mediating functions of angels) to Dan. xii. 1, where Michael is spoken of as "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people;" see also Dan. x. 13.21., and cp. Jude 9, Rev. xii. 7.

---

* But see also Robertson Smith *Op. cit.* pp. 229 f.

CHAPTER II.

Some technical terms considered.

It will be necessary next to consider as briefly as possible one or two technical terms in connection with sacrifices which have a bearing upon our present investigation :—

i. There are some derivatives from the root כפר * (*kāphar*) which are of great significance when considered in connection with the Old Testament ideas of Mediation. Concerning the root-meaning three main opinions are held; in the first place, it is maintained that it comes from the Arabic and has the meaning "to cover over"; that is to say, a gift or an offering has the effect of covering over the eyes in order that a cause of offence may not be seen; this meaning is illustrated, for example, in Gen. xx. 16, *Behold, I have given thy brother a thousand pieces of silver; behold, it is for thee a covering of the eyes to all that are with thee; and in respect of all thou are righted;* but still more pointed, on account of the use of the actual word under consideration, is Gen. xxxii. 20 (21 in Hebr.), *I will appease his face* (lit. "I will cover his face"; אכפרה פניו) *with the present that goeth in front of me; and afterward I will see his face, peradventure he will receive me.* If this derivation is correct, the meaning

* With two exceptions it is only the *Pi'el* (Kipper) form with its passive *Pu'al*, together with the derivatives from these, that is found in the Old Testament; the two exceptions are the *Niph'al*, which occurs in Deut. xxi. 8, and the *Hithpa'el* in I. Sam. iii. 14.

"to cover over" implies that an offering blinds the eyes of God to an offence that has been committed; the offering is the means whereby God is induced not to regard the cause of offence. On the other hand, the word is believed to denote that that which is "covered over" is not the face of God, but the cause of offence, so that it is not seen by God; by this means the sin would be regarded as non-existent. In the one case the making of the atonement was accomplished by a gift to the Deity; in the other the sin was, as it were, obliterated by means of covering it over. For this latter Lev. xvii. 11 is instructive: *It is the blood that maketh atonement for* (or "covers over") *your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement* (or "covers over") *by reason of the life* (it is said in the first part of this verse that the *life of the flesh is in the blood*). Now, although there is a good deal involved in the difference between these two explanations as to what this "covering over" refers to, in either case the principle of Mediation comes to the fore. On the one hand, it is by means of a gift that God consents, as it were, not to see the sin; on the other, it is the means whereby the sin is hidden from God in such a way as to make it appear as though it were not. Once more, there is a good deal of justification for the meaning "to wipe off" or "to wipe clean"; this is the signification of the Syriac stem, and there are other Semitic analogies which could be urged in favour of this meaning. * Originally the idea in each case was a *naïve*

* See, further, Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 381 (2nd ed.).

one; but the importance of it all lies in the fact that witness is borne to the belief, firstly, of the shortcomings of men in the sight of God; secondly, to the necessity of putting away the cause of offence; and, thirdly, to the need of some efficacious means whereby this can be done; or, if one were to put it into modern form: the existence of sin, the need for it to be taken away, and how it can be taken away. How far-reaching were the ideas connected with the root-idea of the Hebrew word כפר may be seen from the meanings which are attached to some of its derivatives:—

KŌPHER means a "ransom," *e.g.* Exod. xxi. 30: *If there be laid on him a ransom, then he shall give for the redemption of his life whatsoever is laid upon him.*"

KIPPŪRIM is an abstract noun meaning "atonement," *e.g.* Exod. xxix. 36: *And every day shalt thou offer the bullock of sin-offering for atonement.* This is the word from which the modern name for the Day of Atonement comes, "Yom Kippur"; cf. Lev. xxiii. 27, 28.; xxv. 9.

KAPPŌRETH is the technical word for the covering of the ark of the testimony, Exod. xxv.; it means the "propitiatory"; in I. Chron. xxviii. 11 the temple is called from it "the house of the propitiatory" (בית הכפרת). The different forms of the verb also have meanings which are very significant from the point of view of our present enquiry:—

KIPPĒR, which is the ordinary and most usual form, means to "make atonement" or "to reconcile."

HITHKAPPĒR, a reflexive form, which means "to cause oneself to be reconciled"; this implies the need of the priest to perform the necessary functions; and lastly,

NIKKAPPER means "to become reconciled."

In all these cases the underlying ideas, as already pointed out, are the existence of sin which separates from God, the yearning to be reconciled to God, and the means whereby such reconciliation can be brought about.

ii. We turn next to the word *Chăţţ'āth* (חטאת) which is usually, but incorrectly, translated "Sin-offering." The original root-meaning of this word has nothing to do with "sin"; this is proved by the meaning of the word in cognate languages. The root-meaning is still preserved in some Old Testament passages, *e.g.* in Judg. xx. 16 we read: *Among all this people there were seven hundred chosen men that were left-handed; every one could sling stones at an hair-breadth, and not miss;* the last word here (ולא יחטא) comes from the same root as the word translated "to sin." Again, in Job. v. 24 we have the following: *And thou shalt know that thy tent is in peace; and thou shalt visit thy fold* (or "dwelling-place") *and shalt miss nothing;* again, the last word in the verse comes from the root that we are considering. Without going into further detail one may say that the idea underlying the word was originally that of something *lacking*, something that misses the mark.* And, as we shall see, this originally *negative* sense is, generally

* It is interesting to notice, in passing, that this meaning is precisely that of the Greek *ἁμαρτάνω*, the word which occurs so frequently in the New Testament for "to sin." The negative sense here, too, shows that it is inadequate to express what, according to Christian teaching, is the essence of sin; hence the developed meaning which it assumes in the New Testament.

speaking, that which is present in the word *Chătt'āth*, or "Sin-Offering."

The central point of the "Sin-offering" is the smearing of the blood of the sacrificed animal on the horns of the altar, see *e.g.* Exod. xxx. 10: *And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it* (*i.e.*, the altar) *once in the year; with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations; it is most holy unto the Lord.* The decisive act is this bringing of the blood upon the altar; this was believed to be the first step in establishing a right relationship between the worshipper and God; and this was accomplished by means of the blood of the offering. It is supremely important always to bear in mind the significance there was in blood to the ancient Hebrew on account of its containing the life or soul. In the case of the *Chătt'āth* or "Sin-offering" the blood first of all consecrated the altar afresh, while the offering itself was the means of re-establishing normal relations between God and the worship; it was that which made reconciliation. But when it is asked what was supposed to be the cause of the relationship having been broken, the reply is, some ritual offence, something which had impaired the "consecrated state" of a man. The result of this was twofold; a state of "uncleanness," and a consequent estrangement between God and the man who had "made a mistake." And, therefore, to re-establish normal relations a twofold action was necessary; first the becoming "clean," that is, in a fit state to enable reconciliation to take, and then the actual ceremony of reconciliation.

This is very important in view of the later history of the doctrine of Mediation, for, as already pointed out, consecration and reconciliation are quite distinct; or, to put it in another way, the obliteration of sin does not *per se* reconcile with God, it only makes man in a fit state to be reconciled; the forgiveness of sins is only the first step which is brought about by the functions of Mediatorship, reconciliation forms the completion of the mediatorial action. In this *Chătt'āth* or "Sin-offering" there was, then, originally only the idea of making good something that had been left undone—the ritual "mark" had been missed; and in that it took away that which had caused the Deity displeasure, it was of a purely negative character. It must, one feels, have been a later development when the positive character was added whereby the offering became also the means of putting a man in a state of consecration or sanctification (קדש), because it implies advanced conceptions, and because, moreover, it has no real connection with the name *Chătt'āth*. In the form in which this *Chătt'āth* appears in the Old Testament, the translation "Sin-offering" is very misleading; as will be clear from what has been said, it should be translated "reconciliation-offering," or, taking into account its later positive character, "consecration-offering." Finally, it must be remembered that this *Chătt'āth* is not an offering which is sacrificed on account of known or conscious offences against the ritual laws, much less does any idea of moral offence enter in.

The importance and interest about these ancient conceptions is that they are the forerunners of things that are true, and that, therefore, they contain the germs of truth within themselves.

iii. We come now to the offering called the *'āshām* (אשם). This comes from a root meaning, in the first instance, "to be guilty"; the noun also means "guilt," but comes later on to denote "compensation for guilt." The transition is not difficult to follow; a man who is guilty makes an offering in order that his guilt may be taken away; it is, as it were, transferred to the offering, and therefore the offering is conceived of as bearing the guilt, and thus itself guilty; that is why it bears the name *'āshām*. But this is all a later development; originally the *'āshām* was something much simpler. The clearest illustration of it in its early sense is to be found in 1 Sam. vi. 1-18; here we have an account of how the Philistines were suffering because of their having taken away the Ark of the Lord against His will; consequently they are anxious to get rid of it, and come to their priests and diviners for counsel: *What shall we do with the Ark of the Lord? show us wherewith we shall send it to its place;* the priests reply: *If ye send away the Ark of the God of Israel, send it not empty; but in any wise return Him an 'āshām* ("guilt-offering" R.V.); *then shall ye be healed . . .*; in reply to the question: *What shall be the 'āshām which we shall return to Him?* the priests say: *Five golden tumours, and five golden mice, according to the number of the lords of the Philistines; for one plague was on you* (them) *all, and on your lords. Wherefore ye shall make images of your tumours, and images of your mice that mar the land; and ye shall give glory unto the God of Israel; peradventure He will lighten His hand from off you, and from off your gods, and from off*

your land. We have here a very interesting combination of the antique belief in imitative magic with a not very advanced religious belief; we learn from the passage that the original idea of an *'āshām* was that of compensation. It was an offering which "seems to have been confined to offences against God or man that could be estimated and so covered by compensation." In later times it became an exclusively religious act, which was not necessarily the case in the earlier stages of its history. As a specifically "trespass-offering" it was represented by a ram, in addition to a penalty of the fifth part of its value, which formed the restitution to the injured party. The great difference, and it was of a fundamental character, between the *'āshām* and the *Chăṭṭ'āth*, which was considered just now, was that in the case of the *'āshām* the blood of the victim was not applied to the horns of the altar; the reason for this was that, as we have already seen, the *'āshām* was compensatory; it compensated for the injury done, and therefore there was no need for the offence to be expiated at the altar. As an acknowledgment of guilt the *'āshām*-offering may perhaps be best described as an *act of penitence.* When, therefore, we read in Is. liii. 10 of the "Servant of the Lord" offering himself as an *'āshām*, we must see in the act, firstly, a recognition of guilt which the "Servant" takes upon himself, and, secondly, a compensation for the sins of the people. The thought underlying it all is that God has been injured, and has therefore to be compensated; the *'āshām* is the medium whereby the injury is compensated for, and by means of which normal relations between God and His people are re-

established. As a compensatory offering the victim in the *'āshām* could be said "to bear the sin (*i.e.*, the injury done to God) of many." The point in Is. liii. 10 which is so extraordinary is not the offering of the *'āshām*, but that the victim should be a *man*.

From what has been said about these three technical terms (and they by no means exhaust the number that ought strictly to be considered), viz., to "cover over," the "reconciliation"—or "consecration-offering" (*Chăṭṭ'āth*)—and the "offering of compensation" (*'āshām*), it will be seen that they touch closely upon the idea of Mediation, and that they are the antecedents, or foreshadowing, of the great Sacrifice upon the Cross of the One Mediator and Advocate Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER III.

Negative Teaching on Mediation in the Old Testament.

But it would not be right to ignore the fact that there are in the Old Testament passages which are directly contrary to the idea of a mediator between God and man. Two of these may be given; in I. Sam. ii. 25 occur the words: *If a man sinneth against a man, God will mediate* ("decide," or "arbitrate") *for him*; *but if a man sinneth against Jehovah, who can intercede for him?* That is to say, that if a man commits a sin against another man, God, through His representative, will put things straight again between the two; but there is nobody to perform a like office when a man sins against God. Then, again, in Job ix. 33 we read: *Oh that there were a Mediator between us* (LXX. renders ὁ μεσίτης ἡμῶν for בינינו), *that may lay his hand* (*i.e.* settle matters) *upon us.* The underlying idea here is quite similar to that in the passage from I. Sam. above; the context shows that Job sees no hope of justification in the sight of God—*If I wash myself with snow water, and make my hands never so clean, yet wilt thou plunge me in the ditch, and mine own clothes shall abhor me*—, and therefore he longs for someone who could act on his behalf, and present his case before God; but there is nobody to do this. It is an intensely pathetic cry for a Mediator, without whom man's case in the sight of God is hopeless.

But the very hopelessness which this plaint implies shows that what is desired is not believed to exist.

There are, of course, other passages in the Old Testament (though their number is very limited) which witness to a repudiation of the idea of Mediatorship; it will not be necessary, however, to deal further with these, as our object is mainly to examine the *positive* teaching on the subject; and this far outweighs that on the negative side.

THE TEACHING ON MEDIATION IN POST-BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

CHAPTER IV.

The Teaching in the Apocrypha.

The two classes of literature known as *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha* are usually differentiated because the former was accepted by the Alexandrian Canon and the latter was not; but it must be remembered that *both* were rejected by official Palestinian Judaism. On the other hand, it should be mentioned that certain books among the Apocrypha, viz., *Tobit*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Judith*, and the first book of *Maccabees*, were recognized as containing teaching in harmony with orthodox Judaism. It cannot, however, be too strongly insisted upon that, although both these classes of literature were rejected by the Jewish religious leaders in Palestine, they reflected nevertheless the thoughts and convictions and aspirations of a large body of Jewish thinkers, and that the influence of these upon the bulk of the Jewish people was originally greater than that of the Pharisaic (*i.e.*, official) party.

The *Apocrypha* and the *Pseudepigrapha* form the normal continuation of the Old Testament Scriptures. The teaching of the *Pseudepigrapha*, especially in the main theme dealt with, *i.e.*, Eschatology, is based upon the prophetical literature of the Old Testament. In

spite, therefore, of the fact that the *Pseudepigrapha* are not recognized, and never have been, by orthodox Judaism, the teaching which they contain on the subject of Mediation must be taken into consideration, because this reflects the belief of the bulk of the Jewish people during the centuries immediately preceding the Christian Era, and onwards. It is a fact which does not admit of contradiction that, speaking generally, the direct line of sequence runs thus: Old Testament, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha; while the "Torah"-religion of official, Pharisaic Judaism ran into a *cul de sac* from which it has never yet emerged, as far as orthodox Judaism is concerned.

The *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha* may, then, be taken together in considering what they teach upon the subject of Mediation, though as the latter comprises a far larger literature than the former, the *data* from the Psuedepigraphical books to be examined will naturally exceed in number those from the Apocrypha. We shall give some typical quotations first, and then proceed to examine the evidence in the light of these.

In *Tob.* xii. 15 we read that the angels present to God the prayers of the saints, it is there said: "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, who bear the prayers of the saints upwards, and who have access to the glory of the Holy One;" with this should be compared what is said in iii. 16—17 of the same book: "And the Lord heard the prayer of both in the presence of the glory of the great Raphael, and he (Raphael) was sent to heal them both" (*i.e.*, Tobit and Sarah); and, once more, it is an angel who says: "And as ye prayed, thou and thy

daughter-in-law Sarah, I brought your sacrifice of prayer before the Holy One" (xii. 12). This belief in the mediatorial functions of angels will come before us again presently in a more pronounced form. An instructive passage occurs in II. Macc. xv. 12—15; it is there related how Judas Maccabæus had a vision, in which he saw Onias (who had in earlier days been high-priest) with outstretched arms, praying for the Jews. After that another figure appeared, likewise with outstretched arms; then Onias spoke to Judas, and said: "This man is the friend of the brethren, who prays much for his people and the holy city,—Jeremiah, the prophet of God." Distinct as the reference to Mediation is in these passages—and it is worth noting that in contradistinction to Old Testament teaching, the Mediator is in each case a supernatural being—they form, nevertheless, exceptions, so far as the Apocrypha is concerned; rarely anywhere else in this collection is there any reference to the subject; on the contrary, in a number of passages in which the subject-matter directly invites the mention of Mediation it is pointedly omitted. A few examples may be given; in *Ecclus.* ("The Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach") it is said that it is easy for God to recompense the wicked man according to his deserts when the end comes (xi. 26); more striking, in view of the fact that in the Old Testament the intercession of Abraham is described, is *Ecclus.* xvi. 7 ff: "He was not reconciled in the case of the giants of old, who in their strength rebelled against Him. He did not spare Lot's fellow-citizens, whom He abhorred because of their pride. He had no mercy on

the people destined to destruction who were swept away in their sins. . . . He has power to reconcile (*i.e.*, through forgiveness), and he pours out his wrath; however great his mercy, so great too is his chastisement; He judges each according to his works"; cf., too, xviii. 11-12. Here one might assuredly have expected some reference to mediation on the part of men or angels if this had been believed in; though it must, of course, be borne in mind that both here and in the next passage to be quoted the dominant idea in the writer's mind is the great contrast between the lot of the wicked and that of the righteous; this is clearly seen also in *Wisdom* v. 1 ff.: "Then in much boldness shall the righteous stand in the presence of those who oppressed him and took no account of his travail. When they (the wicked) see him then shall they be troubled with terrible fear, and shall be amazed at the unexpectedness of his salvation. Repentant they will say, in anguish of soul they will groan, 'This man it was who was once the object of scorn.' . . .;" the long passage which then follows, expressive of the repentance of the wicked, contains not the remotest reference to any mediation or intercession that might be offered on behalf of them; see further *Wisd.* iii. 18, iv. 19-20. In the references to the final Judgement, moreover, the idea of the intercessions of the righteous on behalf of sinners is altogether absent. It is this silence concerning the subject in passages where mention of it might reasonably be expected which is so significant.

On the other hand, the mediating efficacy of works is distinctly taught, for example, in *Ecclus.* iii. 3 "He that

honoureth his father shall make atonement for sins" ; as we shall see later on, it was a tenet of Rabbinical Judaism—which in *Ecclus.* is already found fully developed in many particulars—that works, namely the fulfilling of *Mitzvoth* (lit. "commandments"), were meritorious, and that they were, therefore, efficacious in annulling sin. In the Old Testament, as we have already seen, it is only sacrifices that atoned for sin, in the New Testament it is only Christ Who can do so ; here we have an intermediate conception. There is an instructive example of this in *Ecclus.* iii. 30 : "Water will quench a flaming fire ; and almsgiving will make atonement for sins" ; *i.e.* just as water quenches fire, so do good works (in this case, almsgiving) obliterate sins, cp. xxxv. 3. In these instances the good works form the mediating agency which comes between God and man, and establishes normal relationship between them. But most pointedly of all is this brought out in ii (iv) *Esdras* ; the whole of chapter vii. is very instructive in this respect ; a few verses may be quoted : "For God solemnly declared to the living, as soon as they become alive, what they should do to attain life (eternal), and what they should observe in order to avoid punishment. But they (the wicked) were disobedient, and gainsaid Him. . . . Therefore, O Esdras, evil for the evil, good for the good!"* This definite alternative is not in any degree softened by any reference to a mediating influence, indeed in verses 102 ff. this is explicitly excluded ; for Esdras puts the direct question as to whether on the Day of Judgement the righteous

* Vacua Vacuis et Plena Plenis:

will be permitted to come before God and intercede for the wicked, "Fathers for sons, sons for their parents, brothers for brothers, relations for their cousins, friends for their companions?" The angel answers Esdras: " . . . Just as even now no father can send his son, no son his father, no lord his servant, no friend his companion, to be ill for him, or sleep, or eat, or be made whole, on his behalf,—so in that time also, no man will by any means be permitted to intercede for, nor yet to accuse anyone else; for then each shall bear his righteousness or unrighteousness alone." Very much to the point Esdras then replies: "But how is it that we find it written that already Abraham prayed for the men of Sodom,* Moses for our fathers who sinned in the wilderness,† after him Joshua for Israel in the days of Achan,‡ Samuel in the days of Saul,§ David concerning the plague,‖ Solomon for those who prayed in the Sanctuary,¶ Elijah for those who received rain,** and for the dead (child) that he might live,†† Hezekiah for the people in the days of Sennacherib,‡‡ and many others for other men? If, therefore, when corruption had increased and unrighteousness had become sore, the righteous prayed for sinners, why cannot the same happen also now?" The angel's answer is as follows: "The present world is not the end of things, its glory will not last; therefore the strong were permitted to pray for the weak. But the Day of Judgement is the end of this world, and the

* Gen. xviii. 23 ff. † Exod. xxxii. 11 ff. ‡ Josh. vii. 7 ff.
§ I. Sam. vii. 9; xii. 23. ‖ II. Sam. xxiv. 15—17.
¶ I. Kgs. viii. 22 ff. 30 ff. ** I. Kgs. xviii. 42.
†† I. Kgs. xvii. 20 ff. ‡‡ Kgs. xix. 15 ff.

beginning of the eternal world that is to come; there, Corruptness is past, Unseemliness cast out, Unbelief destroyed, but Righteousness increased, and Truth in the ascendant. At that time, therefore, shall no one be permitted to take pity on one who is under judgement, nor will he be able to cast him down who has conquered."

The teaching, therefore, of the *Apocrypha* may be briefly summed up thus: For the most part the idea of Mediation is wholly absent; generally speaking, there is but little hope for sinners; when there is a question of forgiveness for these, the divine mercy is accorded without the need of any Mediator. A few instances, and they are exceptional, occur in which a Mediator is mentioned, but in these cases he is superhuman. The two points of prime significance are these: firstly, this superhuman character of the Mediator, when he is mentioned; and secondly, as illustrated, above all, in ii (iv) *Esdras*, the hopeless condition of sinners. It will thus be seen that, as far as the *character* of the Mediator is concerned, the teaching of the *Apocrypha* is an advance upon that of the Old Testament; but that, taken as a whole, the doctrine of Mediation in the *Apocrypha* shows a retrograde movement, more, however, by its silence on the subject than by actually antagonistic teaching—with the exception always of ii. (iv) *Esdras* vii.

CHAPTER V.

The Teaching in the Pseudepigrapha.

We turn next to the Pseudepigraphic writings; and here, again, it will be best to present some of the evidence first. The earliest work, or series of works, here to be considered, viz., the *Enoch* literature (*circa* 200-70 B.C.), is especially important on account of the large body of evidence which it contains regarding our present subject. We may take, as an instructive starting-point, a passage which, as will be seen, strikes the key-note of the book as far as the doctrine of Mediation is concerned, namely that the Mediator is a superhuman personality, *Enoch* xii.-xiii.; in these chapters Enoch, the "Scribe of Righteousness," recounts a vision he has had; in this vision he is bidden to announce to those angels who had left the Heavens in order to defile themselves with the daughters of men (cf. Gen. vi. 4. Jude 6) that destruction awaited them, and that they should find neither peace nor forgiveness; Enoch then relates as follows: "Then I went and spoke to them all, and they were all afraid, and fear and trembling took hold of them. And they besought me to write out a petition for them, in order that they might receive forgiveness, and that I should read their petition before the Lord of Heaven. For they could no more speak to Him themselves, nor could they raise their eyes to Heaven for shame on account of their sin, for the sake of which they were being punished. Thereupon, I com-

posed their petition and supplication on behalf of their spirit, and for their individual deeds concerning which they prayed that they might receive forgiveness and forbearance. Then I went and sat me down by the waters of Dan, in the land of Dan, that lies south of the west side of Hermon, and I read their petition [to God (?)] until I fell asleep" (xiii. 3—7). Their petition is not granted (see xiv. 4—7), but nothing could be clearer than the character of Mediator in which Enoch is here presented.

It may be mentioned that the figure of Enoch as the 'Heavenly Scribe,' or the 'Scribe of Righteousness,' is one which occurs fairly frequently, *e.g.*, Enoch xii. 3, xv. 1, xcii. 1; in the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan to Gen. v. 24, Enoch, in his character of Heavenly Scribe, is identified with Metatron (concerning this latter see below). His 'writing' is mostly in the form of intercession; and, as will have been noticed, this intercession is not necessarily on behalf of the Jews, like that of Metatron; in *Ecclus.* xliv. 16, where Enoch is spoken of, a gloss, preserved in one of the manuscripts of the book, runs: "And he was removed to Paradise that he might give repentance to the Gentiles" (Cf. Kautszch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudep. des A. T.*, I. 451). In the *Book of Jubilees* iv. 17—19 it is said of Enoch: "This is the first among the children of men, of those who were born on earth, who learned writing and knowledge and wisdom, and who wrote in a book the signs of the heavens after the order of their months . . ;" cf. x. 17. His 'writing' is further referred to in *Jub.* xxi. 10, *Test xii. Patr.* Simon 5, Levi 10, 14, 16—it is not always the Book of Enoch that is referred to in these passages. The tradition concerning Enoch's scribal activity, therefore, regarded him as an earthly scribe before he became the "Heavenly Scribe."

Then again in xv. 2 we read of Enoch being bidden to address the 'Watchers of Heaven' thus: "Ye ought to pray for men, not men for you;" Enoch counts himself

here as a 'child of man,' but obviously he is superhuman. The intercession of angels on behalf of men, referred to here, will come under our notice more than once again; for example in xl. 6 we read: "And the third voice I heard pray and intercede for those who dwell on earth and supplicate in the name of the Lord of Spirits." The voice is that of the four "presences" on the four sides of the Lord of Spirits. The four "presences" means the four angels of the presence, they are enumerated in verses 9-10 of this chapter: Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel; so that it would be Gabriel who is referred to here; but in ix. 1 the order of these varies, Gabriel coming last, Raphael third, and in place of Phanuel, Uriel is named, but as the second in order. Angels of the "presence" are mentioned in the New Testament, Matth. xviii. 10 . . *For I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven;* Rev. iv. 6. . . . *and round about the throne four living creatures full of eyes before and behind.* An interesting passage from the Old Testament, the contents of which are doubly significant, is worth recalling in this connection, Is. lxiii. 9: *In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them.* The next verse in our passage (xl. 7) is also full of significance from the present point of view, as it illustrates the converse of the idea of Mediation, namely enmity between God and men. The belief in the existence of certain beings who accuse men before God, in a certain sense necessitates a corresponding belief in advocates and mediators, for a righteous judge

obviously requires to hear both sides of a matter;* it is for this reason that xl. 7 is not without importance: "And I heard the fourth voice as it warded off the Satans and permitted them not to appear before the Lord of Spirits to accuse them who dwell on the earth." Here again we have an idea which has a long history behind it; Job i. ii. at once recurs to the mind; and the thought in Rev. xii. 10 belongs, in its origin, to much earlier times than the book of Revelation; . . . *for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accuseth them before God day and night*; it is well to bear in mind that in this passage it is Michael and his angels who war against and overcome the "accuser."

The position taken up by Michael, as Mediator, needs now to be examined a little more closely. In the first place, Michael appears sometimes as though he would like to act as Mediator between the fallen angels and the Almighty, thus in *Enoch* lxviii. 3, 4, we read: "Again Michael replied, and said to Raphael: 'Whose heart would not be mollified, and whose kidneys would not be disquieted because of the word of judgement that has gone against them, against those that they have led out?' But when he was standing before the Lord of Spirits, Michael spoke thus to Raphael: 'I will not come forward on their behalf under the eye of the Lord; for the Lord of Spirits is waxed wrath against them, because they act as though they were equal to the Lord.'" As interceding for men, Michael is probably referred to in

* It is necessary to guard against confusing the two ideas of the accusing Satan and the avenging Angel, cf. *Enoch* xcix. 16.

Enoch lxxxix. 76 : "But he who wrote the book, brought it up, showed it, and read it in the presence of the Lord of the sheep; and he made intercession for them, and besought Him for them, while declaring before him all that the shepherds had done and giving testimony against the shepherds." "He who wrote the book" is most probably Michael, this will be seen by comparing lxxxix. 61, xc. 14, 22. Again, in the *Testament of Abraham*, Abraham implores Michael to intercede for him to the Lord; in the *Apoc. of Moses* 3, God sends Michael as a comforter to Adam; the same is found in the *Life of Adam and Eve* 22, and in the preceding section of this latter book, 21, Michael is sent by God to Eve, to bless her. These passages (and they could be considerably increased) are very important as showing a fixed belief in the mediatorial function of the Archangel Michael; he, like Enoch, with whom he is not infrequently identified, is the Mediator *par excellence* in post-biblical, but pre-Christian, Judaism.

But, as we have already seen, the angels, as an order, occupy the position of interceders for men to God; this must be further illustrated. For an angel as the intermediary, though not necessarily as mediator, between God and man, the following passage from the *Greek Apocalypse of Baruch*,* is suggestive; an angel of the Lord comes to Baruch and says: "Thus saith God, the Almighty Lord, for He hath sent me into Thy presence that I might declare and show thee all things of God; thy prayer is answered

* To be differentiated from the very much larger work, *The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.*

by Him, it has entered into the ears of God, the Lord" (§ 1). But the more distinctively mediatorial function of angels is brought out, for example, in *Enoch* civ. 1: "I swear unto you, ye righteous, that the angels in heaven remember you for good in the presence of the glory of the Great One; your names are written in the presence of the glory of the Great One." Again, in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*, vii. 5, we read of angels interceding for men; in the *Test of the xii. Patr.*, Levi iii. 5.6, mention is made of "the angels of the presence of the Lord, who serve Him, and make propitiation for all the sins of the righteous to the Lord. They offer to the Lord the reasonable sweet odour of incense and unbloody sacrifice"; and in v. 7 of the same book, we read: "Hereupon I awoke and praised the Most High, and the angel * who intercedes for the race of Israel and all righteous men."

It will have been noticed that in the passages from Pseudepigraphic works which have been referred to, the Mediation of angels consists not only in the fact of their interceding to God for men, but that the intercession is conceived of as taking place in the actual presence of God; this point is of considerable importance, for it marks a distinct advance in the development of the doctrine of Mediation. There is clearly a great difference between intercessions which men on earth offer up for one another, as found in the O.T., and the prayers which angelic beings offer to God in His very presence; while

* It is probable that Michael is here meant, for he is the Guardian-angel of the Israelite nation.

in the former case the principle of Mediation is present, yet the character of man makes him but a poor instrument of Mediation, whereas the sinless nature of the angels marks them out as more appropriate pleaders on behalf of men. But it is more especially the fact that the angelic intercession is believed to be uttered in the actual divine presence which shows the advance made in the doctrine of Mediatorship; it is this fact which brings out the distinction between the principle of Mediation and the office of a Mediator, though, of course, the former is included in the latter. In the Old Testament the intercession of angels, as we have seen, is little more than adumbrated; so that we must regard the teaching contained in the Pseudepigraphic literature concerning this point as a distinct advance.

But in the *Pseudepigrapha* the specific teaching of the Old Testament is continued, and it will be well to illustrate this a little more. Thus, in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, § 20, we read: "And Eve said [*i.e.*, to Adam], 'When I saw thee my tormented soul received refreshment. And now, pray unto God, the Lord, for me, that He would answer me, and look upon me favourably, and free me from my grievous pains.' And Adam prayed to the Lord for Eve." In the next section it is described how God heard Adam's prayer, and sent angels to relieve Eve of her pain. In the same way we read of Abraham* interceding for sinners in the *Test. of Abraham*,

* That the good deeds of the fathers bring blessings to their children is in accordance with Jewish belief, just as the converse is true, that the children suffer for the sins of the fathers.

xiv. and in the *Test. of the xii. Patr.* Asher vii. 7, there are the words: "But the Lord will gather you together in faith through His tender mercy, and for the sake of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;" but in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*, liii. 1, we have a passage which combats the idea of the patriarch being an intercessor in the realms above; and this rather witnesses to the fact that, according to the popular belief, Abraham, unlike Enoch, does not continue in the presence of God the intercessions which he had offered up on behalf of sinners while on earth; Enoch is made to say: "Say not, our father stands before God and prays for us to be released from sin; for there is no man there to help any that have sinned." There recurs to the mind in connection with these words the passage, Luke xvi. 23 ff. (the parable of Dives and Lazarus) which implicitly bears out what is said in the *Enoch* passage. Again, in the *Ascension of Moses* xi. 17, we read as follows: "If the enemies shall again have acted godlessly against their Lord, they shall have no defender, who might bring their prayers before God, like Moses who was a mighty angel, who pressed his knees upon the earth at every hour by day and night, praying and gazing up to Him Who rules the whole world in mercy and righteousness . . ."; or again, in xii. 5, 6, of the same book: "All that was to happen on this earth did the Lord foresee, and behold, it comes to pass . . . He hath appointed me for them, and because of their sins, that I might pray and supplicate for them." And, once more, in the *Syriac Apoc. of Baruch*, ii. 2, God says of the prayers of Baruch and Jeremiah, that their prayers on behalf of Jerusalem are like a "strong wall";

the whole of Chap. iii. of this book illustrates the doctrine of Mediation. One other passage must be briefly considered, for it is one of great interest, viz., *Enoch* xlvii. 1-4: "In that day shall the prayer of the righteous and the blood of the righteous ascend up before the Lord of Spirits. In those days shall the holy ones, who dwell above in the heavens, intercede with one voice, they shall pray, praise, give thanks, and glorify the name of the Lord of Spirits, because of the blood of the righteous and because of the prayer of the righteous, that it may not be in vain in the sight of the Lord of Spirits, that judgement may be done unto them, and that they may not have to suffer for ever. In those days I saw how the Ancient of days sat upon the throne of His glory, and the books of the living were opened before Him, and His whole host, which is in Heaven above and around Him, stood before Him. The hearts of the holy ones were filled with joy, because the number of righteousness was near [*i.e.*, to be filled up], the prayer of the righteous answered, and the blood of the righteous avenged before the Lord of Spirits." That part of this passage which, for our present purpose, is the most important, is contained in the words: "In those days shall the holy ones, who dwell above in the heavens, intercede with one voice"; the reference here is to the angels; their prayer, which is answered, is that the blood of the righteous and the prayer of the righteous may not be in vain. The striking point here is that the belief in the intercession of angels is found in connection with a very characteristic element of Judaism, viz., the spirit of revenge; for the thought of our passage is the same as that found in

Rev. vi. 9, 10: *And . . . I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice saying, 'How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?*—that is to say, in the *Enoch* passage it is a question of angelic intercession for the execution of revenge. It is an instance of how thoroughly the idea of angelic intercession—which contains within itself the principle of Mediation—was part and parcel of Jewish belief.

It has been said above that the general principle of Mediation is witnessed to by the existence of the sacrificial system, the sacrifices being regarded as a means of reconciliation with God; it should, therefore, in conclusion be added that this Old Testament idea is present, although in a vastly subordinate degree, in the *Apocrypha* and, in a still less degree, in the *Pseudepigrapha; e.g.*, *Ecclus.* xxxii. 8 (xxxv. 8): "The offering of the righteous makes fat the altar, and his incense offering comes before the Most High"; the whole of this chapter, however, deals with the thesis that only the sacrifices of good men are acceptable to God; cf., too, vii. 31, xxxi. 21 ff., xxxviii. 11. On the other hand, the inutility of sacrifices is sometimes insisted upon, for example in *Ecclus.* vii. 8-9. "Think not to atone for sins (committed) twice in succession, because for the first thou shalt not go unpunished. Say not, 'The Lord will look down (favourably) upon the multitude of my offerings, and when I present anything before the God Most High, that He will accept it.'" Such passages witness to the

growing disbelief in the efficacy of sacrifices as a means of making peace with God, though passages like the following must not be lost sight of. "But thou, wisely thinking mortal, hold not back with hesitating mind, but turn unto God and seek to reconcile Him. Offer to God hundreds of bullocks and of firstling lambs, and of goats in the recurring seasons; yea, seek to reconcile Him, the Immortal God, that He may have mercy." *Sib. Orac.* iii. 624—628.

To sum up, now, the main teaching of these two classes of literature: we note, first of all, that it has pronounced points of attachment with the Old Testament teaching on the subject. The sacrificial system as a means of reconciliation with God is in part advocated, but belief in its efficacy *per se* is no more firmly held; this is a point of supreme importance. The intercession of human beings, of course, finds a place, but not such an important place as in the Old Testament. A great advance has taken place in the belief in the intercession of angels, which is not more than adumbrated in the Old Testament; especially does the figure of the Archangel Michael occupy a prominent position; and his not infrequent identification with Enoch is a point which suggests various thoughts. The significance of angelic intercession, as being offered by sinless beings, and as taking place in the actual divine presence, has already been referred to. But one other thing in this literature must be noted, because it is both interesting and important. We have found that in the Old Testament Mediation is, speaking generally, confined to the intercessions of some of the foremost religious leaders of the people; this is,

at all events, the main characteristic of the Old Testament teaching on the subject. In the *Apocrypha* and *Pseudepigrapha* this intercession is, for the most part, accomplished by angels. But we find another element as well, which may perhaps be described as an attempt to combine the specifically Old Testament teaching with that which is more especially characteristic of the later literature; the mediating function which had been exercised by religious leaders while on earth is conceived of as being continued in the realms above; good men, that is to say, like Enoch *, Abraham, and Moses, who have lived on earth, are believed to be interceding, as spiritual beings in the presence of God in Heaven. The important bearing which this has upon the Christian doctrine of Mediation, will be obvious; it will be sufficient here to quote the well-known words in Hebr. vii. 25: *Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.*"† The following verses in the same passage seem in a wonderful way to express the thoughts of those post-biblical Jewish thinkers who were beginning, on the one hand, to realize the incongruousness of sinful men acting as mediating agencies between God and men, and who, on the other hand, were beginning to recognise not only the inadequacy, but also the inefficacy of the sacrificial system: *For such a high-priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needed not daily, like*

* Even though Enoch is identified with Michael, he is still believed to have been at one time living on earth, and mortal.

† See also Hebr. iv. 14-16.

those high-priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people; for this he did once for all when he offered up himself. In the literature we have been considering, therefore, we are able to discern a distinct development regarding men's thoughts on the subject of Mediation; the substitute which these thinkers conceived of, namely, the angels and the spirits of the righteous, instead of sinful men and the sacrificial system, bears witness to a sublime trend of thought, indeed we should prefer to designate it as something much higher than a mere trend of thought. They had reached the highest conception concerning Mediatorship which was possible in pre-Christian times, the conception, namely, of the mediation of spiritual and sinless personalities, some of whom knew of the weaknesses and temptations of mortal men by their own experience. But to what an ineradicable conviction of the need of a Mediator does this bear witness!

THE TEACHING OF MEDIATION IN THE TARGUMS.

CHAPTER VI.

The Teaching in the Targums.

The *Targums* occupy a place of special importance in the post-biblical literature of the Jews because they embody the traditional exegesis of the Scriptures. The word *Targum* means "Translation"; but the *Targums* constitute much more than translations of the Scriptures, for the translation was intended to be at the same time an interpretation. To the Jews the reading of the Scriptures was considered insufficient if they were not understood, and they could not be understood unless explained. Besides this, as early as the time of Nehemiah* Hebrew had been displaced by Aramaic as the language of the Jews; when, therefore, the Hebrew Bible was read in public it became necessary to translate it into Aramaic. Neh. viii. 1—10 offers a good illustration of this: . . . *And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people . . . Also Jeshua, and Bani . . . and the Levites caused the people to understand the law; and the people stood in their place. And they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly;† and they gave the sense, so*

* See also Ezra iv. 7.

† The margin in the Revised Version has: "With an interpretation"; the Hebrew word means literally: "To spread out," or "expand."

that they understood the reading. When, later on, the synagogues arose, and the Scriptures were read there, the office of "translator" was instituted. The official translator who performed the duty of translating the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic was called the *Methurgeman* or *Targeman*, which is equivalent to the modern *Dragoman* ("Interpreter"). The way in which it was done was as follows: "In the case of the Pentateuch (the *Law*) one verse was read in Hebrew, and then translated into Aramaic, and so on to the end of the appointed portion; but in the case of the prophetical writings three verses were read, and then translated. Whether this system was the custom originally may be doubted; it was probably done in a less formal way at first. By degrees the translation became stereotyped, and was ultimately reduced to writing; and thus the Targums, the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Bible, came into existence."* But, as already stated, the *Targums* were not merely translations, but also interpretations of the biblical text, and the interpretation took the form of a *paraphrase* of the original; sometimes this paraphrase is of a more elaborate character than at others; in the *Targum of Onkelos to the Pentateuch*, for example, the paraphrase is much simpler than that in the *Targum to the Song of Songs*.

In giving some examples of the teaching on Mediation as contained in the *Targums*, it will be understood that they comprise only a very few out of a much larger number that could be given. The *Targums* to which

* See, further, the writer's art. "Targums" in Hastings' *One Volume Dict. of the Bible;* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.* pp. 44-50.

reference will be made, as well as the editions utilized, are the following:

The Targum of Onkelos to the Pentateuch (The Aramaic Text with Notes has been published by Berliner, 1884; Wünsche and others are issuing the Aramaic Text with a German translation, this is in process of publication, 1906.)

The Targum of pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch (An English Translation was published by Etheridge, under the title *The Targums to the Pentateuch*, 2 vols., 1862—1865).

The Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets (An English Translation of the Targum to Isaiah was published by Pauli, *The Chaldee Paraphrase on the prophet Isaiah*, 1871).

The Targum to Canticles, i.e. "*Song of Songs*" (An English Translation has been published by Gollancz, 1909.)

As will be seen, the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible—The Law, the Prophets, and the Writings—are thus each represented. In quoting from or referring to these, we shall use the following abbreviations: *Targ. Onk.; Targ. ps.-Jon.; Targ. Jon.; Targ. Cant.*

i. *Human Beings as Intermediaries between God and men.*

The doctrine of the merits of the fathers being a mediating agency between God and men will come before us later on; but it is a doctrine which finds expression in the *Targums;* thus in *Targ. Cant.* to i. 9 it is said that the Israelites "passed in the midst of the Red Sea on dry land by virtue of the merit of

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the beloved ones of the Lord." It is not only the merits of the fathers which are potent in inducing God to look favourably upon His people, but also the merits of the righteous in any age; for example, in *Targ. Cant.* to vi. 12. God is represented as saying: "I will no longer smite them, nor will I make an end of them, but I shall consider within Myself how I may deal kindly with them, to place them on high in the company of kings, for the sake of the merits of the righteous of the generation, resembling in their actions Abraham their forefather"; again, in the same *Targum* to vii. 14.: "The term of the exile has been completed; and the merit of the righteous has given forth its fragrance before Me . . . . Come, now, rise, and receive the Kingdom which I have reserved for thee," *i.e.* for the Messiah.

Among the merits of the patriarchs which are of mediating efficacy those of Abraham naturally play a leading part. Chief of these is his obedience to God in binding Isaac upon the altar; this act is technically known as *'Akēdah* (= "Binding"); we shall have occasion to refer to it again later on; it is mentioned in *Targ. Cant.* to i. 13., in the words: " . . . Whereupon Moses turned, and besought compassion from the Lord, and the Lord remembered unto them the binding of Isaac, whose father bound him on Mount Moriah upon the altar, and the Lord turned from His anger, and suffered His Divine Presence to dwell in their midst as heretofore." Here God's wrath is directly stated to have been appeased through Abraham's good deed. It may be mentioned in passing that in the *Midrash* on the *Song*

of Songs this verse, i. 13., is also explained as referring to Abraham: "Just as this myrrh is the best of every kind of herb, so Abraham was the foremost among all the righteous"; these words are repeated in iii. 6.* Again it is said in *Targ. Cant.* to ii. 17, that in punishment for their worship of the Golden Calf, God was about to destroy the children of Israel from off the earth, but He called to mind the covenant which He had established with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and "He remembered the sacrifice which Abraham offered in Isaac, his son, on Mount Moriah," cp. also iii. 6, vii. 6. Sometimes also the merits of Jacob are recorded as inclining God favourably towards the Israelites, *e.g.*, in *Targ. Cant.* to iii. 6, it is said that miracles were wrought "through the piety of Jacob"; and in the *Midrash* the "frankincense" is explained as referring to Isaac, "who was to have been presented on the altar like a handful of frankincense." Further, as one would expect, the personality of Moses occupies a prominent position as one who comes between God and men, averting the divine wrath and effecting peace; for example, in *Targ. Onk.* to Deut. v. 5, we read: "I (Moses) stood between the Word of Jehovah and you"; the substitution of the "Word *(Memra)* of Jehovah," for "Jehovah," which is what the Old Testament has, is for the purpose of avoiding an anthropomorphism; this is characteristic of Targumic exegesis.

Very striking are the words in *Targ. Cant.* to i. 5.: "... When Moses, their Teacher, went up to Heaven,

* Wünsche, *Der Midrasch Schir ha-Schirim.*

and brought about peace between them and their King"; in the same *Targum* to i. 9., it is said: "At that moment the anger of the Lord waxed against them, and he was about to drown them in the waters of the sea, in the same manner as Pharoah and his host were drowned, had it not been for Moses, the prophet, who spread forth his hands before the Lord, and removed the anger of the Lord from them;" and once more, iii. 3.: " . . . And Moses, the great Teacher of Israel, replied, and said, I will ascend unto the high Heavens, and supplicate the Lord; peradventure He will forgive your guilt, and suffer His Presence to dwell among you as heretofore."

But it is of still greater interest to observe the way in which the *Targums* speak of the Messiah as Intercessor and Redeemer; a few illustrations may be given to illustrate this. In *Targ. Jon.* to Zech. xii. 5., the Messiah is spoken of as Israel's "Redeemer"; this must not, however, be understood as redeeming from *sin*, the reference is to redemption from bondage to the nations which the Israelites will be suffering, according to Jewish teaching, immediately prior to the advent of the Messiah; nevertheless, from many other passages it is clear that the Messiah occupies a special position as intermediary between God and men, so that his title of Redeemer here connotes the idea of a unique office which he fulfils as God's regent.

One cannot dissociate the Messianic teaching of the prophetical books in the Bible from that of the *Targums*, the former underlies the latter; this fact comes out strongly when one takes into consideration the whole of the post-biblical Jewish teaching on the subject. In connexion with the belief in the "redemptive"

functions of the Messiah it is well to bear in mind the Isaianic conceptions regarding the Person of the Messiah; the four passages, ii. 2-4, iv. 2-6, ix. 5-6, xi. 1-5, will be found to be instructive in this connection. "In the first passage Jehovah Himself is the Messianic ruler; He is to be the universal Judge over all peoples. The ruler is divine, His subjects include all nations. In the second passage Jehovah is still the Messianic ruler on earth, but His presence is indicated by the *Shekhinah;* His subjects are now restricted to the purified children of Israel. A new element has entered the circle of ideas, namely, the 'Branch of Jehovah,' forming the point of attachment for the idea of the 'Shoot' or 'Twig' of Jesse. In the third passage a divine-human ruler (the Immanuel-conception of vii. 14 forming the link) sits upon the throne of David; His subjects are the children of Israel. In the fourth passage a purely human ruler, upon whom the spirit of Jehovah is manifest in a unique manner, is presented; he is a descendant of Jesse, and therefore, presumably, his subjects are restricted to the children of Israel."* This striking chain of ideas whereby the functions of the Messiah are by gradual steps transferred from God Himself to a human ruler shows that in the history of the Messianic Hope one may not dissociate the thought of God from Messianic action; so that in the redemptive functions of the Messiah, even when they refer to purely temporal affairs, one is justified in discerning mediatorial activity.

The Messiah is also spoken of as "Redeemer" in *Targ. Cant*, to iv. 5, vii. 4. Generally speaking, in the *Targums* the Messiah is conceived of as a human being, but there are exceptions, such as in *Targ. Jon.* to Zech. iv. 7, where it is said: "And He will reveal the Messiah, whose name hath been uttered from eternity, and he shall rule over all kingdoms."† But the most instructive passage concerning the Messiah as Mediator is, of course, Is. liii.; in *Targ. Jon.* to verse 4 it is said:

* See the writer's *The Evolution of the Messianic Idea*, pp. 236f., and chaps. xiv., xv., of the same book.

† Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 383.

"He will intercede concerning our sins and misdeeds, and for his sake they will be forgiven"; the forgiveness of sins for his sake is also referred to in the paraphrase on the following verse; and again on verse 6 this *Targum* says: "It was the good pleasure of Jehovah to forgive all our sins for his sake"; on verse 11 the Messiah is described as interceding for sinners; while the paraphrase on the last verse runs: "Therefore will I give him the spoil of many nations, and the wealth of mighty cities shall he distribute as booty, because he gave his life up to death; and the faithless did he subjugate unto the Law; and he intercedes for the sins of many, the faithless ones shall be forgiven for his sake." It is important to notice here how the *Targum* tones down the sublime teaching of the Old Testament, deliberately passing over the clearly expressed doctrine of vicarious suffering on the part of the Servant of the Lord; yet, in spite of this, the *Targum* gives ample expression to the belief in the mediatorial functions of the Messiah in laying continued stress on his intercession and on his being the means of the forgiveness of sins. The Messiah is here presented as Advocate and Mediator, though concerning the way in which these functions are accomplished silence is preserved.

ii. *Super-human Beings as Intermediaries between God and men.*

Under this heading we may briefly mention first the Archangel Michael, who figures so conspicuously in the Pseudepigraphic literature,* though it is not often that

* See pp. 39 ff.

he is referred to in the *Targums*. He is spoken of as an intercessor in *Targ. Cant.* to viii. 9: "Then shall Michael, Israel's chief, say, If she be ready as a wall among the nations (prepared) to give silver for the acquisition of the Unity of God's Name, then shall I and you be with their Teachers. . . . And even though she be destitute of precepts, we shall implore on her behalf mercy from heaven." This intercessory activity of the Archangel Michael accords with what we have already seen to be the teaching in the Pseudepigraphic literature, and it will come before us again in dealing with the subject in the later Rabbinical literature.

Of greater importance is the teaching concerning certain semi-divine beings of whom mention is made in the *Targums*, and the conceptions concerning whom are greatly developed in Rabbinical literature (see below). The first of these to whom attention must be drawn is *Metatron*. In *Targ. ps.-Jon.* to Gen. v. 24 *Metatron* is identified with Enoch, the Great Scribe:* "Enoch ascended into Heaven through the Word of God, and He (God) called Him Metatron, the Great Scribe." In the same *Targum* to Deut. xxxiv. 6 *Metatron* is mentioned together with the Angels Jophiel, Uriel, and Jophjophia, as those who buried Moses; they are called the princes of Wisdom.† "In the Hebrew writings, according to Ludwig Blau, *Metatron* 'fills the *rôle* of Enoch in the Apocrypha in bearing witness to the sins of mankind. Since both sources represent him as a youth, it may be assumed that the first versions of the

* See p. 38.

† Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

Hebrew mystical works, though they received their present form in the Geonic period,* originated in antiquity, so that the conception of *Metatron* must likewise date from an early period' (*Jewish Encycl.* viii., 519). It is characteristic that while *Metatron*, or Enoch, appears as the accuser of mankind in general, he occupies the *rôle* of intercessor and reconciler as far as the children of Israel are concerned."† The word *Metatron* is most probably a hebraized form of the Greek *Metathronos* or perhaps *Metatyrannos*, *i.e.*, one who occupies the next rank to ruler.‡ (See further, the chapter on the Teaching of Mediation in Rabbincal writings).

Next, we come to the *Memra*, or "Word," of God; this conception is specifically characteristic of the *Targums*, and occurs in these with great frequency; only a small selection from a very large number of passages is offered here. In the first place, the *Memra* is often represented as Israel's Intercessor before God; thus, in *Targ. Jon.* to Jer. xxix. 14, the *Memra* is spoken of as the Intercessor who pleads to God on behalf of Israel. Again, frequently in the *Targ. Onk.* the *Memra* appears as the Helper of the righteous in Israel, *e.g.*, to Gen. xxi. 22: "The *Memra* of Jehovah is thy help (lit. support) in all that thou doest"; these words are

* i.e., 589-1040 A.D.; the *Geonim*, "Princes" (of the Captivity), were the acknowledged heads of the academies, or schools, of Sura and Pumbeditha, in Babylonia. They were the official heads of Judaism in things judicial as well as spiritual.

† Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp., 175f.

‡ Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

spoken to Abraham ; to Exod. iii. 12, it is said to Moses : "Yea, my *Memra* shall support thee ;" to Num. xiv. 9 : "The *Memra* of Jehovah will support us, be ye not afraid of them" ; to Deut. ii. 7 : "These forty years the *Memra* of Jehovah was supporting thee, thou didst not lack for anything." In this *Targum* the words, "The *Memra* of Jehovah will support thee" (מימרא דיי בסעדך) is a standing phrase. Then, again, in this *Targum* it is the *Memra* who is the deliverer of the children of Israel out of Egypt, *e.g.*, to Exod. iii. 12, iv. 12, 15.

In the second place, stress is often laid upon the redemptive function of the *Memra* ; thus, in *Targ. ps.-Jon.* to Num. xxi. 9 f. the *Memra* is spoken of as Israel's "Redeemer" ; he is also called the "Redeemer" in *Targ. Jon.* to Is. xlv. 17., Jer. iii. 23 ; and in the same *Targum* to Is. lvi. 13. it is said : "My *Memra* shall be unto you for a redeeming deity" ; and to Zech. xii. 5. : "In the *Memra* redemption will be found."

Lastly, the *Memra* is represented as a Mediator between God and men ; according to *Targ. ps.-Jon.* to Lev. xxvi. 9. for example it is said the *Memra* is the means whereby God turns again to His people ; in the same *Targum* to Deut. iv. 7. it is said that "the *Memra* brings Israel nigh unto God, and sits on His throne* receiving the prayers of Israel"† ; in *Targ. Jon.* to ii Kings xiii. 23. we read : "Jehovah looked upon His people in mercy because of His *Memra*" ; and in the same *Targum* to Is. xlv. 25. the justification of the seed of Israel is said to be due to

* Cp. the name "Metatron," see p. 59 above.

† *Jewish Encycl.*, viii., 465a.

the *Memra*. "As in ruling over the destiny of man the *Memra* is the agent of God (*Targ. ps.-Jon.* to Num. xxvii. 16.), so also is it in the creation of the earth (Is. xlv. 12.) and in the execution of justice (*Targ. ps.-Jon.* to Num. xxxiii. 4.)"*

Two other super-human Beings are often mentioned in the *Targum*, namely the *Shekhinah*, and the *Holy Spirit*; but with these we shall not be at present concerned, for they are not represented as mediating agencies in the same sense as *Metatron* and the *Memra*; we shall refer to them when dealing with the doctrine of Mediation in Rabbinical literature.

---

* *Ibid.*

THE TEACHING ON MEDIATION IN RABBINICAL LITERATURE.

CHAPTER VII.

Summary of the preceding Chapters.

We have, so far, examined the subject of Mediation in the Old Testament, in the *Apocrypha*, in the *Pseudepigrapha*, and in the *Targums*. It is at this point that the parting of the ways comes as regards the Jewish and the Christian doctrine on the subject; and therefore, before we proceed to examine the teaching of the later Jewish literature, it will be well to make a brief summary of the leading points hitherto noticed.

Firstly, we saw that at the root of the doctrine of Mediation lay two conceptions, namely, the Idea of God and the Sense of Sin; according as to whether the conception of God is exalted, according as to whether the sense of sin is deep, so will the intensity of the need of a Mediator between God and man assert itself; and in accordance with man's realization of the nature of God's Personality on the one hand, and his recognition of his own sinfulness on the other, so will be the ideas which he formulates concerning the person and work of a Mediator.

Secondly, it was shown that, speaking generally, while in the Old Testament the *principle* of Mediation was observable throughout, the presentation of the idea of Mediatorship was only rarely adumbrated; and this was precisely what was to be expected, since although the doctrine of God in the Old Testament is, taking it as a whole, a very exalted one, more especially in the prophetic literature, nevertheless the sense of sinfulness in man is only inadequately apprehended.

Thirdly, illustrations of the general principle of Mediation were given, namely, the priesthood, the sacrificial system, the prophetical office, and the kingship in so far as the king was entitled to perform priestly functions. But it was pointed out that in each of these cases the idea of *Mediatorship* fails from the fact that each office only represents one side of mediatorial action; for the essence of the idea of a Mediator between God and man is that he should represent two sides, the human before God, and the divine among men; but while, in a certain sense, the priest is the representative of men before God, and the prophet comes among men as God's representative, neither combines in himself the two offices; and, therefore, strictly speaking, it is only the *principle* of Mediation which is presented in the persons of priest and prophet. But, on the other hand, it was further pointed out that in such persons as Abraham and Moses, who occupy a special position in the sight both of God and of men, the office of mediator is, at any rate, adumbrated.

Fourthly, another important point upon which emphasis was laid was that in Mediation two elements were required; viz., intercession, and the presenting of some-

thing; examples were cited to prove this; and in connexion with this part of the subject certain technical terms were examined, the most important of which were (1) the various forms from the root כפר "to cover," underlying each were the ideas of the existence of sin which separates from God, the yearning to be reconciled to God, and the means whereby such reconciliation can be brought about; (2) the *chăṭṭ'āth*, or "reconciliation-offering"; (3) the *'āshām*, or "compensation-offering."

Fifthly, some passages were given which were directly contrary to the idea of a mediator between God and man.

In the next place the teaching of the *Apocrypha* was examined, and the conclusion reached was that for the most part the idea of Mediation was absent; speaking generally, there is but little hope for sinners; when there is a question of forgiveness for these, the divine mercy is accorded without the need of any Mediator. One very striking point, however, is that when a Mediator is mentioned, though it be but rarely, he appears as a superhuman being. So that as far as the character of the Mediator is concerned the teaching of the *Apocrypha* is an advance upon that of the Old Testament; but, taken as a whole, the doctrine of Mediation in the *Apocrypha* shows a retrograde movement,—more, however, by its silence on the subject than by actually antagonistic teaching; though one book, ii. (iv.) Esdras, contains much that is directly antagonistic to all idea of Mediation.

Next, it was seen that the teaching of the *Pseudepigrapha* presented some new and important elements; thus the sacrificial system as a means of

reconciliation with God is in part advocated, but belief in its efficacy *per se* is no more firmly held; this was a point of great importance. The intercessions of human beings finds a place, but not such an important place as in the Old Testament. On the other hand, it was found that a great advance had taken place here in the belief concerning the intercession of angels, which was not much more than adumbrated in the Old Testament; it was shown that the figure of the Archangel Michael occupied a prominent position, and that not infrequently he was identified with Enoch. Another element was found which seemed to be an attempt to combine the specifically Old Testament teaching with that which was more specifically characteristic of the post-biblical writings, namely that the mediating function which had been exercised by religious leaders while on earth was conceived of as being continued in the realms above; Enoch, Abraham, and Moses who had lived on earth, were believed to be interceding, as spiritual beings, in the presence of God in heaven. In the *Pseudepigrapha*, therefore, it was pointed out that a distinct development regarding men's thoughts on the subject of Mediation was to be discerned; the substitute which the authors of these writings conceived of, namely, the angels and the spirits of the righteous, instead of sinful men and the sacrificial system, reflected almost the highest conception concerning Mediatorship which was possible in pre-Christian times, the conception, namely, of the mediation of spiritual and sinless personalities.

Lastly, in the *Targums* we have both a continuation and a development of the teaching in the *Pseudepigrapha;*

the mediating function of such men as Abraham and Moses is frequently emphasized ; but a great development has taken place, for now for the first time super-human, *semi-divine* beings, *Metatron* and the *Memra*, appear as Mediators between God and men.

We are now in a position to examine the teaching of the later Jewish teaching, or, as it may be expressed, of Rabbinical Judaism.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Torah as a Mediating Agency.

It would obviously be quite impossible to attempt to deal in any way exhaustively with the idea of Mediation as presented in Rabbinical writings; this would require specialized study and a much wider acquaintance with the literature in question than we are able to boast of; all that can be at present attempted is to give a few indications of the fact that the principle of Mediation is not so alien to the spirit of Judaism as one might at first be led to suppose.

Our first step will be to try and show that much of the ethical teaching of Judaism *involves* a belief in the principle of Mediation. It should be stated that we are at present referring to the principle of Mediation in a wide sense of the term; anything, that is to say, which comes in between God and man, and brings about reconciliation, thus tending to be effective in establishing good relations between the Creator and His creatures, partakes of the nature of a mediating influence; but for this purpose that which exercises the mediating influence must be regarded as being *itself* effective in producing the result desired; and, as will be seen, this is the case with those things now to be considered.

We may begin with what is the foundation of all Jewish ethical teaching, namely the *Law*, or *Torah*, the observance of which is *per se* effective in establishing and maintaining a right relationship between God and man. The *Torah* is the means of attaining eternal life; thus, for example, in *Shabbath* 88b it says: "Wherefore are the words of the *Torah** (Prov. viii. 15. 16) compared to a prince? In order that thou mayest know that just as a prince has the power of killing and giving life, so are the words of *Torah* mighty to slay or to make alive. This is what Rabaṯ said: 'The *Torah* is a means of salvation for those who rely upon her; but for those who turn away from her she is a means of death.'"‡ Again, in *Pirke Aboth* ii. 8 we read: "He who has gotten to himself words of *Torah* has gotten to himself the life of the world to come."§ In the same work, vi. 1, it says: "It (*i.e.* the *Torah*) clothes him with meekness and fear, and fits him to become righteous, pious, upright and faithful; and removes him from sin, and brings him towards the side of merit;" and in vi. 7: "Great is *Torah* which gives life to those who practise it in this world and in the world to come." Further, it is said in *Chagigah* 12b that a cord of grace is drawn in

* Strictly speaking the *Torah* includes the Pentateuch only; but the extended use is not infrequently found.

† *I.e.*, Ben Joseph Ben Chama a Babylonian *amora* of the fourth generation; he lived from about 280-352 A.D. An "*amora*" (Interpreter) was the technical name given to the Commentators of the text of the *Mishnah*, see Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 61 ff.

‡ Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

§ Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 32.

the future world by God around those who study the *Torah*; and in *Bereshith Rabba* xxiii. 4 occur the words: "The righteous [these are, of course, those who pre-eminently study the *Torah*] have the power to change the attribute of justice to the attribute of mercy." As in the *Torah* all is contained that is required both in this world and in the world to come, he that faithfully studies it and observes its precepts is doing all that he has the power of doing—and it is sufficient—to ensure for himself eternal life; therefore, one is not surprised to read in *Sifre* 40a, for example, that it is the *Torah* which leads men to eternal life in the next world; in other words, the *Torah* is the medium, and its study is the condition, of immortality.* The idea of imputing personality to the *Torah* which seems to underlie this passage, receives actual expression in *Shemoth Rabba*, c. 29, where it says that the *Torah* stands before the Holy One and intercedes for Israel.†

---

* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 141 ff.

† Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

CHAPTER IX.

Almsgiving as a Mediating Agency.

Another means whereby a right relationship between God and man is effected is the giving of *Alms.* This may be illustrated by a few quotations. In *Baba Bathra* 10a a saying of Rabbi Akiba's* is preserved to the effect that benevolence—of which almsgiving is, of course, the visible expression—saves from the torments of hell,† (*Cf. Gittin* 7a). In the same tractate, *Baba Bathra* 9a, it is said that just as formerly reconciliation was made by means of the shekel, so now reconciliation is made by means of almsgiving.‡ The verse Prov. xi. 4 *(Riches profit not in the day of wrath; but righteousness delivereth from death)* was expounded thus: "Water will quench blazing fire; so that almsgiving makes atonement for sins."§ A most striking sentence is that contained in *Baba Bathra* 10a: "Almsgiving is a powerful mediator between the Israelites and their Father in heaven; it brings the time of redemption nigh."‖ This tractate is full of further teaching to the same effect; one more example may be given, namely, the following words of Monobazus, King of Adiabene:

* A *Tanna* (*i.e.*, "Teacher") who was born in the middle of the first century, A.D., and suffered martyrdom about the year 132.

†Bacher, *Aggada der Tannaiten*, i. 295.

‡ Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 333.

§ Quoted in the *Jewish Encycl.* I. 435b.

‖ *Ibid.*

" My fathers gathered treasures here below ; but I lay up treasures above. My fathers gathered (treasures) in a place where the hand can reach them ; but I have gathered them in a place where no hand can reach them. My fathers gathered that which bears no fruit ; but I have gathered that which bears fruit. My fathers gathered the treasures of mammon ; but I have gathered treasures which are souls. My fathers gathered for others ; but I have gathered for myself. My fathers gathered for this world ; but I have gathered for the world to come." *(Baba Bathra*, Ia).*

---

* Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch* II. 2. 134. *Cf.* Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums*, p. 120.

CHAPTER X.

Repentance as a Mediating Agency.

Further, repentance is potent in re-establishing a right relationship between God and man; it is directly spoken of as the "Interceder" on behalf of men with God (*Shabbath* 31b). In *Yoma* 86b it is said: "It (*i.e.* Repentance) brings redemption, and is the cause of God's regarding sins as though they had been unconsciously committed, and even of His regarding them as good works and meritorious. It prolongs the days and years of men." In the same tractate we read: "Great is the power of repentance; for it reaches up to the throne of God; it brings healing (Hos. xiv. 4); it turns sins resulting from ill-will into mere errors, nay, into incentives to meritorious conduct" (*Yoma* 86ab). Again, in *Shabbath* 32a we read: "Repentance and works of charity are man's intercessors before the House of God"* And, once more: "He who sincerely repents is doing as much as he who builds temple and altar, and brings all sacrifices" (*Sanhedrin* 43b).† According to *Pesikta* 156b, on the ten days which follow *Rôsh Hashshana* (*i.e.*, "New Year's Day") the divine *Shekhinah* rests on Israel; the act of repentance done during these

* *Jewish Encycl.* X. 377a.
† *Op. cit.* II. 279 b.

days is especially acceptable to God; therefore, according to *Rôsh Hashshana* 17b, whosoever shows repentance during this period receives forgiveness of sins, but whosoever does not repent then will not be forgiven even though he should bring as offerings all the rams of Nebaioth (see Is. lx. 7) that are in the world.

CHAPTER XI.

Other Mediating Agencies.

One other thing must be mentioned, and that is that individual *suffering* is a means of Atonement, and, therefore, of reconciliation with God. This is a matter of considerable importance and claims particular attention. It is not only that bodily sufferings are recognized as punishment for sin, but that they are in themselves the means of obliterating sin. From this point of view one may say that the committing of sin is like the incurring of a debt; when the money is paid the debt no longer exists, the matter is settled; so sin is looked upon as involving a debt which is owing to God; this debt can be paid in the form of bodily suffering; the payment having been made in this form is recognized as valid, and the divine Creditor is believed to be fully satisfied. Here it is, therefore, important to note that the bodily suffering is the means of establishing right relations between God and man; it is that which comes between God and man, and it thus involves the principle of Mediation. This can be illustrated by a few quotations. In *Sifre* 73b it is said that a man should rejoice more in chastisements than in prosperity, because if he enjoyed good fortune all the days of his life, the sins of which he is guilty would not be forgiven him. How, it is asked, can he attain forgiveness? He is forgiven by means of chastisements. The matter is

put very baldly in *Pesikta* 161b, where it is said that God causes the righteous to pay Him what they owe Him on account of the evil deeds which they have done.* In *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 65, we are told that Isaac prayed that he might be granted sufferings in order to turn away from him the judgement in the world to come. Again, "Suffering is more apt than sacrifice to win God's favour and to atone for man" *(Bereshith Rabba* 5a*)*.† If suffering thus makes atonement for sin much more will this be the case with death. Therefore it is taught that for all those who seek to attain to righteousness death in itself effects reconciliation. "Let my death make atonement for all my sins," men say when they are dying or in great peril.‡ "All who die are reconciled through death," is a saying quoted in *Sifre* 33a. And the more dreadful the death the more efficacious is its reconciling power; therefore martyrdom is a supreme means of reconciliation. That martyrs should be believed to have places of special honour in heaven stands to reason *(Baba Bathra* 10b*)*.

Besides the things that have been referred to, Prayer, Fasting, and Self-Mortification are also means of reconciliation with God; it will not be necessary to go into any further details regarding these. The point to be emphasized is that all these things are understood to be means whereby God is induced to look favourably upon men. The significance of this, in the present connexion, however, lies in the fact that the *Torah*

* Weber, *Op. cit.* p. 322.

† *Jewish Encycl.* II. 279 b.

‡ *Ibid.*

Almsgiving, etc., are *per se* mediating elements between God and man. It is, of course, natural and obvious that this should be so ; but this involves the *principle* of Mediation, the truth, namely, that something is needed to come in between God and man in order that normal relations may be established and maintained between them. They bear witness to the fact that sin estranges from God, and that man's desire is to stand right with God, and that something must act as a link between God and man—a link, or a means, of drawing them together again. In a word, to repeat what has already been said, they involve a belief in the principle of Mediation.

This, therefore, corresponds with what we have seen to lie at the root of the doctrine of Mediation in the Old Testament, namely, the Idea of God and the Sense of Sin.

CHAPTER XII.

The Idea of Mediatorship.

We must now go a step farther and turn from the *principle of Mediation* to the idea of a *Mediator*; this figures more frequently than might be supposed in Rabbinical literature, though we shall naturally not expect to find it occupying a very prominent position there, nor that there is unanimity of teaching among the various authorities cited.

It will be best if we deal with this part of our subject under three headings; though the subject-matter of each runs into the other, yet it will be seen that for clearness' sake it is better to divide it in this way.

We will, therefore, first draw attention to some general considerations which suggest the idea of Mediatorship. There is a beautiful thought which frequently finds expression in Rabbinical writings to the effect that Israel, as a whole, is one self-contained organism, all the component parts of which are dependent upon each other in spiritual things, and that which is lacking in righteousness to one is supplied by others who are more righteous.* Naturally those who were, above all, regarded as the more righteous were the patriarchs of old, whose good deeds were so great and so many in number that some of them could be imputed to men of later generations, whose lives were not so rich in well-doing. There

* *Cf.* i. Cor. xii. 26.

is a comment on the words of *Song of Songs* i. 5, *I am black, but comely*, which, judging from its frequent occurrence, evidently enjoyed much favour; these words are explained thus: "The congregation of Israel says, "I am black through my own deeds, but comely through the work of my fathers." Although sometimes individuals may lay claim to the benefit of this heritage of good works, it is as a rule for the Israelite body as a whole that they are a means of atonement and reconciliation.* There is an instructive passage in *Shemoth Rabba*, c. 44, which well illustrates this belief in the atoning efficacy of the good works of the fathers; it is as follows: "How many prayers did Elijah offer up on Mount Carmel that fire might fall from Heaven, and yet he was not answered! But when he uttered the names of the dead, and called Jehovah the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, then he was immediately answered. So it was, too, with Moses. When the Israelites had committed that evil deed, Moses stood up and pleaded for their justification forty days and forty nights; and he was not answered. But when he made mention of the dead, his prayer was answered at once; for it is said: 'Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,' as it is written (Exod. xxxii. 14), *God repented Him of the evil.* Wherefore, just as this living vine rests upon the dead stem, so does Israel live, relying on the fathers who are dead." †

* *Cf.* Bousset, *Op. cit.*, p. 182.
† Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 293.

CHAPTER XIII.

Intercession and Vicarious Suffering.

But the idea of a Mediator is more pointedly illustrated by passages which describe the actual intercession of the righteous on behalf of others, as well as their sufferings on behalf of others. That the death of the righteous atones for the sins of the people is stated several times; thus in *Pesikta* 174b, the passage in II. Sam. xxi. 14, where it is said that after the burial of Saul and Jonathan God was entreated for the land, is interpreted in the sense that the death of these was in itself an act of intercession on behalf of the people; and not only so, but the death and suffering of the righteous is believed to be an actual atonement for the sins of the people, thus bringing about reconciliation; this is said, for example, of Ezekiel and Job in *Sanhedrin* 39a;* and in *Pesikta* 174b, it is further stated that the death of the righteous has the same atoning power as the Day of Atonement. The righteous have the power, according to *Sanhedrin* 103a, *Wajjikra Rabba*, c. 2, of warding off from the people the wrath of God. Rabbi Ishmael, who lived at the beginning of the second century A.D., prayed: "May I be for its atonement" (*i.e.*, for that of the house of Israel.) †If it should happen that there were no righteous to die for others then the death of children has the same atoning power; thus in *Shabbath* 33ab, it is

* *Jewish Encycl.* II. 279 a.

† Bacher, *Op. cit.* I. p. 264.

said that at a time when there are righteous men God suffers them to die for others; but at a time when there are no righteous men then God suffers school-children to die for others: for these, in whom the *Jeçer hara'* (*i.e.*, the "evil tendency") is not yet powerful, are not yet worthy of death for their own sins*—their death can, therefore, be utilized for others. It is important to observe that this vicarious suffering by children is efficacious because of their innocence.†

A few examples may now be given of the atoning work of the patriarchs; in *Pesikta* 154a it is said of Abraham: "All the follies and lies of which Israel is guilty in this world, our father Abraham is able to atone for." ‡ All that is good, and all blessings, come because of Abraham; it is by means of his merit that the world is preserved; so it is said in *Bereshith Rabba* c. 39. In the same place it says, further, that by means of Abraham's intercession the childless were blessed with offspring, and the sick recovered. Moses is spoken of as the wise man who makes atonement, and pacifies the wrath of God by his prayers (Ex. R. xliii.)§; everything was granted to him, because of his merit (*Berakhoth* 10b). In *Shabbath* 89 b Rabbi Yochanan speaks of Abraham as an advocate pleading for Israel. All the people who stood at the foot of Mount Sinai were protected by the merit of Moses alone (*Shir Rabba* to iv. 4). ‖ Philo (*De*

* Weber, *Op. cit.* p. 329.
† See Wünsche, *Op. cit.* I. p. 132, and *Cf.* iv. Ezra viii. 26 ff.
‡ Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 327.
§ *Jewish Encycl.* II. 280 a.
‖ Weber, *Op. cit.* p. 298.

Vita Moysis iii. 19) expresses a view which was certainly endorsed in later days when he says that Moses is "the mediator and reconciler of the world." Once more, in *Pesikta* 115b it is said that Jerusalem was preserved owing to the presence there of Jeremiah: "As long as Jeremiah was in Jerusalem it was not attacked; but as soon as he went out it came to ruin." Finally, an interesting passage is the following from *Tanchuma*, *Shophetim* 4*: ". . . For in his days (*i.e.*, in the days of Gideon) the Israelites suffered oppression, and the Holy One sought a man who would bring their defence before God. And he found no one, for that generation was lacking in *Torah*-works and works of charity. When, then, justification was found through Gideon, who pleaded for them, immediately the Angel revealed himself to him, for it is written: 'And the Angel of the Lord came to him and said to him, *Go in this thy strength*, that is, in the strength of thy merit, which thou hast made effective for my children."

A belief which is not without importance in connexion with our present enquiry, and which has reference to the departed, must be briefly touched upon before we proceed. The atoning and redeeming power which is effective through the works of righteous men is not restricted in its results to the fellow-creatures on this earth, but also benefits those who are dead. The following passage from *Tanchuma Haasinu* 1† is very instructive regarding this matter; "The living redeem the dead; therefore, we are wont, on the Day of Atonement, to

* Quoted by Weber, *Op. cit.* pp. 298 ff.

† Weber, *Op. cit.* p. 329.

make mention of the dead, and to give alms on their behalf * (*i.e.*, in order that the reconciliation inherent in the observation of this Day may benefit them too); for thus we have learned in the *Torah Kohanim* ("Law of the Priests"). It might, perhaps, be thought that after death alms can no more benefit them: therefore it is said in Deut. xxi. 8: *Whom Thou hast redeemed*, from which it follows, that when one gives alms on their behalf (*i.e.*, on behalf of the departed), they are led out (from Gehinnom) and led up (into the garden of Eden), just as one sends forth an arrow from the bow. . . ." The exegesis may be somewhat at fault here, but it expresses the belief that righteous acts on this earth have an atoning value for men in the next world.

But if righteous men on earth have thus the power, through their good works, to act as mediators between God and their fellow-creatures, we shall not be surprised to find that angels, who are constantly in the Divine presence, are also conceived of as exercising a similar function. In the vast system of Angelology which has been evolved by the Rabbis the most numerous class of angels consists of those who carry out God's governance and providence in the world; while God Himself dwells in unapproachable majesty in the world beyond, His angels act as His intermediaries on this earth. Every man has his angel,† sometimes more than one, who is God's messenger, and looks after the person assigned to his care. Angels, who are thus intimately acquainted

* *Cf.*, vicarious action of the same kind with regard to baptism, mentioned in i. Cor. xv. 29.

† *Cf.* Acts xii. 15.

Angel Mediators

with and interested in men, may be therefore regarded as very natural beings to intercede for men and mediate between God and men. They are said, for example, to be the instruments of God in bringing help to men for which he has been asked; while in *Sanhedrin* 38b it is said: "The Holy One does nothing concerning which He does not take counsel with the angels."† This is a saying of Rabbi Jochanan.* Again, when Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac it was owing to the intercession of angels that the act was averted.‡ When Moses was exposed on the river, angels pleaded for him that he should not be allowed to perish (*Sotah* 12b).§ The mediating function of angels between God and man is very beautifully expressed in Ex. R. xxi., according to which an angel, set over the prayers of men, weaves them into crowns for the Most High.‖ Every nation has its own guardian angel who pleads the cause of the nation under his protection before God (*Targ. ps.-Jon.* to Gen. xi. 7, 8). Israel's interceding angels make it their duty to seek out the nation's special merits and plead them in the presence of God (*Sukkah* 29a). An interesting passage from Philo *(On One who is Heir)*¶ runs: "The Father, the Creator of the universe, gave to the archangel and most ancient *Logos (i.e.* the *Word)* the privilege of standing on the confines, separating the creature from

* Wünsche, *Op. cit.* III. 3.

† He lived during the third century, and died in 279 A.D. at Tiberias.

‡ Bacher, *Agada der palästinischen Amoräer* III. 29 (1899).

§ *Jewish Encycl.* I. 587 a.

‖ *Ibid*, 593 a.

¶ *Ibid*, 596 a.

the Creator, and of interceding between the immortal God and the mortal, as ambassador sent by the ruler to the subject. Rejoicing in this position, he says: *I stood between the Lord and you* (Deut. v. 5), being neither uncreated nor created, but between the two, pledge and security to the Creator and to the creature, a hope that the merciful God would not despise His work." This is written in reference to the archangel Michael, who occupies a very special position among the angels; we have already seen how he is described as fulfilling the function of mediator in the pseudepigraphic literature, but one or two references in Rabbinical writings may be added here. Most significant is the fact that, according to *Chagigah* 12b, Michael is the heavenly high-priest, whose altar, upon which he offers up sacrifice, stands in the fourth heaven.* In *Jalkut Shimeoni Bereshith* 132†, Michael is described as the prince over all the angels, for he is the guardian-angel of the Israelite nation; he acts as Israel's representative and patron in the presence of God, and he intercedes there on behalf of his people. Perhaps the most striking title given to Michael is that of "Advocate of the Jews" (*Chagigah* 12b).‡

---

* Wünsche, *Op. cit.*, I. 271.

† Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 170.

‡ Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.* p. 176.

CHAPTER XIV.

Semi-divine Beings as Mediators.

We have so far seen that both the principle of Mediation, as well as the idea of a Mediator, are expressly formulated in the Rabbinical literature; men and angels, chief among the latter being the archangel Michael, fulfil this function. We have, however, yet to deal with another element, in connexion with our subject, which plays a great part in the literature we are considering, namely, the intermediate beings, other than angels, between God and man, one of whose main functions is that of acting as intercessors for men in the presence of God. We shall not go into much detail here,* as this would take us somewhat off our present subject; it will be sufficient if we give a few references to illustrate the mediatorial functions which these semi-divine beings are described as filling. It should, however, be made clear that the Rabbinical teaching concerning these intermediate beings between God and man are the expression of individual opinions; they must obviously not always be taken in their literal sense; nevertheless, since they *are* the expression of the opinions of those who were the religious leaders and teachers of the people, and since, moreover, they are not isolated, but are frequently met with, and are incorporated in the official *Thesaurus* of Jewish belief, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the teaching conveyed must have been widely

* The subject is treated in some detail in Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.* pp. 169-195.

accepted in orthodox circles during the Rabbinical period. In referring to the subject Mr. Montefiore says: "It is safe to assert that in the ordinary stream of Judaism these 'agencies' never possessed any special importance at all";* but it must at least be allowed that, apart altogether from the details concerning the activity of the various 'agencies,' one of the underlying causes owing to which the whole circle of conceptions with regard to them came into being was an instinctive sense of the need of somebody coming between God and man, and, moreover, somebody who was greater than man in order that he might presume to enter the presence of God and intercede for men, but yet somebody who was of necessity less than God, otherwise the thought would have been blasphemy. It is this underlying cause which is of real importance, and the few details to be given now are only of interest, in the present connexion, as being the articulation, often halting it is true, of this underlying cause.

(a) The first of these intermediate agencies to whom attention is drawn is METATRON.† His most important function, and the only one which concerns us here, is that in which he appears as mediator; as one who is described as constantly in the presence of God, *Metatron* occupies an appropriate position as Israel's intercessor; Moses himself is said to have besought *Metatron* to intercede for him with God in order that his life might be prolonged. He is called the "Great Scribe," because he writes down in the presence of God the merits of the children of Israel, and is thus fitly

* *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, January, 1908, p. 349.

† See pp. 58 ff.

described as the advocate who pleads on behalf of his clients before the Judge.* In *Bedmidbar Rabbâ*, c. 12, the term Mediator is directly applied to him, and, what is still more significant, he is represented as the reconciler between God and the Chosen People. *Metatron* is sometimes identified with Michael and at others with Enoch.

(b) Secondly, the MEMRA,† or "Word," of God. The Targums have a very large number of references to the *Memra's* activity; in the present connection the following examples are instructive. In *Targ. Onk.* to Lev. xxvi. 9, the biblical words are interpreted as meaning that God had respect unto the people because of the *Memra*; so, too, in the *Targ.-Jon.* to Is. xlv. 25 the justification of the seed of Israel is said to be due to the *Memra*. In *Targ.-Jon.* to Is. lvi. 13 it says, "My Memra shall be unto you for a redeeming deity." ‡ A brief reference to the teaching of the great Jewish philosopher Philo § on this subject will be appropriate here. There are two points in his teaching regarding the *Logos* or *Rêma* (=*Memra*), which are especially important because it stands midway between the Jewish and Christian doctrines of Mediation. The first is that the *Logos* occupies the position of intermediary between God and His created world; he is the interceder for mortals to the Immortal, and he comes as the messenger of God to proclaim God's will; while he is called the first-born of God, who was from the beginning, he is yet "after the likeness of man"; as man's

* *Cf.*, the similar title given to the archangel Michael.

† See pp. 59 ff.

‡ For further examples see Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 180-184.

§ He lived at the beginning of the Christian Era.

advocate and interceder with God he is spoken of as the "High-priest." The second is that his main work is the liberation of man from evil; he himself is free from sin both conscious and unconscious, and he is said to live in the hearts of men to keep them from sin and destruction; if he lives not in the heart of man, guilt gains the upper hand. Like the *Memra* of the Targums the *Logos* of Philo regards the Jewish nation as his special care.* The fact that the *Memra* so rarely figures in the later, Talmudic, literature is a striking one; perhaps we are not wrong in ascribing this to the Christian doctrine of the *Logos*, which began to play an important part towards the end of the first century A.D.

(c) Thirdly, the *Ruach ha-Qôdesh* (= the "Holy Spirit"), often identified with Wisdom.† It is true that the function of mediating between God and man is rarely mentioned in connection with the Holy Spirit; here and there, however, there are passages which offer suggestions to this effect; so, for example, in *Wajjikra Rabba* c. 6 the *Ruach ha-Qôdesh* is described as the defender of Israel, who enumerates in the presence of God the merits of the Israelites;‡ this clearly implies something of the nature of a Mediator. The same thing is said in *Debarim Rabba* c. 3.§ But the function of Mediator, which the *Ruach ha-Qôdesh* fulfils, is seen rather in that he comes as a messenger from God to men; it is,

* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 181 f.

† *Cf.*, the Septuagint rendering of Exod. xxxi. 3, which speaks of the "divine spirit of wisdom."

‡ Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 191

§ *Ibid.*

that is to say, only one aspect of the mediatorial office that he exercises. Thus he comes in order to manifest God's will among men, thereby enabling them to know and to fulfil the purposes of God, and therefore to appear righteous in the sight of God;* and, according to *Tanchuma Wajechi* 14, all the good that is accomplished by righteous men is owing to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.†

(d) Lastly, the *Shekhinah*,‡ or "Glory of God." In some respects the *Shekhinah* is equivalent to the *Memra*, in others to the Holy Spirit. Thus, according to *Sanhedrin* 7a, it inspires correct judgement in upright judges; a saying of Gamaliel's, preserved in *Sanhedrin* 39a, runs: "As the sun, which is but one of the countless servants of God, giveth light to all the world, so in a much greater degree does the *Shekhinah*"; § the Holy Spirit was believed to appear in the shape of a dove, the wings of which were the *Shekhinah*. Maimonides explains the *Shekhinah* as "light created to be intermediary between God and the world."‖

It will thus be seen that little stress can be laid on the functions of the Holy Spirit and of the *Shekhinah* with regard to the subject of Mediation, while those of *Metatron* and the *Memra* are important in the present connexion.

This agrees with the teaching of the *Targums*.¶

* See, *e.g.*, *Bemidbar rabba*, c. 17.

† Weber, *Ibid.*

‡ Literally "dwelling," *i.e.*, the sign of God's indwelling.

§ *Jewish Encycl.* XI. 260 b.

‖ Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, p. 129.

¶ See pp. 50 ff.

CHAPTER XV.

The Messiah as Mediator.

A few words must be added regarding the question as to in what respects the *Messiah* fulfils the office of Mediator. It is very necessary to bear in mind that the purely human character which the Jews impute to the Messiah precludes any conception of Mediator in the full Christian sense being applied to him. Although in the pseudepigraphic literature the Messiah is mostly represented as super-human, and his kingdom as being not of this world, in Rabbinical writings we find that this has to a large extent changed, and here the conception of an earthly and purely human Messiah is that which prevails, while the kingdom which he will found is temporal. Yet this is not always so; for example, when in *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 85, the Messiah is called *Go'el 'acharon* ("the latter redeemer," to distinguish him from Moses, "the former redeemer"), the term probably connotes something more than the release of the Israelites from their temporal foes, though it is this main idea of redemption which usually occurs. In the *Targum of Jonathan* to the Prophets the comment on Is. liii. 4, which speaks of the vicarious suffering of the Messiah, runs: "He will intercede for our sins and evil deeds, and for his sake they will be forgiven"; and, in reference to verse 5, it goes on to say that the Messiah will rebuild the sanctuary which had been desecrated on account of

Israel's sins, and that through his te[illegible]me of the elements multiplied, and sins will be forgive[illegible]directly or inverse 6 is explained as meaning that it was however, good pleasure to forgive Israel all his sins brief Messiah's sake. The mention of the forgivene[illegible]re sins for the Messiah's sake occurs more than once in the comments on the later verses. But in the Talmud it is only, comparatively speaking, rarely that the work of the Messiah can be described as mediatorial; once or twice, it is true, in *Bereshith Rabba* it is said that when the 'age to come' begins God will redeem Israel out of Gehinnom through the Messiah, the son of David, *e.g.*: "But when they who were bound in Gehinnom saw the light of the Messiah they rejoiced in receiving him, and said: 'This is he who will lead us out of this darkness.'"* It is also an interesting point that the resurrection of the dead seems to be brought about through the intermediary of the Messiah, for in *Sanhedrin* 113a it says that God gives the "Key" of the resurrection of the dead to the Messiah (*Cf. Bereshith Rabba* c. 73, *Midrash Tehillin* to Ps. xciii.);† and in commenting on Deut. xxxiv. 6 Rabbi Levi ben Gershom explains that the resurrection of the dead is the means whereby the Messiah will bring the nations to the worship of God‡ (Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 14: *For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him).* The belief that the Messiah will bring a new Law (*Torah*), or, at all events,

* Weber, *Op. cit.* p. 368.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.*

...t the ancient *Torah*, must also be
...ying a certain idea of mediatorial activity.
...ah is known as "the Messiah our Righteous-
...ecause he makes the people righteous in the sight
...od, both through his personal holiness and through
...is intercession, and also because he is the means of inducing the people to fulfil the commandments of the Law. Therefore by means of the Messiah's work peace is established between God and Israel. Moreover, because of the merit of the Messiah, together with his constant intercession, forgiveness of sins is granted to sinners.* But it is not always that the Messiah is represented as being exclusively concerned with the Israelites; sometimes his mediatorial action is directly stated to extend to the Gentiles; thus in *Shir Rabba* to vii. 2 it is said of the Messiah that he is called the "Way," because he leads all men ("all the inhabitants of the world") to repentance before God (*Cf.* John xiv. 6, *I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me*). Finally, we may quote the following (in substance) from *Pesikta rabbati* 36: "God contemplated the Messiah and his works before the creation of the world, and concealed him under His throne (*Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 2); Satan asked God what the light was under His throne, and God replied that it was one who would bring him to shame in the future (*Cf.* Lk. x. 18); then, being allowed to see the Messiah, Satan trembled and sank to the ground, crying out: 'Truly this is the Messiah who will deliver me and all heathen kings over to hell.'"†

* Weber, *Op. cit.* pp. 379 f.

† Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.* p. 207.

We have thus dealt briefly with some of the elements found in Rabbinical writings which refer directly or indirectly to the subject of Mediation. It would, however, not be right to close this chapter without adding a brief reference to the fact that there is much in this literature which speaks altogether against the idea of Mediation. Whatever may have been the reasons—and perhaps they are not far to seek—the fact is that, in spite of the clear enunciation of the doctrine of Mediation to be found in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigraphic writings, and also in the Targums, there are yet pointed instances in which the doctrine is combated in Talmudical writings; the fact cannot be ignored, nor would it be right to do so; and we shall, therefore, give quite a few examples illustrating this. But though these examples may be few in number it is well to remember that they might be greatly multiplied, and their existence must be allowed due weight when considering the whole subject of the doctrine of Mediation in this class of literature. "The whole idea of Atonement, according to the Rabbinical view, is regeneration—restoration of the original state of man in his relation to God, called *tekanah*. 'As vessels of gold or of glass, when broken, can be restored by undergoing the process of melting, thus does the disciple of the Law, after having sinned, find the way of recovering his state of purity by repentance.'* Therefore he who assumes a high public office after the confession of his sins in the past is 'made a new creature, free from sin like a child' (*Sanhedrin* 14a)."† In *Berakhoth*‡ ix. 1,

* *Chagigah*, 15 a, a saying of Rabbi Akiba's.

† *Jewish Encycl.* II. 280 a. ‡ Jerusalem Talmud.

Rabbi Judah* is quoted to the following effect: "An appeal to a mortal patron for relief depends on his servant's willingness to permit the applicant to enter; but appeals to the Almighty in times of trouble do not depend on the angel Michael or Gabriel; one need only call upon God." As directly opposed to the Christian belief in the mediatorial work of Christ are these words from the *Zohar*†: "We depend not on a man, nor do we trust in a Son-God, but in the God of heaven, who is the true God."§ With this may be compared what is said in *Sanhedrin* 92b, namely that when Nebuchadnezzar observed that one of those in the burning fiery furnace was like the Son of God, an angel cried out in wrath and said, "Has God a Son?"—

These few references must suffice here, though, as already remarked, they could be greatly multiplied. The attitude towards the idea of Mediation which they reflect constitutes one of the elements in Rabbinical literature regarding our subject.

* Born about 135 A.D.; he was the redactor of the *Mishna*.

† The *Zohar*, which purports to be the work of Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai, is a pseudepigraphic commentary on the Pentateuch.

§ *Jewish Encycl.* X. 170 a.

THE TEACHING OF THE JEWISH PRAYER BOOK.

We will now examine in some detail what the Jewish Prayer Book has to say on this subject of Mediation. It is sufficient for all practical purposes to utilize for this the convenient and abridged form of the Jewish Liturgy edited by the late Dr. Singer (Hebrew and English). The *Machzor Vitry* (A.D. 1208),* i.e., the most important

* This compilation represents the Ashkenazic *Minhag* (i.e. "Custom" or "Ritual"). Concerning the difference between the *Minhag* of the Sephardim (i.e. the Jews who adhere to the Spanish and Portuguese ritual) and the Ashkenazim (i.e. those who adhere to the German and Polish rituals), the following remarks of Rabbi Greenstone (JE. iv. 397 *a*) will be of interest; "These," i.e. the Sephardim and Ashkenazim, "differ not only in minor customs and observances, but also in the pronunciation of Hebrew and in their liturgies. The Sephardim have retained the pronunciation of Judæa, while the Ashkenazim are considered to have brought with them the language of Galilee. They also differ in the manner of intoning their prayers; the Sephardim still maintaining the old Oriental chants, while the Ashkenazim have permitted a strong European element to enter into their synagogal music. The important portions of the service are alike in both, with some possible variations of words and phrases; but in the prayers of later origin the divergence is very great. The Ashkenazim are supposed to have brought their prayer-book from Tiberias, Galilee, [the earliest authority for which is the Machzor Vitry], while the Sephardim are supposed to have brought theirs from the Babylonian schools of the ninth century."

of the earliest compilations of prayers, is very voluminous, and all that is really essential is to be had in Singer's very handy compilation. Some references will also be made to the Sephardic Ritual from which many further appropriate illustrations could be gathered ; Gaster's sumptuous edition is the one that has been utilized.

CHAPTER XVI.

The Principle of Mediation in the Jewish Prayer Book.

It will be best to begin by showing that the principle of Mediation is accepted and finds frequent expression here. In the Old Testament the whole sacrificial system obviously implies a belief in the principle of Mediation, and the technical terms used in connexion with sacrifices tend to emphasize this belief. Now in so far as, in principle, the sacrificial system of the Old Testament is accepted, and its teaching embodied in the Jewish Prayer Book, to that extent, at any rate, the teaching of the latter must be regarded as identical with that of the former. And that the Old Testament teaching on sacrifices has in principle been deliberately embodied in the Jewish Prayer Book is abundantly evident even to the most superficial reader. To give but a few examples; in the Morning Service there are incorporated: one passage from *Leviticus* and three from *Numbers*; in these passages things so vital to the principle of Mediation are dealt with as oblations, burnt-offerings, lamb-offerings, the goat for a sin-offering, and the sprinkling of blood upon the altar. Moreover, these passages are followed by an extract from the Mishna treatise *Zebachim*, in which further details are given as to the sacrificial ritual, thus emphasizing the acceptation of the Old Testament doctrine of Mediation. In this extract mention is made of sin-offerings, trespass-offer-

ings, etc., *e.g.*, one subject dealt with is the "trespass-offering of one who is in doubt whether he has committed an act that has to be atoned for by a sin-offering"; one need not emphasize the significance of the idea of *atonement* in connexion with our subject. Again, in the Additional Service for Festivals the worshippers say: ". . . And their meal-offering and their drink-offerings as hath been ordained; three tenth parts of an ephah for each bullock . . . . with wine according to the drink-offering thereof, *and a he-goat wherewith to make atonement*, and the two continual offerings according to their enactment." It is true enough that some of these offerings here enumerated were honorific sacrifices; but that others were propitiatory is absolutely clear, even apart from the mention of the sacrifice of atonement; and both these latter categories involve the idea of Mediation. Another important passage in this connexion is the following from the Additional Service for New Year: "Lead us with exultation unto Zion thy city, and unto Jerusalem the place of thy sanctuary, with everlasting joy; and there we will prepare before thee the offerings that are obligatory for us, as is commanded us in thy Law through the hand of Moses thy servant, from the mouth of thy glory, as it is said, And in the day of your gladness, and in your feasts, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings; and they shall be to you for a memorial before your God: I am the Lord your God." * Here again, the expression "a memorial before

* On this passage see further below.

your God" is suggestive of the principle of Mediation, since such a "memorial" was undoubtedly intended to contribute towards the continuance of normal relations between God and His people; and anything which thus acts as a means of establishing or upholding a proper relationship towards God is of the essence of Mediation. This is brought out still more strongly in the Service for the Day of Atonement (concerning which we shall have more to say presently) in the words: ". . . for the sins for which we owe a burnt-offering; and for the sins for which we owe a sin-offering; and for the sins for which we owe an offering, varying according to our means; and for the sins for which we owe an offering, whether for certain or for doubtful trespass . . . for all these, O God of forgiveness, forgive us, pardon us, grant us remission." This passage is especially interesting on account of its somewhat equivocal character; if sins are committed for which a burnt-offering or a sin-offering is owed, the obvious inference is that the debt having been paid, normal conditions have been re-established; and in this case there should be no need for the further petition for pardon and the grant of remission. If, on the other hand, the prayer for pardon is enough why should a sin-offering be owing? The incongruity is not difficult to account for. It is an attempted compromise between the old and the new; the old doctrine which wholeheartedly accepted the principle of Mediation, and the new, which says, in effect, that neither is any *thing* nor any *body* to come between God and man. If, however, it should be maintained, in explanation, that divine forgiveness is accorded on condition of the sacrifice, or

its substitute, being offered, the consequence would be a frank recognition of the principle of Mediation.

Under this heading should also be mentioned the atoning character sometimes imputed to the observance of New Moons; for example, in the Additional Service for Sabbath we have these words: "Thou, O Lord our God, also gavest us in love Sabbaths for rest and *New Moons for atonement*"; and later on in the same service: "Our God, and God of our fathers, accept our rest, and on this Sabbath day renew this New Moon unto us for good and for blessing, for joy and for gladness, for salvation and comfort, for sustenance and maintenance, *for pardon of sin and forgiveness of iniquity;*" and during Leap Year is added: "And for atonement of transgression." And, once more, in the Additional Service for the New Moon, after the *Amidah* prayer, the following is said: "The beginnings of the months thou didst assign unto thy people for a season of atonement throughout their generations. While they offered unto thee acceptable sacrifices, and goats for a sin-offering to atone for them, these were to be a memorial for them all, and the salvation of their soul from the hand of the enemy. O do thou establish a new altar in Zion, and we will offer upon it the burnt-offering of the New Moon, and prepare he-goats for thine acceptance; while we all of us rejoice in the service of the sanctuary, and in the song of David thy servant, which shall then be heard in thy city, and chanted before thine altar. O vouchsafe unto them everlasting love, and the covenant of the fathers remember unto the children. Bring us with exultation to Zion thy city, and to Jerusalem thy sanc-

tuary with everlasting joy, and there will we prepare unto thee the offerings that are obligatory for us, the continual offerings according to their order, and the additional offerings according to their enactment; and the additional offering of this New Moon will we prepare and offer unto thee in love according to the precept of thy will, as thou hast prescribed for us in thy Law through the hand of Moses thy servant, by the mouth of thy glory . . ." This passage has been quoted at length for three reasons. First, on account of the expression "a season of atonement." It was primarily, of course, a season of atonement because the special sacrifices then offered were believed to be of an atoning efficacy; but it will probably not be disputed that this atoning efficacy was extended to the observance of the season itself; the fact of observing it, apart from the details of its observance, being believed to have the effect of establishing normal relationships between God and His worshippers; it constituted a means of reconciliation, that is to say. If this is so, it is precisely parallel to what is believed concerning the atoning efficacy in the Day of Atonement, quite apart from the manner of its observance; we shall come to this again presently. Secondly, on account of the expression "these were to be a memorial for them all"; the idea of the "memorial" of sacrifices before God expresses clearly their mediating character; God is reminded, as it were, of the means which had been used to induce Him to forgive sins, and thus to be at peace with His people. The "memorial" of the sacrifices before God is analogous to the memorial, in the shape of phylacteries,

between the eyes, as mentioned in Exod. xiii. 9; the word (זכרון) is the same in each case. Both constituted a means of establishing, or continuing, normal conditions between God and men. Then, thirdly, this passage offers a striking example of the way in which the sacrificial system of the Old Testament has been accepted and embodied in the Jewish Prayer Book; and it is not only in principle that this has been done; for nothing could be more pointed than the way in which the re-establishment of the whole system is contemplated; and in the system must obviously be included the principles and doctrines underlying it. If it be objected that most, or at all events, many, Jews of the present day repudiate this, and refuse to accept in a literal sense what is written in their Prayer Book, the only reply is that we must be guided by the official exposition of Judaism, and not by the opinions of individuals. And it may be confidently asserted that in the Prayer Book itself what is written in the passage we are considering is intended to be understood in a literal sense, whether it is the sacrificial system or the return to Palestine which is referred to. One other expression in this passage deserves a passing notice, namely where it is said that the acceptable sacrifices, etc., were to be "the salvation of their soul from the hand of the enemy" (תשועת נפשם מיד שונא lit. "from the hand of the hater"); there used to be a quaint old custom, which still obtains in Poland and Galilee, and possibly elsewhere, according to which the men shook out the corners of their garments at the blessing of the New Moon. This is said to have been a symbolic way of expressing

the shaking off of enemies ; if this was so it was a harmless piece of imitative magic ; it is a wide-spread belief that the periodic renewal of the moon shows that there must be very real recuperative powers in it which can be utilized for the benefit of men if they only go the right way about bringing these powers into play. At the bottom of this lies, of course, originally, the belief in the personality of the moon, or at all events in the moon being the manifestation of some personality. Perhaps, therefore, one may hazard the suggestion that in the distant past the New Moon represented to the Israelites a manifestation of Jehovah ; in this case we shall have something parallel to the conception concerning the *Shekhinah,* which came at one time to be regarded as a kind of intermediate agent between God and men.* That is, however, all by the way. The most important point about the passage we have been considering is that it proves without a shadow of doubt that the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, together with the principles and doctrines underlying it, has been embodied in the Jewish Prayer Book.

---

* See p. 89.

CHAPTER XVII.

The Torah a Mediating Agency.

Next, we come to some passages in which the principle of Mediation is implied, the mediating agency being the *Torah.* In the Morning Service for Sabbath, for example, various petitions are offered up, after which follow the words: "Do it for the sake of thy name, do it for the sake of thy right hand, do it for the sake of thy holiness, do it for the sake of *thy Law*;"* it will be seen that the expression "for the sake of" (למען) is used in precisely the same way as in Christian prayers it is used in connexion with the name of Christ; so that the Christian might fairly urge that if God is besought to answer prayer for the sake of *things*, much more might He be asked to do so for the sake of a *person*; indeed, we shall see later on that this is actually done in the Jewish Prayer Book. A passage from *Pirke Aboth* (ii. 2), which is incorporated in the Afternoon Service for Sabbath, is worth quoting in this connexion, though it cannot be pressed, as its meaning is somewhat ambiguous: "Rabban Gamaliel, the son of Rabbi Judah the prince, said, An excellent thing is the study of the Torah combined with some worldly occupation, for the labour demanded by them both makes sin to be forgotten (משכחת עון);" the point is as to whom this "forgetting" refers; if it refers to the student

* See also the Additional Service for Sabbath, where the same formula recurs.

of the Torah he must be, but a poor student, for the *Torah* provides a special means for the obliteration of every sin, and among these means the "forgetting" of a sin finds no place; if it has not been atoned for, a sin is none the less a sin for having been forgotten. If, on the other hand, the forgetting is intended to refer to God, then the *Torah* has been the means of the obliteration of sin, or, in other words, the *Torah* is of mediating efficacy, since all that tends to eliminate that which is a bar between God and man is a means of reconciliation between them, and this is of the essence of Mediation. If the *Torah* can, in any sense, be said to have this effect, then it can to a certain extent be paralleled by the idea underlying the frequently used root כפר (*Kaphar*) with its derivatives. The "covering" of sin, which is the fundamental idea contained in this root, refers either to the conception of the face of God being covered, or blinded, in respect of sin, or else to that of the sin itself being covered over by the sacrifice; and in either case, therefore, the idea is that the sin is caused to be forgotten.*

There is another rather significant passage from *Pirke Aboth*, which also finds a place in the Prayer Book; according to this Hillel said that, "He who has acquired for himself words of Torah, has acquired for himself life in the world to come" (ii. 8). But perhaps the most striking passage of all under our present heading, also from *Pirke Aboth*, and, in common with

* Cf. the "Kapparath-schlag" still in vogue among some of the Jews in Poland, *i.e.*, the sacrifice of a cock (preferably white, symbolizing innocence) as a "covering" of sins. See pp. 19 ff.

those already cited, occurring in the Afternoon Service for Sabbath, is the following: "Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob, said, He who does one precept (of the Torah) has gotten himself one advocate (פרקליט "Paraclete"); and he who commits one transgression has gotten himself one accuser (קטגור)." In the original these two words, "advocate" and "accuser," are aramaized Greek, corresponding to παράκλητος, used in the New Testament of the Holy Spirit, and ὁ κατήγορος, the ordinary word for "an accuser," though the form κατηγορῶν occurs once, and is used of the Devil (Rev. xii. 10). It is the use of the former which is so significant when used in reference to the *Torah*; for this word occurs in other Rabbinical writings and is used of the angel who acts as man's advocate in the presence of God (*Shabbath* 32 *a*). The word is also applied to sacrifices; it is said, for example, in *Zebachim 7b* that the sin-offering is a more efficacious advocate than the burnt-offering, *cf. Baba Bathra* 10*a*. And again, repentance is spoken of as an advocate; thus, in *Shabbath* 32*a* we read: "When a man is led to a place of judgement and brings with him clever advocates (פרקליטין גדולים), he is acquitted, otherwise he is not. These advocates of a man consist in repentance and good works (תשובה ומעשים טובים), and though nine hundred and ninety-nine proclaim his guilt, and *one* his merit, he is delivered" (the reference is to Job xxx. iii. 23).*

The use of the term "advocate" as applied to the *Torah* will thus be seen to be of great interest in connexion with our present subject.

* Cf. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. פרקליט.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Further Mediating Agencies.

Our next point, which is closely connected with the foregoing, is to consider a variety of other things which are mentioned in the Prayer Book as being of mediating efficacy. First among these is *Repentance*, which has just been referred to as occurring in Rabbinical literature in this connexion. In the Afternoon Service for Sabbath we have these words from *Pirke Aboth* iv. 13: "Repentance and good deeds are as a shield against punishment;" as means for thus warding off the expression of divine anger, these two things must be regarded as witnessing to a belief in the principle of Mediation. The same thing, as regards *Works*, is to be seen, by implication, in the "Meditation" which is said on the first night of the feast of Tabernacles: "Seeing that I have gone forth from my house abroad, and am speeding the way of thy commandments, may it be accounted unto me as though I had wandered far in thy cause." Anything, as we have already seen, that is a means of bringing man nearer to God is *ipso facto* of mediating efficacy. The belief that anything is a cause of making peace between God and men involves a belief in the principle of Mediation; and it is only with the existence of a belief in this *principle* that we are at present concerned; it is the first step, and a very necessary one, which one has to take in seeking to trace out the gradual development of belief in a Mediator. Once more, in the Service for the Day

of Atonement forgiveness is asked for a great variety of sins, which are enumerated in order; among these, forgiveness is asked "for the violation of positive, or for the violation of negative precepts, whether these latter do or do not admit of a remedy by the subsequent fulfilment of a positive command;" in a note appended in explanation of this difficult passage it is said: "There are prohibitions, the transgression of which cannot be rectified by any subsequent act of the offender." The words "cannot be rectified" mean, as a matter of fact, "cannot be atoned for," so that here too the belief in the mediating efficacy of works is implicitly involved. Again the *Day of Atonement* is in itself regarded as a mediating agency.* Thanksgiving, for example, is offered up for the Day of Atonement "which thou, O Lord our God, hast given us for forgiveness, pardon, and atonement." (See further below). Another means of atonement, and therefore of mediating efficacy, is *Fasting*; this is graphically illustrated in the Sephardic Ritual in the "Service for Voluntary Fast of an individual," for example: "Therefore O Lord, with Thy abundant mercy answer me, at this time and hour, and let the diminution of my fat and blood, which hath by this day's fast been diminished, be accounted and favourably accepted before Thee, as the fat of the sacrifice laid on Thine altar; that it may atone for what I have sinned, trespassed, and transgressed against Thee, whether accidentally or by choice; through ignorance or presumption; knowingly or unknowingly."

* Cf. "Though no sacrifices be offered, the day in itself effects atonement" (*Sifra*, Emor, xiv [on Lev. xxiii. 27 sq.] quoted by Margolis in *Jewish Encycl.* II., 286 b.)

And again :

"Sovereign of the Universe! I have now afflicted myself with a fast before Thee ; it is known and manifest before the throne of Thy glory, that while the temple existed, a man sinning offered a sacrifice in Thy presence ; of which the fat and blood were offered alone, and this made an atonement, but at present because of our manifold sins, we have neither sanctuary, altar, nor priest to make an atonement for us. May it, therefore, be Thy will, O Lord my God, and the God of my fathers, that the diminution of my fat and blood, reduced in Thy presence by my fast this day, be accounted and accepted before the throne of Thy glory as if I had offered it on thine altar, and be Thou favourable unto me, according to Thine abundant mercy."

Besides Repentance, Good Works, and Fasting, it would seem that *Punishment* is a means of obliterating sin, and thus of effecting normal relationship with God ; the passage to be quoted, however, is ambiguous, and must not be pressed ; it occurs in the concluding portion of the Service for the Day of Atonement (Ashkenazic Ritual): " O may it be thy will, O Lord my God, and God of my fathers, that I may sin no more, and as to the sins I have committed, purge them away in thine abounding compassion, though not by means of affliction and sore diseases." It is these last words that are rather striking, for they imply that sins *can* be purged away by means of affliction and sore diseases, i.e., by means of punishment ; and if this is so, then punishment must be regarded as, *per se*, of mediating efficacy. The original of " by means of " (עַל-יְדֵי with שׁ) has the sense, "through

the agency of," and certainly implies that the sin is forgiven mediately, as opposed to מיד "immediately."

But if punishment is a means of obliterating sin, and thus of effecting reconciliation with God, still more must this be so in the case of *Death*; and indeed, nothing could be more pointed than the words uttered in the "Confession on a Death-bed"; it is said there: "O may my death be an atonement for all my sins, iniquities and transgressions of which I have been guilty against Thee." And in the same Service, according to the Sephardic Ritual, occur the following words:

"But if the time appointed for me to die be near, O let my death be an atonement for all my sins, iniquities, and trangressions, wherein I have sinned, offended, and transgressed against Thee, from the day of my first existence; and let my portion be in the Garden of Eden." And again:

"May it be Thy will, O Lord, my God, and the God of my Fathers, to receive my soul with mercy, when Thou takest it from me; and to place it under the throne of Thy glory, from whence Thou hast planted it in me: and when I die, let my death be an atonement for all my sins."

CHAPTER XIX.

The Day of Atonement.

A few words will come in appropriately here about the *Day of Atonement*; this occupies an important part in the Jewish Prayer Book; but as the ritual for the day follows post-biblical, as well as biblical directions, it will be best to make some references here to the Mishnic treatise *Yoma*, which deals specifically with this subject. To begin with, however, as Dr. Margolis truly remarks*: "The Day of Atonement is the keystone of the sacrificial system of post-exilic Judaism. In the belief that the great national misfortunes of the past were due to the people's sins, the Jews of post-exilic times strove to bring on the Messianic period of redemption by strictly and minutely guarding against all manner of sin. The land being defiled by the sin of the people, the pollution must be removed lest the Divine Presence withdraw from among them. Hence the sacrificial system with its sin- and guilt-offerings. While provision was made for the expiation of the wrong-doings of individuals by private offerings, the public sacrifices atoned for the sins of the community. Especially dangerous seemed the errors unwittingly committed (Ps. xix. 13). On the Day of Atonement such sins as may not have been covered by the various private and public expiatory sacrifices were to be disposed of by a general ceremony of expiation. In this elaborate ceremonial, as described,

* *Jewish Encycl.* II. 286 a.

the ordinary rites of the sin-offering were to be discerned in an intensified form. In every sacrifice there is the idea of substitution; the victim takes the place of the human sinner. The laying-on of hands upon the victim's head is an ordinary rite by which the substitution and the transfer of sins are effected; on the Day of Atonement the animal laden with the people's sins was sent abroad (compare the similar rite on the recovery of a leper, Lev. xiv. 7). The sprinkling of the blood is essential to all sin-offerings. By dipping his finger in the victim's blood and applying it to a sacred object like the altar, the priest re-establishes the union between the people that he represents and the Deity." The principle of Mediation, so fully brought to expression here, comes also to the fore in the post-biblical teaching on the Day of Atonement; especially is this the case, as remarked above, in the Mishnic tractate *Yoma;* some illustrations from this may, therefore, be given. In iii. 8, e.g., we have the following confession of sins on the part of the High-priest: "O Name* (i.e., O God), I have done amiss, I have transgressed, I have sinned before Thee, —I and my house; O Name, make atonement I pray (כפר־נא) for the iniquities, and for the transgressions, and for the sins whereby I have done amiss, and whereby I have transgressed, and whereby I have sinned before Thee,—I and my house, as it is written in the law of Moses, Thy servant, saying, *For on this day shall*

* This word is often used in order to avoid uttering the name of God; it is to be paralleled by the custom of not pronouncing the name Jehovah, instead of which *Adonai* ("My Lord") is used among the Jews, and the word *Shema'* ("Hear") among the Samaritans.

atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord." (Lev. xvi. 30). This acknowledgement of sin,* and realization of the need of its obliteration in order to stand right with God, is the necessary preliminary to a belief in Mediation. Then, as regards the taking away of sin, it is said, in viii. 8.: "Sin-offering and guilt-offering, and an offering for a conscious offence effect atonement," i.e., these *per se* obliterate sin. And again, in the same section, it continues, "Repentance makes atonement for venial transgressions whether for 'Do' or 'Do not' (i.e., whether the sin is one of omission or commission) and as for grievous (sins) it holds them in abeyance until the Day of Atonement comes and makes atonement."† This passage is of considerable importance since it teaches that the atoning efficacy of the Day is in itself greater than the atonement brought about by repentance; this witnesses to the feelings of the need of something outside of man, of something more efficacious than anything man can do, in order to bring about a normal relationship with God by the taking away of sin. On the other hand, the indispensable need of repentance for sin in man is insisted on in the passage which follows; even the Day of Atonement is insufficient to atone for sin if there is no repentance, see viii. 9.: "(He who says) I will sin, and the Day of Atonement will atone (for it), for such the Day of Atonement effects no atonement."

* Repeated in iv. 2, and vi. 2.

† Cp. the Midrash *Debarim Rabba* sec. II. to Deut. vi. 5, where it is said that on the Day of Atonement the Israelites appear as innocent as the ministering angels.

As another instance of the atoning efficacy of this Day we have the following final sentence of the tractate: "As regards transgressions (which have occurred) between man and the *Mākōm* (i.e. God),* the Day of Atonement makes atonement (for these); but regarding those which have occurred between a man and his neighbour, (for these) the Day of Atonement makes no atonement until he (i.e. the transgressor) has forgiven his neighbour." There is an interesting note of Rabbi Akiba's† added at the close of this tractate which looks very much like a warning lest the efficacy of the Day of Atonement should be regarded by some as a necessary and indispensable mediatorial agency between God and men: "Blessed are ye, Israelites, (for) in the sight of Whom are ye cleansed, and Who cleanses you? (It is) your Father in Heaven; for it is said: *And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you* (Ezek. xxxvi. 25). And it says (in another place), *Jehovah the Mikveh* ("hope") *of Israel* (Jer. xvii. 13).

* This word (meaning "Place") is often substituted for God in Rabbinical writings. In the Midrash *Bereshith rabba*, c. 68 it is said: "Why is the Holy One—Blessed be He—also called *ha-Mākōm*? Because He is the *Place* of the world, and the world is not His place; this is explained by Weber thus (*Op. cit.* p. 149): "He (God) is the Infinite, Who comprehends the Universe in Himself, but Whom the Universe cannot comprehend" (Cf. the Athanasian Creed, "The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible . . . As also there are not three incomprehensibles . . . but one incomprehensible;" and Jn. i. 5, *And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not.")*

† A Palestinian *Tanna* ("Teacher") who lived in the second century A.D.

What is it that the Washing (= βαπτισμός), which is equivalent to *Mikveh*, does? It cleanses the unclean. So doth the Holy One—Blessed be He—cleanse Israel." As Fiebig, in his edition of *Yoma*, remarks on this passage, it is noteworthy that Akiba speaks here of *sins* being washed away by the "Baptism," cf., Eph. v. 26, . . . *that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word.*

CHAPTER XX.

Intercessory Prayer.

Before coming to deal with the subject of actual Mediatorship as contained in the Jewish Prayer Book one or two examples must be given of Intercessory Prayer, for this forms one of the connecting links between the doctrine of Mediation and that of Mediatorship. At the Morning Service for Sabbath there occurs a series of intercessions which reminds one of the Prayer for the Church Militant in the Anglican Liturgy; or, perhaps still more of the "Bidding Prayer;" this begins as follows: "May there be granted (lit. may there arise) salvation from heaven, grace, and mercy, and loving-kindness, and long life, and sufficient sustenance, and support which is from heaven, and discernment which is from above, (may there also be granted) a living seed, and a continuing seed, that will not cut itself away from and that will not cease from the commands of the Law, (May all this be granted) to . . . ." then follows the list of those for whom intercession is made, viz: Teachers, Rabbis, heads of academies, chiefs of the Captivity, colleges, judges in the gates, the disciples of all these, and their disciples, besides everyone who is occupied in the study of the Law.* That is the first section of the

* With this may be compared the seventh petition offered up at the burial of men, according to the Sephardic Ritual: "May thy soul be bound up in the bond of life with the heads of colleges, and the heads of the Captivity; with Israelites, Priests, and Levites, and with the seven bands of just and pious men. . . . "

Intercession; in the next section mention is made of the whole congregation present, for those who are great and for those who are small, and for women and children. In the third section prayer is offered up for all holy congregations, "them, their wives, their sons and their daughters, and all that belong to them; those also who unite to form synagogues for prayer, and those who enter therein to pray; those who give the lamps for lighting, and wine for *Kiddush** and *Habdala*,† bread to the wayfarers, and charity to the poor, and all such as occupy themselves in faithfulness with the wants of the congregation." Finally, in the fourth and fifth sections intercessions are offered up for the King and the Royal Family.

Another very beautiful example is an intercession for the faithful departed which is said only on the Sabbaths preceding Pentecost and the Fast of the Ninth of Ab‡;

* *i.e.* "Holiness" or "Hallowing;" the name given to the ceremony which is celebrated in honour of the holiness of the Sabbath (or of a festival); the central act of the ceremony is the drinking from a cup of wine (over which a Blessing has been said) by all the members of a family before partaking of their evening meal on Fridays. Extra candles, or a special lamp, are also lighted in honour of the Sabbath. See for further details, Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.* pp. 345 ff.

† *i.e.* "Separation," or "Distinction;" the ceremony which takes place on Saturday evenings at the going out of the Sabbath; here also a lighted candle and a cup of wine are used. Both *Kiddush* and *Habdala* date from pre-Christian times.

‡ This fast is observed in commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, first by the Chaldæans in 586 B.C., and, later on, by the Romans in 70 A.D. Three other fasts are observed in connexion with the former of these destructions; the tenth of Tebet, when the siege began; the seventeenth of Tammuz, when the first breach was made in the walls; and the third of Tishri, when Gedaliah was slain (see ii. Kings xxv. 25., Jer. xli. 2.)

the first part of this is as follows: "May the Father of mercies, Who dwelleth on high, in his mighty compassion, remember those loving, upright, and blameless ones, the holy congregations, who laid down their lives for the sanctification of the divine name, who were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death were not divided . . . May our God remember them for good with the other righteous of the world . . ."

While there is nothing here to suggest Mediatorship in the fuller sense of the word, there is, at any rate, the distinct expression of the need of men coming between their fellow-creatures and God, and using prayer as a mediating agency.

CHAPTER XXI.

The Idea of Mediatorship in the Jewish Prayer Book.

We come now to consider some passages of great interest and importance in which belief in a mediator finds clear expression. First, we may draw attention to the doctrine that the merits of the fathers are effective in bringing about a normal relationship between God and men. Thus, in the ordinary Morning Service we have the following: "Our Father, our King, for our fathers' sake (בעבור אבותינו), who trusted in thee, and whom thou didst teach the statutes of life, be also gracious unto us and teach us." Again, these words in the *Amidah*-prayer are important: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, the great, mighty and revered God, the most high God, who bestowest loving-kindnesses, and possessest all things; who rememberest the pious deeds of the patriarchs, and in love wilt bring a redeemer (גואל) to their children's children for his name's sake (למען שמו)"; we shall return to this passage. In the great prayer known as *Abinu Malkenu* ("Our Father, our King") we have some further striking examples: "Our Father, our King! do this for the sake of (למען) them that were slain for thy holy name." "Our Father, our King! do it for the sake of them that were slaughtered for thy Unity." "Our Father, our King! do it for the sake of them that went through fire and water for the

sanctification of Thy name." That which is prayed for here is God's mercy and compassion.

Another prayer in the Morning Service contains the following petition :

> " We beseech thee, O gracious and merciful King, remember and give heed to the Covenant between the Pieces (with Abraham), and let the binding (upon the altar) of (Isaac) an only son appear before thee, to the welfare of Israel."

The *'Akedah*, i.e. the " Binding " of Isaac, plays an important part in the Jewish Liturgy. " In the course of time ever greater importance was attributed to the *'Akedah*. The haggadistic literature is full of allusions to it ; the claim to forgiveness on its account was inserted in the daily morning prayer ; and a piece called *'Akedah* was added to the liturgy of each of the penitential days among the German Jews." * Geiger held that the Christian doctrine of atonement and vicarious suffering was the means of influencing Jewish belief in this matter ; † but this is exceedingly unlikely, for the treatment of the Jews by the Church in the Middle Ages was cruel in the extreme, and it can hardly be supposed that Jewish teachers would be likely to borrow a doctrine of this kind from their persecutors. There was, moreover, ample authority in earlier Jewish writings for emphasizing the doctrine of atonement, quite apart from that of vicarious suffering taught in Is. liii. It is far more likely that the Christian doctrine was the cause that the teaching on Mediatorship

* *Jewish Encycl.* I. 303a.

† *Nachgelassene Schriften* v. p. 352.

is not more prominent in Jewish writings than is actually the case. Probably this is also one of the contributory reasons why, as Dr. Lansberg says, in "the point of view of some advocates of reformed Judaism the great importance of the Biblical story of the attempted sacrifice of Isaac consists in the lesson that God does not desire such a sacrifice"; at any rate, in opposition to traditional Jewish usage, "many American reform rituals have abolished the *'Akedah* prayers. At the same time," continues the same writer, "stress is laid, even by reformers, on the typical character of the story as expressing the spirit of martyrdom which permeates Jewish history, and has maintained the Jewish faith."* The *'Akedah* is again referred to in the Additional Service for the New Year, where, however, its mediating efficacy is altogether toned down: "May the binding with which Abraham our father bound his son Isaac on the altar appear before thee, how he overbore his compassion in order to perform thy will with a perfect heart. So may thy compassion overbear thine anger against us; in thy great goodness may the fierceness of thy wrath turn aside from thy people . . ."; but towards the end of this prayer we have again these words: "For thou art he who remembereth from eternity all forgotten things, and before the throne of whose glory there is no forgetfulness; O remember the binding of Isaac this day in mercy unto his seed." †

References to the *'Akedah* are frequent in the Sephardic

* *Jewish Encycl.* I. 303b.

† See Ecclus. xliv. 20. 22.

Ritual; a few examples may be given. Among the prayers for New Year's Day occurs the following:

"If we have sinned, and have frequently scoffed, yet reveal unto us the propitious time, for the sake of the exalted Isaac, who was bound as a sheep, and for whose ransom a ram was favourably accepted. O remember for us this day the merit of his being bound, though our backslidings be many; we have sinned against Thee, O Lord, forgive us."

Again, among the Daily Prayers, the following are offered:—

"O God and the God of our fathers! O remember us with a good memorial before Thee, and visit us with the visitation of salvation from the ancient heaven of heavens, and remember unto us, O Lord our God, the love of Thine ancient servants, Abraham, Isaac, and Israel; and the covenant, the mercy and the oath, which Thou didst swear unto our ancestor Abraham on Mount Moriah, and the act of binding his son Isaac upon the altar, as it is written in Thy Law."

"O most merciful and gracious King, we beseech Thee to remember and have respect to the covenant made with our ancestor Abraham, between the pieces, and let the binding of his only child appear before Thee, and for the sake of our father Israel, O our Father, forsake us not, nor cast us off, O our King."

"O Lord, when in wrath remember mercy; when in wrath remember the binding of Isaac and the perfection of Jacob."

"For the sake of the binding of Isaac, the only child who was bound on the altar, and was accounted a perfect,

pure, and holy burnt-offering, . . . we beseech Thee to cause the sea to cease from its raging, and to still its waves . . ."

Further examples of the pleading of the father's merits are the following:—In the Afternoon Service for Sabbath occurs the following from *Pirke Aboth*: "Let all who are employed with the congregation act with them for Heaven's sake, for then the merit of their fathers sustains them, and their righteousness endures for ever." In the Service for the Feast of Purim we have these interesting words: "Who will rise up to atone for error, and obtain pardon for the sin and iniquity of our fathers? [It is, of course, not the Patriarchs who are here referred to] A flower blossomed from the palm-tree: lo! Hadassah [i.e. Esther] arose to awaken the merit of those that slept in the grave." In the Additional Service for Festivals part of one of the prayers runs: "Our God, and God of our fathers, merciful King, have mercy upon us, O thou good and beneficent Being, suffer thyself to be sought of us; return unto us in thy yearning compassion for the fathers' sake who did thy will." In the Service for the Day of Atonement in the Sephardic Ritual occur the words: "All these things didst Thou ordain for the glory of Aaron, whom Thou didst appoint the instrument of atonement for Israel; and in His hands hast Thou placed the remission of iniquity."

It must be added that, with one exception (the passage from the Service for the Feast of Purim) the merits of the fathers are not directly pleaded for atonement of sin; but that this is the underlying intention of the doctrine of the merits of the fathers does not need

emphasizing; it is sufficient, for example, to point to the fact that if God's mercy and compassion are sought on the strength of the father's merits the former would not have been withheld excepting on account of sin. In any case, the offering of others (for the "merits" must be regarded in the light of an acceptable offering) is the means whereby normal relationships between God and men are believed to be re-established; and this is of the essence of the doctrine of Mediatorship. The following passages, also from the Sephardic Ritual, are interesting in this connexion; the quotations are from the Prayers for the different days of the week:—

"The faithful men who came before Thee by virtue of their good works are lost to us; they were powerful and able to stand in the breach, and repel by their intercession the evil decrees. They were a wall unto us, and a place of refuge in the day of wrath, mitigating anger by their silent prayer, and restraining wrath by their cry; before they called Thou didst answer them; they knew how to obtain favour by prayer; for their sake didst Thou act like a compassionate father, not dismissing them empty from Thy presence. But by reason of the multitude of our sins, they are lost to us; they have been taken away from us because of our iniquities; they have retired to their eternal rest, and have left us to sorrow. Those who repaired the fence have disappeared, those who averted anger are cut off; there is none capable to stand in the breach, for those who are worthy to appear before Thee are now no more. We have wandered the four quarters of the globe, but have found no relief. We now return unto Thee, our faces covered with shame, to seek Thee, O God, in the time of our distress."

These very touching words witness to a belief in the *possibility*, at any rate, of the mediatorial office of the fathers.

And again:

" . . . O Most High! Thy mercy is everlasting, and pardon is with Thee. O repent Thee of evil, and incline to mercy. . . . O close the mouth of the adversary (שטן) that he may not accuse us, rebuke him, that he be silent, and suffer a good intercessor * (Job xxxiii. 23) to rise up to justify us, and declare our uprightness. O merciful and gracious God! Thou hast revealed Thy ways to him who was faithful in Thy house, and when he entreated Thee, then didst Thou make Thy truth known to him."

Cf. also the following, which is taken from a prayer offered on visiting graves:

". . . May your merits, and your perfect life assist us in our needs and protect us in times of trouble. Increase ye also your prayers to the Lord our God, that He, through His infinite mercy and His abundant loving-kindness and for the sake of our holy fathers, and for the sake of our pious ones who have fulfilled His will, may have compassion, pity, and mercy upon us. . . . May your rest be a glorious one, and may the merit of your deeds and your devotion to the study of the Law stand us in good stead, as well as all who have joined us, and the whole house of Israel. . . ."

Judging from various indications in the earlier Jewish literature the conjecture may be hazarded that originally the atoning efficacy of the merits of the fathers was

* It is said that this refers to a man's good angel.

more fully believed in, and more directly expressed than is at the present the case in the Jewish Liturgy.*

In passing, reference may be made to an interesting passage from *Pirke Aboth* (v. 21) which is incorporated in the Afternoon Service for Sabbath: "Whosoever makes the many righteous, sin prevails not over him;† and whosoever makes the many to sin, they grant him not the faculty to repent. Moses was righteous, and made the many righteous and the righteousness of the many is laid upon him . . ."; on this Dr. Taylor‡ remarks: "Moses is reckoned as co-operating with Israel in all their acts of righteousness; consequently the זכות (*Zecuth*) of the many depends upon him." The word *Zecuth* means the state of righteousness (attained by good works) which renders a man justified in the sight of God. Still more distinctly is the office of Mediator seen to be held in the case of Elijah in a passage in a liturgical form of Grace after meals, incorporated in the Jewish Prayer Book, viz., "May the All-merciful send us Elijah the prophet (let him be remembered for good), who shall give us good tidings, salvation and consolation."

In the Sephardic Ritual there are also many references to the merits of the fathers; in the Service for the Day of Atonement we have, for example, the following:—

* Cf. the beautiful and touching thought expressed in the words: "The tears of the righteous in Paradise cool the torments of hell," (*Shemoth Rabba* vii.)

† Cf. Jas. v. 20, *He that converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall cover a multitude of sins.*

‡ *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 94.

"O Lord, yield to our entreaty for the sake of Thy name, And have compassion on Thy people Israel.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Abraham, Thy perfect servant from the East.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Isaac, who was bound in Thy temple.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Jacob, who was answered on a ladder from Thy heavens.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Joseph, who, when imprisoned, hoped in Thee.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Moses, who was 'faithful in all Thy house.'

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Aaron, who ministered arrayed in Thy Urim and Thummim.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Phineas, the pure one who was zealous for Thy name.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of David, Thy Sweet Psalmist.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of Solomon, the king, who built a temple to Thy name.

O Lord, yield, for the sake of those who have been slain and burnt for testifying the unity of Thy holy name."

And, again, at the Service for New Year's Day, there are several very striking passages in which the merits of the fathers are pleaded :—

"O Thou Who art clothed and enwrapped in righteousness, Thou Who alone art all-perfect, when we are destitute of good works, remember the patriarchs who sleep in Hebron, and may their memorial appear constantly before Thee, as the burnt-offering of the morning, which is for a continual burnt-offering."

"The children of Thy servants repair this day to Thy sanctuary; they remember the righteous deeds of their ancestors, for their sake, O Lord, remember them for life, and may they be continually present before Thee."

"For the sake of the pure lives of the forefathers, answer, O Lord, their offspring, defiled by sin, who are terrified and amazed, for they have to appear before Thee on this day of judgment. 'Thou givest truth unto Jacob, and mercy unto Abraham.'"

"O establish their seed for a blessing for their sake, and grant the reward of their good deeds to their children after them. . . . Bestow on me this day, the reward of the righteousness of my ancestors, and may my lot and portion in eternal life be like theirs, and cause to be proclaimed to Thy congregation, 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave,' 'Because that Abraham obeyed my voice.'"

On the seventh day of the *Feast of Tabernacles*, at morning service, seven scrolls of the Law are taken out and laid on the reading-desk, and seven circuits are made with the lulab* round the reading-desk, in memory of the seven circuits which used to be made round the altar in the Temple on *Hoshanna Rabba*.† At each circuit one Old Testament Saint is specially commemorated, and the circuit is called by his name. The words recited at these "circuits" are so interesting and important in the present connexion that we may be pardoned for quoting some of these rather fully.

* *i.e.*, the "palm-branch" which is carried during the Feast of Tabernacles; to it are tied willow-branches and twigs of myrtle.

† *i.e.*, the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles; the day takes its name from the fact that on it the people constantly cry out: "Hoshanna," which means "Save, we pray." The word "Rabba" means "Great."

Circuit of Aaron:

Through the merit of Aaron may Thy people sing aloud when they say Hosanna. He was sealed with honour when he put on the glorious mitre, to minister in the priesthood. He was clothed in faithfulness with beautiful garments to glorify Thy name; O show his glory to a contrite nation, Thou Who dwellest in the exalted habitation, and through his merits and his prayers, save Thy troubled people. Remember us, O Lord, with the good-will that Thou bearest unto Thy people. He put on the holy garments to sanctify Thee and to minister in the innermost sanctuary, and he clothed himself in them when he entered there, and appeared as a holy angel of the Lord. With his sacrifices and his burnt-offerings he made atonement for our sins; O remember his prayers and supplications to Thy faithful people this day, and plant them and grant them fulness of rest at the footstool of Thy sanctuary.

Circuit of Phineas:

Remember the merit of Phineas selected for the attribute of justice, which is the foundation of the world. . . . Hasten for his merit thy salvation to this congregation. Remember us, O Lord, with the good-will that Thou bearest unto Thy people. O Lord, for the merit of this zealous one, answer the cry of Thy hallowed people. . . .

Circuit of David:

O Lord, remember David, the prince, who sung upon the ten-stringed instrument and the psaltery; with whose hymns and psalms Thou art praised throughout the world. . . . For the merit of David, Thy beloved, whose seal is placed upon Thy royal crown,

have mercy and grant comfort to Thy people Thine inheritance. For his merit, show to the afflicted nation the re-building of Thy temple and of Thy dwelling. Remember from Heaven, I beseech Thee, the merit of the patriarchs to Thy congregation, and lift them up and exalt them through the merit of Thy seven perfect men. . . . Remember unto us, O our God, the merit of David, the son of Jesse; and out of his stem call forth the rod, gather Thy scattered, and through his merit, collect our dispersed, and with our wives and children we will rejoice in Thy kingdom, and in the relation of Thy wonders.

Circuit of Isaac:

O remember the covenant of Isaac, who was bound for an offering before Thee. He resigned himself to be bound as a lamb, to do Thy will. O favour his root, and be gracious to his seed, when they come before Thee; and if their guilt testifies against them yield to their entreaty for the sake of Thy name, we beseech Thee. Remember us, O Lord, with the good-will that Thou bearest unto Thy people. Remember, O God, my Rock and Redeemer, the merit of Isaac—whose seal in heaven is on the attribute of might—unto the nation who seek Thy help. Extend the merit of his being bound and his righteousness unto the people called by Thy name. Seal them for good out of Thy good-will, O God, Who art girt with might. Do not withhold Thy tender mercy from Thy inheritance, and Thy peculiar treasure.

Circuit of Moses:

Forget not, we beseech Thee, the merit of Moses, whose seal is upon the attribute of eternity. For the sake of his merit and his meekness subdue Thou our

enemies; and on Mount Moriah shall we sing hymns with the chief musician. O Thou, eternal God, have mercy for ever on the people who extol Thee. Remember us, O Lord, with the good will that Thou bearest unto Thy people. A perfect and sweet Law inherited "the meek" on Mount Sinai; forty days he abode with the tremendous Lord God, to receive from His heavenly habitation the Law which is pure and bright. God of truth, Who didst cause Thy faithful people to inherit the law of truth, remember, we beseech Thee, from Thy heavenly abode, his righteousness and Thy law. Remember us, O Lord."

Lastly, something must be said concerning the intercession and mediation of angels; some echoes of this are preserved in the Jewish Prayer Book. In the "Prayers before retiring to rest at night" occurs this prayer, which is repeated three times: "In the name of the Lord, the God of Israel, may Michael be at my right hand; Gabriel at my left; before me, Uriel; behind me, Raphael; and above my head the Divine Presence of God (שכינה אל *i.e.*, the *Shekhinah.*)* This passage does not, of course, witness to the mediatorship of angels; their function here is only that of guardianship during the hours of darkness against evil spirits which were always believed to be specially active after nightfall; but the passage is quoted in order to show the belief in personalities who were more powerful than men and who acted as God's intermediaries among men. That angels were believed to fulfil other functions besides that of guardianship will be seen presently.

* Cp. Matth. xviii. 10, . . . *in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

There is a striking but somewhat difficult passage in the liturgical form of the "Grace after meals," which seems to have some reference to the mediatory functions of the angels, it runs: "On their behalf (i.e. parents and relatives) and on our behalf may they teach *Zecuth* on high as shall be for the preserving of peace"; the words "may they teach *Zecuth* on high," must refer to the angels, and the "teaching of *Zecuth*" probably means placing their merit on record so that it may be pleaded on behalf of men. Dr. Singer, in his translation of the passage, renders it: "Both on their and on our behalf may there be such advocacy on high as shall lead to enduring peace"; and the passage continues: "And may we receive a blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of our salvation; and may we find grace and good understanding in the sight of God and man." From these words it seems that by "enduring peace" is meant peace between God and men, which is to be brought about through the mediatorship of angels.

Again, in the Sephardic Ritual, in a hymn for New Year's Day belief in angelic intercession is witnessed to in the following verse:—"Then all the angels of the throne were deeply moved; Ophanim* and Seraphim interceded and implored for mercy for this chief of the host and said, 'O grant a redemption and appoint a ransom for him. Deprive not the world of so great a luminary.'" The object of this intercession is of less importance than the fact that such intercession is said to be offered by angelic beings.

* One of the ten orders of angels into which, according to Rabbinical teaching, the angelic host is divided. The Ophanim are said to dwell in the seventh Heaven.

CHAPTER XXII.

The Messiah as a Mediating Agent.

There are a few passages in the Jewish Prayer Book in which the Messiah is spoken of as "Redeemer." The reason why these are referred to is not because they teach the Mediatorship of the Messiah, for it cannot be said that they do this, but because they witness to a belief in some special function which the Messiah is to fulfil on behalf of his people, and also because one cannot dissociate from the person of the Messiah mentioned in the Prayer Book the conceptions concerning Him which we find in the Old Testament.

In the opening hymn of praise for the Morning Service occur the words: "He will send our Messiah at the end of the days *to redeem* (לפדות) them that wait for the end, [that wait for] his salvation." Again, it must be the Messiah who is referred to when, later on, in the same service the *Amidah* prayer (so-called because it is said *standing*) is said: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, and God of our fathers . . . Who rememberest the pious deeds of the patriarchs, and in love wilt bring a *redeemer* (גואל) "Goēl" * to their children's children for Thy name's sake." † Here it must be remarked that

* *Goel* is a regular word for the Messiah in Rabbinical literature *e.g.*, *Bereshith Rabba* chap. lxxxv.

† This is repeated at the Morning as well as at the Evening Service for Sabbaths and Festivals.

although the English has "for Thy name's sake," in reference to God, the original reads "for His name's sake" (שמו), in reference to the "redeemer." *

We have in these two passages two different roots used for the words rendered "to redeem" and a "redeemer," viz., *padah* (פדה) and *ga'al* (גאל); it will be worth while to examine quite briefly the ideas which these two roots connote respectively according to biblical usage.

Padah means "to ransom," the underlying idea being always that of a payment in one form or another. It is used with man as the subject—*e.g.*, in Exod. xiii., 23 *All the first born of man among thy sons shalt thou redeem; i.e.*, a life is saved by means of a substitute. Cf., in the "Service for the Redemption of the Firstborn" in the Jewish Prayer Book, the words which the priest says after the father has paid the redemption money: "This is instead of that, this in commutation for that, this in remission for that." Another example, among many, is Ps. xlix. 7, 8, *None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom† for him.* But the word is used mostly of "delivering," God being the subject, *e.g.*, from the Egyptian bondage, Deut. vii. 8, xiii. 6, Mic. xvi. 4, or from exile, Jer. xxxi. 11, Zech. x. 8, or from trouble, difficulty, violence, Shoel, and death.

Ga'al, in its original meaning when man is the subject, signifies "to act as a kinsman," then, just as *Padah*, to redeem for a money payment. But this word, too, is used mostly with God as the subject, and implies a personal relationship between Him and the object of redemption; it is used of redeeming from the Egyptian bondage, from exile, from evil generally, from an enemy, and from death (the "pit"), Hos. xiii. 14, Ps. ciii. 4. The real difference between the two roots, when used with God as the subject, is, speaking generally, that *Padah* connotes redemption for which an equivalent of some kind is exacted; while *Ga'al* implies redemption without anything in the shape of payment.

* The Name of the Messiah was, according to Jewish teaching, one of the seven things which were called into existence before the creation of the world (*Shemoth Rabba* c. xvii.).

† Here the Hebrew equivalent is *kaphar* (כפר), see above, pp. 19ff.

In the two passages quoted above, the different usage of the two roots is, in one respect, well brought out, for in the passage in which the root *ga'al* is used—*i.e.*, the second passage, the redeemer is clearly conceived of as his people's kinsman, being mentioned along with the patriarchs. Elsewhere in the Prayer Book the title "Redeemer" (*Go'el*) is applied to God, *e.g.*, in the act of Praise which precedes the passage just referred to, we read: "Our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is his name, the Holy One of Israel, Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who hast redeemed Israel." In the sentence before this the root *padah* is used, and translated "deliver"; this is interesting, as showing that *ga'al* is used in a more technical sense than *padah*, which, unlike its use in the Old Testament, is of more general signification.

The Messiah appears again as a mediating agency in the prayer beginning: "Our God and God of our fathers! May our remembrance rise, come, and be accepted before Thee, with the remembrance of our fathers, of Messiah, the son of David, Thy servant . . ."; this prayer is said at the Evening Service, at Morning Service on New Moons and the intermediate days of the Feasts of Passover and Tabernacles, at the Service for Festivals, at the Service for the Day of Atonement, as well as at "Grace after Meals."

In the Service for the Inauguration of the Sabbath there occurs the beautiful hymn known as לכה דודי לקראת כלה ("Come, my beloved, to meet the bride"); in this poem the Sabbath is personified as a bride, whose visit to the faithful of Israel it is desired to honour and welcome. One of the

verses of this poem contains the following words, interesting especially in the present connexion:— "Shake thyself from the dust, arise, put on the garments of thy glory, O my people! through the son of Jesse, the Bethlehemite, draw Thou nigh unto my soul, redeem it." Here the Messiah, belonging to the house of Jesse, is the one for whose sake (עַל-יְדֵי) redemption is sought (the root used is again *ga'al*).

One other passage, interesting from more than one point of view, must be given; it occurs in the "Service at a Circumcision":—

"May the All-Merciful, regardful of the merit of them that are akin by the blood of circumcision, send us his Messiah, who walketh uprightly, to give good tidings and consolation to the people scattered and dispersed among the peoples.

May the All-Merciful send us the righteous priest, who remains withdrawn in concealment † until a throne, bright as the sun and radiant as the diamond, shall be prepared for him; [may he send us the prophet ‡ who] covered his face with his mantle and wrapped himself therein, with whom is God's covenant [lit., "my covenant"] of life and peace.

May the All-Merciful make us worthy of the days of the Messiah, and of the life of the world to come." §

† *i.e.*, Moses; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 6; . . . *but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.*

‡ *i.e.*, Elijah; cf. I. Kings xix. 13, One is naturally reminded of the account of the Transfiguration, see especially Matth. xvii. 3—5.

§ More accurately "the age to come," (*'Olam ha-ba'*) a technical term for the Messianic Era which is to inaugurate eternity according to Jewish teaching. Cf. Lk. xviii. 30, Hebr. vi. 5.

The significance of these passages can only be adequately grasped when it is realised what the conceptions of the Messiah and his work were according to Biblical, post-Biblical, and Rabbinical teaching. It is impossible to touch upon this large subject here; reference may be made to Oesterley and Box's *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, chaps. x., xi., together with the literature referred to there.

While in the Jewish Prayer Book the Messiah does not occupy the position of mediator in the full sense of the word, it is clear that he figures as a unique mediating agent between God and His people. This is as much as one can reasonably expect; for the Jewish Prayer Book is in many respects an adaptation to modern needs, and anything that would seem to play into the hands of Christian dogmatic teaching would necessarily, and from the Jewish point of view quite rightly, be eliminated. As it is, the amount of Christian teaching on many subjects which it contains is extraordinary; we say "Christian teaching" because it is what we, as Christians, teach, though we realize to the full that in doing so we are teaching Judaism; but the truth is that a very great deal of Judaism is accepted by Christianity, since it was what Christ taught. The Christian religion owes infinitely much to Judaism; we would only wish that Jews would recognise that Christianity is in some respects developed Judaism. But where there are points of fundamental difference, such as in the case of Messianic teaching, we may not find fault with the official exponents of Judaism if, in their Liturgy, they have felt constrained to eliminate much concerning the Messiah which is taught in the

Bible and in Rabbinical literature because they believe that it would have a tendency to direct Jews into the channel of Christian thought. On the other hand, we have the right—and we are sure that Jews will concede us the same—we have the right to investigate Judaism as a whole, and of reading into the Jewish Prayer Book much concerning the teaching of the Messiah which it does not visibly contain; or, in other words, we feel that we are justified in studying the Jewish Prayer Book in the light of earlier Jewish teaching. When this is done, it is impossible not to become convinced that Christian teaching concerning the Messiah is the natural and logical development of what is potentionally contained in Judaism.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Teaching antagonistic to the Doctrine of Mediation.

It was pointed out in an earlier chapter that the Jewish Prayer Book contained a good deal which repudiated altogether the idea of Mediation, and this in spite of the comparatively large amount of positive teaching on the subject which figures there. This contradiction, if contradiction it be, will be briefly dealt with in our concluding chapters. Here it is our purpose to illustrate by a few quotations the negative teaching of the Jewish Prayer Book on Mediation.

We saw (Chap. xviii.) that, according to Jewish teaching, Good Works were to be reckoned among those things which *per se* had the power to bring about a right relationship between God and man, and that they thus partook of the nature of a mediating agency. But the following passage from the Morning Service offers another side to this teaching : "Sovereign of all worlds! Not because of our righteous acts do we lay our supplications before thee, but because of thine abundant mercies. What are we? What is our life? What is our piety? What our righteousness?" Later on in the same Service, but in a part which is only used during the ten days of Penitence, occur these words: "Our Father, our King! be gracious unto us and answer us, for we have no good works of our own; deal with us in charity and kindness, and save us." It should, however, be added that, according to the original, this could mean

that since the penitents have no works which they could offer, therefore they throw themselves upon the divine mercy; in this case the passage might be understood to imply that if the works *were* forthcoming their efficacy could be pleaded. But there is no ambiguity in a passage that comes soon after this, according to which it is said: "We do not lay our supplications before thee because of our righteous acts, but because of thine abundant mercies."

Again, we saw (pp. 131 f.) that there were some echoes in the Jewish Prayer Book of the mediatorial function of angels, which, in earlier Jewish theology, was certainly believed in; this is, however, repudiated in the words: "Not in man do I put my trust, nor upon any angel do I rely, but upon the God of Heaven, who is the God of truth . . ."; this is from an act of Praise said on the Morning Service for Sabbath. The mediatorial function of the Messiah seems also repudiated in the following words from the Morning Service: "True it is that thou art indeed the Lord of thy people, and a mighty King to plead their cause. True it is that thou art indeed the first, and thou art the last, and beside thee we have no King, Redeemer, and Saviour." * A pointed denial of Mediatorship is also contained in the words: "We know that we have sinned, and that there is none to stand up in our behalf." A formula which occurs several times in the Jewish Prayer Book runs: "Remember us unto life, O King, who delightest in life, and inscribe us in the book of life, for thine own sake, O living God." This is

* Somewhat similar words occur in several other passages.

not, it is true, necessarily a denial of a doctrine of Mediation, but it points in that direction. More significant is the absence of all reference to Mediation in the words of the penitential hymn for the Morning Service, from which we have already quoted: "Our Father, our King! forgive and pardon all our iniquities. Our Father, our King! blot out our transgressions, and make them pass away from before thine eyes. Our Father, our King! erase in thine abundant mercies all the records of our guilt. . . ." Then, again, the following passage reads almost like an intentional repudiation of Christian doctrine: ". . . From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God; and beside thee we have no King who redeemeth and saveth, setteth free and delivereth, who supporteth and hath mercy in all times of trouble and distress; yea, we have no King but thee." This is said in the Morning Service for Sabbath and Festivals; and the same thought occurs in the Additional Service for these in the words: "He is our God; there is none else; in truth he is our King; there is none besides him; as it is written in his Law . . . there is none else." And, once more, in the Prayers before retiring to rest at night it is said: "And he is One, and there is no second to compare to him, to consort with him."

But, perhaps, that which most clearly witnesses to the non-belief in a Mediator between God and men is the frequent prayer for divine pardon for sin directly, without the mention of any intermediate intercessor; this is where the difference between Judaism and Christianity on the subject of Mediation in the Jewish Prayer Book becomes most manifest. A few examples of this must

close our survey:—"Blessed art thou, O Lord, thou King, who pardonest and forgivest our iniquities and the iniquities of thy people, the house of Israel, and makest our trespasses to pass away year by year" (Morning Service for Sabbath and Festivals). At the beginning of the Service for the Day of Atonement it is said: ". . . He will turn again and have mercy upon us; he will subdue our iniquities. And thou wilt cast all our sins into the depths of the sea," and so often in this Service. In the Concluding Service for the Day of Atonement the same teaching is emphasized in a passage which has additional interest, because it witnesses to the inefficacy of sacrifices: "Thou givest a hand to transgressors, and thy right hand is stretched out to receive the penitent. . . . Endless would be the fire offerings required for our guilt, and numberless the sweet savours for our trespasses; but thou knowest that our latter end is the worm, and hast, therefore, multiplied the means of our forgiveness." The whole passage is of great beauty, and affords an excellent example of what one may call the "liturgical faculty" which is so characteristic of the Jews.

The passages given above do not, of course, exhaust all that could be given; but it may be claimed, we think, that they fairly represent the most pointed ones which are antagonistic to the doctrine of Mediation.

THE MODERN JEWISH ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE DOCTRINE OF MEDIATION.

In considering the modern Jewish attitude towards the doctrine of Mediation, our method of procedure will differ from that hitherto pursued. The various classes of literature which have been referred to in the preceding pages are all recognized universally as original authorities, they can be appealed to as constituting authoritative sources, they stretch over a period of many centuries, and on the main point under consideration, they offer a long chain of evidence which is not greatly affected by a certain amount of antagonistic teaching. The *data*, when once gathered, are easy to handle, their classification is a simple matter. It is very different when one comes to deal with the subject in modern Jewish literature; there is no unanimity as to what is authoritative, the literature extends over a short period, the *data* are difficult to gather, there is an intangibility about the whole matter. Most people would probably be inclined to say that the question is an exceedingly simple one, inasmuch as in modern Judaism there is no doctrine of Mediation, and this is true; nevertheless the following facts have to be borne in mind: Orthodox Jews cling to their Liturgy, and as we have seen, there is, at the very least, a definite doctrine of Mediation taught there; Orthodox Jews regard the Talmud as a final appeal in matters of belief, and in both *Mishna* and *Gemara* there is a great mass of teaching on Mediation, as has already

been pointed out; and again, Orthodox Jews have the greatest veneration and love for the *Torah*, the core of which is the Pentateuch, (though it has come to mean something wider as well,)* and it is not easy to get away from the fact that the doctrine of Mediatorship is, at the very least, adumbrated there. This being so, it is clear that Orthodox Jews will be chary of repudiating the teaching of the Bible, the Talmud, and the Liturgy; and it is here, therefore, that the interest of our present subject comes in; for, as we shall see, Orthodox Jews do not repudiate any of these authorities, it is in their interpretation of the teaching which these contain that Orthodox Jews differ from the interpretation which Christians would give.

But the explaining away (the expression is not meant unkindly, but it is difficult to know what other to use) of much of the teaching in Bible and Talmud, and yet accepting the authority of these, has appeared to many intellectual Jews as illogical; it is more logical, though certainly somewhat drastic, to refuse to regard the Law, or *Torah*, as finally authoritative, and binding; and this is the position which has been taken up by what is known as "Reform Judaism." Both Orthodox and "Reform" Jews believe in Judaism, but while the former cling to the Law, the latter repudiate this; it is a question as to whether Judaism is a legal religion or not; and obviously this constitutes a difference which is fundamental. The attitude of the Reform Jews towards the idea of Mediation will, therefore, also require some notice.

* "The Torah is not merely the Law (Pentateuch), it is the whole body of revealed truth and doctrine," Abrahams' *Festival Studies*, p. 26 (1906).

"The pivot of the opposition between Reform and Conservative Judaism is the conception of Israel's destiny. Jewish Orthodoxy looks upon Palestine not merely as the cradle, but also as the ultimate home of Judaism. With its possession is connected the possibility of fulfilling the Law, those parts of Divine legislation being unavoidably suspended that are conditioned by the existence of the Temple, and by the occupation of the Holy Land. Away from Palestine, the Jew is compelled to violate God's Will in regard to these. God gave the Law; God decreed also Israel's dispersion. To reconcile this disharmony between the demands of the Law and historically developed actuality, the philosophy of Orthodoxy regards the impossibility of observing the Law as a Divine punishment, visited upon Israel on account of its sins. Israel is at the present moment in exile; it has been expelled from its land. The present period is thus one of probation. The length of its duration God alone can know and determine. Israel is doomed to wait patiently in exile, praying and hoping for the coming of the Messiah, who will lead the dispersed back to Palestine. There, under His benign rule, the Temple will re-arise, the sacrificial and sacerdotal scheme will again become active, and Israel, once more an independent nation, will be able to observe to the letter the law of God as contained in the Pentateuch."†

But as always happens when a cleavage has thus caused separation, attempts at bridging over the chasm are not wanting; and there are signs within modern Judaism of the formation of an intermediate position between Orthodox and "Reform" Judaism. The attitude of these semi-Reform Jews towards the principle of Mediation will also be deserving of a short consideration.

The question naturally arises, whence are the *data* to be gathered for information upon the subject? As has been already remarked, the gathering of such *data* is not an easy matter on account of the lack of sources

† *Jewish Encycl.* X. 3476.

which are to be regarded as official and authoritative; we must therefore have recourse to works which, if not official, may at all events be claimed as voicing fairly and fully the tenets of the particular type of Judaism which they represent. Other books will be incidentally referred to, but in the main the three following works will be utilized as text-books: as representing Orthodox Judaism, M. Friedländer's, *The Jewish Religion*, 2nd ed. (1900); as representing semi-Reform Judaism, Morris Joseph's *Judaism as Creed and Life* (1903)*; and, as representing Reform Judaism, C. G. Montefiore's *Liberal Judaism* (1903). These will be referred to by the names of their respective authors. The quotations from these works which we shall give will be somewhat full, but in justice to the writers themselves, and in order to avoid the risk of misrepresenting them, it is best to give their words with the context.

---

* A second edition of this work has just been published, but it is the first edition we have utilized.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Orthodox Judaism and the Doctrine of Mediation.

i. *The Doctrine of God.*

The Jews have no formal Creed in the Christian sense of the word, but as Dr. Friedländer (pp. 13 f.) points out, "it became necessary to formulate the truths taught in the Bible, when disputes arose as to their meaning and to their validity. The Mishnah, therefore, declares certain opinions as non-Jewish and contrary to the teaching of the Divine Word. Later on, when controversies multiplied between the various sections of the Jewish nation, as well as between Jews and Christians, and Jews and Mohammedans, it was found most important to settle the forms and arrangement of our beliefs. Moses Maimonides, the great religious philosopher, taught, in his Commentary on the Mishnah, thirteen Principles of faith, which found general acceptance among the Jews, and are known as the Thirteen Principles." These Thirteen Principles, formulated in the twelfth century, A.D., have been incorporated in the Jewish Prayer Book, and constitute the nearest approach to a formal Creed of Judaism.* The Second Principle is as follows :—

> "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His Name, is a Unity, and that there is no unity in any manner like unto His, and that He alone is our God, Who was, is, and will be."

* It exists in prose and poetry.

Dr. Friedländer, in expanding and explaining this Principle, says that the belief in the Unity of God is "the belief that the Being Who is the cause of everything in existence is One; not like the unity of a group or class, composed of a certain number of individuals, or the unity of one individual consisting of various constituent elements, or the unity of one simple thing which is divisible *ad infinitum*, but as a unity, the like of which does not exist." Whatever other non-Jewish forms of belief it is intended to repudiate here, it is certain that the Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity is included among them, and therefore also, by implication, the Mediatorial function of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.

ii. *The Law.*

The eighth and ninth Principles are as follows:—

> "I believe with perfect faith that the whole Law, now in our possession, is the same that was given to Moses our teacher, peace be unto him."
>
> "I believe with perfect faith that this Law will not be changed, and that there will never be any other law from the Creator, blessed be His Name."

By the "Law," as already pointed out, is meant, in the first instance and primarily, the Pentateuch, including the historical as well as the legal portions.* Now we have seen that in the cases of Abraham and Moses (and we might have added Phineas, see Num. xxv. 10-13) there are instances in which the principle of Mediatorship is dis-

* It has a wider meaning as well, but is used by Maimonides in the restricted sense here.

tinctly adumbrated, if nothing more *; the whole-hearted acceptance of the Law, therefore, on the part of Orthodox Judaism would seem to demand also the acceptance of this principle which is taught there. Again, in the Law is included the whole of the sacrificial system, underlying which is the principle of Mediation†; and some of the technical terms in connexion with sacrifices emphasise the implicit acceptation of the principle of Mediation on the part of the writer or writers of the Pentateuch.

How does Orthodox Judaism deal with this subject? It will be best to see first the way in which the two Principles, quoted above, concerning the Law are understood and explained by Dr. Friedländer in his Manual. "The whole Torah," he says, "including both history and precepts, is of Divine origin; nothing is contained in the Torah that was not revealed to Moses by the Almighty, although we do not know in what manner Moses received the information" (p. 134).

In regard to the other Principle quoted, he says that by it "Jews pronounce their belief in the immutability of the Law."

Upon the mediatorial functions of Abraham and Moses nothing is said, but the regarding the sacrificial system Dr. Friedländer has much to say:

"What was the main idea that prompted man to bring an offering to the Almighty? He felt, as it were, the existence of a higher Being, the Creator and Ruler of all things; he was conscious that his own life and welfare depended on the Will of the Being to whom in

* See Chapter i.
† See Chapter ii.

reality everything belongs that man believes himself to possess and enjoy. In order to give expression to this feeling of allegiance, man brought the first and best of what he had acquired to the true Owner, and thus introduced himself by such gifts as a faithful subject who is anxious to merit the favour of his Master. That which was first introduced by man voluntarily, was afterwards sanctioned and regulated by Divine command" (pp. 414). Later on Dr. Friedländer continues: "Great stress is laid on the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice upon the altar. 'The blood,' the Law says, 'is the soul of all flesh; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for the soul' (Lev. xvii. 11). We are thus reminded that, in so far as the animal life is concerned, the pre-eminence of man over the beast is nought, and yet the Creator gave us the right to shed the blood of animals in order to save our life. Why? Because man has a higher mission to fulfil; he has been created in the image of God" (p. 416). The object and reason of sacrifices here given seem somewhat inadequate, especially in view of the abundant instruction on the subject offered in the Torah itself. It is, however, of much interest to note that Orthodox Jews believe so firmly in the permanent character of the sacrificial system that they look forward to a time when it will again be fully observed. Dr. Friedländer says: "With the destruction of the Temple sacrifices ceased; with the Restoration of Israel and the Re-building of the Temple the Sacrificial Service will likewise be resumed (cf. Mal. iii. 4). There are persons who believe that the Sacrificial Service, implying much

anthropomorphism, could not have been intended to be permanent, and that it was only a concession made to the fashion and the low degree of culture of the age. Those who reject sacrifices on this account must also reject prayer, which is likewise based on a certain degree of anthropomorphism, though less strikingly than sacrifice. If the law concerning offerings were only intended for a certain age, such limitation would have been indicated in the Law. In the absence of such indication we have no right to criticise the Word of God, and to think that we are too advanced in culture to obey the Divine commands. . . . On the other hand, the revival of the Sacrificial Service must be sanctioned by the Divine voice of a prophet. The mere acquisition of the Temple Mount, or of all Palestine by Jews, by war, or political combinations, or purchase, would not justify the revival. It is only the return of the Jews to Palestine, and the rebuilding of the Temple by Divine command, and by Divine intervention, that will be followed by the restoration of the Sacrificial Service. And however contrary the slaughter of animals, the sprinkling of their blood, and the burning of their flesh be to our taste, we ought to look forward with eagerness and pleasure for the revival of the full Temple Service as an event that will enable us to do the Will of the Almighty revealed in the Torah" (pp. 416f.).

It is clear, therefore, that Orthodox Judaism accepts the Law as Divine, and regards its precepts as permanently binding; but it holds that the sacrificial system does not involve the principle of Mediation. An explanation of the real object of sacrifices is not forth-

coming in Dr. Friedländer's book, for to say that these were instituted merely in order to give expression to a feeling of allegiance on the part of man towards the true Owner of all things is simply to ignore the teaching of Scripture.

But we have not yet done with the Law. We have so far only referred to the *Written Law;* but Orthodox Judaism has much to say about the *Oral Law.* Dr. Friedländer says: "Many explanations and details of the laws were supplemented by oral teaching; they were handed down by word of mouth from generation to generation, and only after the destruction of the second Temple were they committed to writing. The latter are, nevertheless, called Oral Law, as distinguished from the Torah or Written Law, which from the first was committed to writing. Those oral laws which were revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai are called "Laws given to Moses on Mount Sinai"* . . . The Oral Law, or the Tradition, has been handed down in two different forms: *(a)* in the form of a running Commentary on the Pentateuch; such Commentaries are called *Midrashim; (b)* arranged according to the different subjects, and treated independently of the text of the Torah. This is done in the *Talmud*" (pp. 136 f.).

* Cp. with this Mr. C. G. Montefiore's words: "Thus there are really two divine laws: one contained in the Pentateuch; one forming the substratum of the subsequently written and codified Rabbinical legislation. Few educated persons would venture nowadays to put in any plea for the Mosaic origin of any of the Rabbinical ordinances, yet official and orthodox Judaism is still bound to the *observance* of these ordinances" (p. 92).

(1) *Midrash* means "exposition" or "exegesis." The Midrashic literature consists, generally speaking, of two classes, the *Midrash* (a) *Halakah*, of a legal character, and the *Midrash Haggadah*, of a (b) more popular kind. The *Midrashim* of the former category are: *Mechilta* ("Measure"), a commentary on Exod. xii.—xxiii. 19, xxxii. 12-17, xxxv. 1-3; *Sifra* ("The Book"), on Leviticus; *Sifre* ("Books"), on Num. v.—xxxvi., and Deuteronomy. These, in their original written form, go back to the earlier part of the second century A.D. Of the latter class are the following: *Bereshith Rabba*, on Genesis, and commentaries on the five *Megilloth* ("Rolls"), viz., Lamentations, Canticles, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Esther; *Wayyikra Rabba*, on Leviticus; *Debarim Rabba*, on Deuteronomy; *Bemidbar Rabba*, on Numbers; and *Shemoth Rabba*, on Exodus. These last ten works go by the comprehensive name of *Rabboth*.*

(2) The *Talmud* ("Learning") exists in two recensions, the Jerusalem and the Babylonian, of which the latter is the more important. There are two elements in the *Talmud*, first the *Mishnah* (lit. "Repetition"), which is a commentary on the text of Scripture, and secondly the *Gemara* ("Completion"), which is a commentary on and expansion of the *Mishnah*.

We have seen above† what abundant teaching on Mediation there is in this Rabbinical literature; but in spite of the fact that Orthodox Judaism accepts this as authoritative, it lays no stress on its teaching on the subject of Mediation.

iii. *The Messiah.*

The Twelfth Principle runs:

> "I believe with perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah, and, though He tarry, I will wait daily for His coming."

Dr. Friedländer writes as follows on this Principle: "All the attributes of Messiah are those of a human

* See further below, *Appendix*.

† Chapters vii.—xv.

being in his highest possible perfection. No superhuman qualities are ascribed to Him; all His glory, all His success is dependent on the Will of God. He is an ideal man, and an ideal king, but no more; if miracles are to be wrought, it is not Messiah who will perform them, but God, Who will act wondrously for Messiah and Israel. The advent of Messiah is not expected to change the nature of man, much less the course of the world around us. The only change we expect is that the Unity of God will be acknowledged universally, and that justice and righteousness will flourish over all the earth. Those who believe in a superhuman nature of Messiah are guilty of idolatry" (p. 160). Further on in his book Dr. Friedländer says: "The belief in the coming of Messiah in some future time has been, like the belief in the Unity of God, the source of vexatious disputations between Jews and non-Jews. Mohammedans and Christians tried by all means in their power to convince the Jews that the Anointed whose advent was prophesied by the Prophets, had already appeared, the former pointing to Mohammed, the latter to Jesus, as the person realizing those predictions. The Biblical passages adduced as evidence, prove nothing of the kind . . . Christians quoted passages from Isaiah, which had no reference whatever to Messiah in evidence of the Messianity of Jesus . . . the sufferings and final relief of the servant of the Lord, that is Israel (Chaps. lii. and liii.), were applied to Jesus" (pp. 225 f.). In reference to this passage from Isaiah, it is interesting to note what Dr. Friedländer has to say on the subject of vicarious atonement. "Of this we are certain, if death

is punishment, that everyone dies for his own sin. This theory is so frequently repeated in the Bible that it is surprising how the theory of vicarious death and vicarious atonement could be considered as harmonizing with the teaching of the Bible. We are taught that God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation; but at the same time we are told that the children are only punished if they repeat the sins of their fathers, and even then only for their own sins. It has been asserted that Isaiah in chap liii. assumes the principle of vicarious atonement. That this is not the case we can easily see if we turn from the Anglican Version to the original Hebrew, and translate it literally and in accordance with the context. Isaiah, in describing the future glory of the servant of the Lord (=Israel), tells us what those people who oppress Israel will then feel and how they will give expression to their feeling of shame and regret, saying, 'Surely he hath borne griefs caused by us, and carried, sorrows caused by us: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded through our transgressions, bruised through our iniquities.' Sin-offerings were brought, but not as a vicarious atonement, although the sinner might well have felt that he himself deserved the treatment endured by the sacrifice. The sin-offering could not have been a vicarious atonement, as it was not offered when the sin was committed knowingly" (p. 224). With this last statement we are not here concerned*, nor yet with the

* See pp. 22 ff. above.

rendering of the Hebrew of Is. liii. 4, 5, given above, though we should have liked to have had Dr. Friedländer's translation and explanation of verses 8 and 10; but it is worth while noting the fact that in asserting that the "Servant of the Lord" is equivalent to Israel, Dr. Friedländer is not altogether in accord with the earliest, and what presumably reflects the most authoritative Jewish exegesis; for in the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel to the Prophets, Is. liii. is explained in such a way that the passages which refer to the humiliation of the Servant are interpreted of the people of Israel, while those which speak of the glory of the Servant, are referred to the Messiah.* Our main point, however, is that the mediatorial function of the Messiah, as witnessed to in the Old Testament, the Targum, in Rabbinical Literature, and to a modified extent in the Jewish Prayer Book, is altogether repudiated by this exponent of Orthodox Judaism.

It may be well, finally, to supplement these extracts from Dr. Friedländer's work by a quotation from a recently published volume from the pen of Dr. Adler, the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire; in his *Anglo-Jewish Memories* he has a sermon on "The Jewish Doctrine of Atonement," in which the modern Orthodox Jewish attitude regarding the doctrine of Mediation is clearly and explicitly stated. Dr. Adler says (pp. 243 f.): "Is it in the power of any human being to obtain forgiveness for the sin committed by his fellow? Let us turn to a memorable incident

* See also pp. 56, 57 above.

recorded in the Bible. The wrath of the Almighty was roused against His people Israel, for they had set at nought His behests, and had made themselves an idol of gold, and worshipped it. Moses, deeply grieved, cries to the people, 'Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up to the Lord; peradventure I will make an atonement for your sin' (Exod. xxxii. 30). The great leader was ready to sacrifice himself for his nation. He prays to God: 'Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written.' Did the Lord accept this vicarious atonement? No. He said unto Moses: 'Whosoever has sinned against Me, him will I blot out from My book.' These words enunciate the doctrine, that every man is accountable to God for his own actions, and cannot release himself from his individual responsibility by the intercession of another person, however great. We require no Mediator to save us from the effects of our guilt. Our own sincere repentance suffices to achieve for us Divine forgiveness."

We trust we may be pardoned for making two comments upon these words of Dr. Adler; for though the object of the present writer in writing these pages is not controversial, sometimes a word or two, if only in justification of one's own position, seems demanded. In reference to the words above: "The great leader was ready to sacrifice himself for his nation. He prays to God. . . . Did the Lord accept this vicarious atonement? No,"—the point at issue is not so much as to whether or not the Lord accepted the vicarious atonement,

but the fact that it *was* offered. Dr. Adler distinctly affirms that it was offered. And by whom was it offered? By Israel's greatest teacher, by the man to whom God revealed the *Torah*, by the man who, with perhaps the exception of Abraham, is more venerated by Hebrews than any other who has ever lived. Was it a wrong suggestion of his, that of vicarious atonement? There is no hint to this effect; the text says that God refused the offer; if it had been unjustified would it have passed unrebuked? So far from being antagonistic to the doctrine of Mediation, this passage is the very reverse; we have the authority of Israel's greatest teacher and law-giver in favour of that doctrine. Dr. Adler says further, in the passage quoted: "These words enunciate the doctrine, that every man is accountable to God for his own actions, and cannot release himself from his individual responsibility by the intercession of another person, however great;" even if the words referred to could be made to bear the meaning claimed, which, as we have shown, they cannot do, it is fair to ask Dr. Adler how he can reconcile what he says with the passage Gen. xviii. 16-33? Here we have, in the first place, Abraham's intercession for the men of Sodom, and in reply to his prayer God is represented as saying: "If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then will I spare all the place for their sake" (verse 26); Abraham's intercession continues until ultimately God says: "I will not destroy it for ten's sake" (verse 32). The intercessory prayer of Abraham, and the righteousness of ten men were the means, or mediating element, by which all the sinners in the city would have been saved from the

effects of their guilt; that is the plain and obvious meaning of the passage. Dr. Adler's words are not in agreement with this meaning.

It would not be difficult to show that various other assertions which Dr. Adler makes in the pages of his book, referred to, are not in accordance with sound Biblical exegesis; but we are not concerned with this here.

Our main business has been to set forth the attitude of modern Orthodox Judaism towards the doctrine of Mediation, and we are convinced that this has been stated truly, namely that modern Orthodox Judaism repudiates it *in toto*. We have no right to find fault with that; what we do marvel at and consider illogical is that Orthodox Judaism should recognise the authority of the *Torah* and of the *Talmud*, and yet repudiate the doctrine of Mediation (we do not say Mediatorship, in the Christian sense) which, as we have attempted to show in the preceding pages, is distinctly taught in each.

CHAPTER XXV.

The Attitude of Reform Judaism towards the Doctrine of Mediation.

i. *The Law.*—The attitude of Orthodox Judaism towards any form of a doctrine of Mediation is, as we have attempted to show, illogical, inasmuch as it repudiates this doctrine *in toto*, while it accepts as authoritative the Bible and the Talmud in which the doctrine is distinctly taught. Reform Judaism cannot be taxed with being illogical in this respect, for it frankly repudiates the authority of both Bible and Talmud. "We have to remember," says Mr. Claude Montefiore*, "that Judaism as a living religion is not contained in any book or expressed in any document, but that it is the religion professed by Jews, just as Christianity is the religion professed by Christians" (p. 2). A little later on he says: " . . . In the ordinary Jewish prayer-books there is a document which is called the 'Thirteen Principles of the Faith,' and in a footnote these principles are called

* An orthodox Jewish writer of wide reading and enlightened culture says, in writing about Mr. Montefiore's book, that "Mr. Montefiore will have found a number of people to agree with him, and most of them, it is fair to assume, will be willing to accept his language as an adequate expression of their thought. n this sense, and, without violating Mr. Montefiore's claim to speak about 'that particular and individualized form of Liberal Judaism' which he himself happens to hold, Liberal Judaism, as he interprets it, may be taken as a definite conception corresponding to a definite set of opinions, which are shared by a definite section of the community." L. Magnus, '*Religio Laici' Judaica ; the Faith of a Jewish Layman*, p. 2 (1907).

'Articles of the Jewish Creed.' Is not Judaism these articles? Certainly not. Judaism as a living religion is not any series of articles, but a state of the mind; if there were no Jews, there would be no Judaism" (p. 7). Still more pointedly does he remark: "The liberal Jew cannot regard the Law as the centre of Jewish belief and practice. If he was founding a public service *de novo*, he would not make the reading of the Law its central and most important feature. If he were building a synagogue, without reference to past custom, he would not put scrolls of the Law into an ark, and make that ark the most sacred part of the building. If he had such an ark, he would put in it the prophecies of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, rather than the Pentateuch, for the Prophets are more primary and more essential than the Law" (p. 125); "the prominent references to the Law in the liturgy can easily be given a new and different meaning by 'liberal' worshippers. To them the Law is no longer the Pentateuch, but the Moral Law, before whose majesty all men must bow . . ." (p. 166). One can quite understand the words of a very thoughtful Orthodox Jew who says in reference to such tenets: "The most cherished feelings of the conservative Jew are outraged by such hypotheses."* At the same time, it is only fair to point out that Mr. Montefiore protests against the idea of cutting himself off from the past, he recognizes in Judaism a historical religion to which everyone who calls himself a Jew must be linked:

* L. Magnus, *Op. cit.* p. 10.

"Though a man's personal religion is not what he has read about religion, but what he himself believes, feels and experiences, it is doubtful how far anyone could rightly be called a Jew who knew *nothing* of the past history of Judaism. It is clear that he must somehow be linked on to the past; he cannot start with an absolutely clean slate, devise his own religion, and call it Judaism. He must therefore possess a certain *minimum of knowledge.* This minimum he may have obtained either orally, from parents, teachers, or environment, or through books. No man, in sheer loneliness, or independence, creates his own religion. He is a link in a long and very strange chain which stretches back to vague beginnings. . . . For Judaism and Christianity are historical religions; and there are certain periods of their history which are of special or even of supreme importance. They are also literary and documentary religions; the story of their foundation and early growth is recorded in a particular book—the 'Bible'; and part of the religion of every Jew or every Christian to-day is the view he takes and the belief he holds about this particular book" (pp. 14 f.). But we gather from many passages of Mr. Montefiore's book that every man is justified in accepting as much or as little of the Bible as he chooses, that the importance of the various books of the Bible depends solely upon each individual's personal interpretation of their meaning, that if the original and obvious meaning of a passage does not commend itself, one must put another meaning on to it more consonant with individual taste*—in a word, that Holy Scripture is

* See, *e.g.*, pp. 126, 133, 163, 164, 166.

not authoritative. We are not finding fault with this attitude, though we may disagree with it, all we want to do is to make clear the relative positions of Orthodox and Reform Judaism with regard to their attitude towards the sources of Judaism; and it will be clear from the passages quoted that Reform Judaism, as represented by Mr. Montefiore (and that he is its foremost exponent is universally recognized) is entirely at variance with Orthodox Judaism on this subject of the authority of the Law, and Scripture generally, let alone the Oral Law as contained in *Midrash*, *Mishnah*, and *Gemara*.

ii. *Atonement and Mediatorship.*—What then are Mr. Montefiore's ideas on Mediation and on that which is inseparable from it, namely Atonement? The following passage is very instructive on this point: "Man is liable to sin. Is the ultimate reason of this that it was only through sin that human goodness could have been attained? Vile sins have been committed at every date in man's history, by Christians, by Jews, by believers, and by unbelievers. But man can also attain to a high degree of holiness and purity. He may attain to it gradually without any crisis or sudden change; he may also cease to be a 'sinner,' and become almost suddenly a 'saint'. But, in either case, there will have been room and necessity for the mental and spiritual phenomenon of *repentance*.

The desired result of repentance is atonement. Man wishes to feel at one with God, reconciled to Him. This atonement can be conceived both outwardly and

inwardly. Outward atonement is the feeling that God has 'forgiven' our sins. If we desire this feeling merely to avoid the *punishment* of our sins, then the outwardness reaches a low religious ebb. In such a case God is merely regarded as supreme power, and not as ideal perfection, or the Good. The desired feeling may, however, shade off into the higher wish that God may be at peace with us in order that we may feel at peace with Him. In this way the outward atonement becomes inward. In old days the outward atonement was an intense reality, and it did not cease to be a reality when the inward atonement was also desired likewise. But we no longer pray for outward atonement to-day, partly because we do not believe that God is ever 'angry' or 'unreconciled' in a merely human sense of the word, partly because we are convinced that in this life, or in any future life, we shall only suffer for our sins what it is good *for us*, what it is our highest interest, to suffer. In this respect the doctrine of Plato, as enunciated in the Gorgias, has completely triumphed.

But we do desire inward peace—to feel at one with God and reconciled to Him. This we can obtain through repentance. Repentance lies partly in our own power, and yet we do well to pray: 'Help us to repent.' God, in human language, inclines Himself to us as we strain forward towards Him. By a law of His being which we can never hope, and which we do not need to understand, He, as it were, imparts of Himself to us if we honestly and eagerly desire to be at one with Him. Reconciliation is neither purely human nor purely divine. It is both in one. . . . Atonement, then, according to this

Jewish teaching, is a matter between God and ourselves. On the one side is man, aspiring, struggling, sinning and repenting; on the other side is God, immutable, righteous, and alone. Between them and their dealings with each other there is neither intercessor nor barrier. God, the eternal giver, is ever ready to receive us. The streams of His influence are ever issuing forth from Him; it is for man to put himself by effort and repentance into an attitude in which he can partake of this influence and move forward by means of it" (pp. 45 ff.). We have quoted this passage at length because it states so clearly the position of Reform Judaism regarding its attitude towards the doctrine of Mediation; it is an attitude which is perfectly logical, and one which Christians can fully appreciate, as far as it goes; the only thing which Christians may reasonably ask is as to wherein it differs from ordinary Unitarianism? What right has "Reform Judaism" to this name seeing that it has cut itself off from historical Judaism in every particular excepting in such as are common to other monotheistic faiths? It is very true to say that in those points of doctrine which other monotheistic faiths have in common with Judaism they show their indebtedness to Judaism; and it might, therefore, be argued that Unitarianism, for example, should rather profess itself, in name, to be specifically Jewish than that Reform Judaism should repudiate its present nomenclature. But to this it may be replied that the *claim* in either case is different; Unitarians would claim to hold their beliefs because they are true, not for the reason that they came through the medium of the Jews; Reform Jews, as their name implies, claim that

they hold their beliefs because these have been handed down by the Jews. In the former case, Unitarians justify their non-use of the name of Judaism, in the latter, Reform Jews can scarcely be said to justify their name on the grounds given, for much which they repudiate almost all that Orthodox Jews hold dear; they have nothing of those things which specifically differentiate Judaism from other monotheistic faiths.* That Orthodox Jews do not consider the term "Reform Judaism" justified may be gathered from the words of an Orthodox Jewish writer (already quoted) who is very far from being obscurantist; in speaking of the existence of Liberal or Reform Judaism as opposed to Orthodox Judaism, he says: "It means all that is implied, in journalistic language, by a 'parting of the ways,' and a 'crisis' in affairs. It means that the Jewish community of England † is dividing itself into two camps, the orthodox and reform, or the Conservative and Liberal, or the old and the new. . . . Can the old beliefs put on their new clothes? Can the Jew who conscientiously rejects the tradition of the inspiration of the Pentateuch attend the same public worship as the Jew who conscientiously accepts it? Nay more, can the same name 'Jew' continue to include them both?" ‡

This is, however, a digression. While the difference between Orthodox and Reform Judaism is fundamental

* Mr. Montefiore deals with this subject on pp. 86ff., but unsatisfactorily, as it seems to us.

† And, it might be added, of the Continent, and of America.

‡ L. Magnus *Op. cit.* p. 3.

in many respects, both will be agreed upon Mr. Montefiore's statement of the difference between Judaism and Christianity regarding the main subject under discussion; he says: "Nor are the differences between Judaism and Christianity merely differences of dogma upon abstruse technicalities of metaphysical theology. They touch the religious life of the individual. Both sides would agree to this, and Christians would say that only they fully know the Father who know the Son, and that the blessedness of redemption in and through Christ constitutes a religious joy and a religious experience deeper and more glorious than can be known to the members of any other faith. And Jews would say that none can feel so near to God as those who in their communion with Him recognise and require no intercessor and no mediator. Judaism (whatever it may have been in the past) * is now a religion without priests: no mystic rites or words intervene or mediate between man and God. When we are told that the Jewish God is distant, we smile with astonishment at the strange accusation. So near is He, that He needs no Son to bring Him nearer to us, no intercessor to reconcile Him with us, or us with Him. The child needs no one to bring him into the very presence of the Father" (p. 56). This passage will, from the Christian point of view, be seen to be an illustration of what was said in our Introduction (pp. 1, 2), that two conceptions lie at the root of the religious doctrine of

* Orthodox Judaism would add: "And whatever it may be in the future," see p. 150 above.

Mediation, namely, The Idea of God, and the Sense of Sin. According as to whether the conception of God is exalted, according as to whether the sense of Sin is deep, so will the intensity of the need of a Mediator between God and man assert itself. Moreover, in accordance with man's realization of the Personality of God and his recognition of his own sinfulness, so will be the ideas which he formulates concerning the person and work of such a Mediator.

iii. *The Day of Atonement.*—In view of the teaching of the Old Testament and Orthodox Judaism on the meaning and observance of the Day of Atonement, it will be of interest to see what attitude Reform Judaism takes up in regard to it. Mr. Montefiore first administers a deserved rebuke—a rebuke which every good Jew, whether Orthodox or Reform would echo—to those whose observance of this day is a mere superstition ; he says : " There are some persons who only come to Synagogue once a year, on the Day of Atonement. They would not eat or drink anything on that day for all the world ! Why do they come to Synagogue once a year ? Because they are silly enough to think that by this annual rite they may ward off some of the consequences of misspent lives and evil deeds. They have to learn the stern lesson, whether in this world or another, that the consequences of evil cannot be changed or diverted by any magic or ceremonial. Already the early Rabbis had found it necessary to say, 'They who think in their hearts, I will sin, for the Day of Atonement will bring me forgiveness—for them the Day of Atonement brings no forgiveness' " (p. 162). The fact illustrates the truth

that even the most careless men will sometimes be led to seek some means of reconciliation with God. Mr. Montefiore goes on to describe the ideas of Reform Judaism on the subject in saying that "the modern Day of Atonement is purely spiritual. It is true that most Jews still fast for twenty-four hours, but no one ascribes any efficacy to the fast.* It is an old custom, which does no particular harm, and is an exercise of self-control. . . . In every other respect, the day has only to do with fundamental religious ideas, with the conception of sin, repentance, reconciliation, and atonement. Such a day is absolutely fitted and useful for every human soul. It is as sacred and holy a day for the liberal as for the orthodox, for reformer as for conservative. . . . We celebrate the day because we *do* believe that God helps us to conquer sin, because we *do* believe that this help will come to us more powerfully, if on our part by prayer, by repentance, by communion, we strain and struggle to receive it. We *do* believe that the Divine element in us can be quickened and stimulated partly by our own effort, and partly by the grace of God. We *do* believe that by these means a sense of holy calm, a conviction of nearness and reconciliation, may come to us, which may make the day *for us* a very Day of Atonement. For atonement is a far more living conception and ideal to us than forgiveness. We do not ask that our past sins may be forgiven in the sense that their effects may be cancelled, for that is impossible; we do

* But see the quotations on pp. 108f.

not ask that our sins should not meet their punishment, for even if the request had any meaning, we can only regard punishment as disciplinal and advantageous. All we can and do ask for is better insight, purer faith, fuller strength. We want to grow in holiness of life, and in the love of God. For this we ask God's help, for this end we try by earnest prayer to realise better the true vileness of sin, how it separates us from God, and weakens and defiles us; for this end only we make repentance and seek atonement. Surely a day which is used for purposes such as these is suited for all . . . " (pp. 162 ff.).

iv. *The Messiah.*—Finally, we must see what Reform Judaism teaches us about the Messiah, for, as we have had occasion to see, both in the Old Testament and in later Judaism, there is a very close connexion between the doctrine of Mediation and the Messiah. Mr. Montefiore says : " The whole doctrine of the Messiah no longer concerns our religious life and aspirations. We do, indeed, believe in the conception of the Messianic age, or, at any rate in the optimistic faith which underlies it. We believe that God rules the world, and that He means it to become not worse, but better. But we no longer believe in a personal *Messiah*, who will lead back the Jews to Palestine, and exercise the sway and power of conqueror and King. From the visions and the faith of liberal Jews, to whom Judaism is a religion, and the Jews are not a nation but a religious community, such a belief has wholly disappeared " (pp. 176 f.). That is all the teaching on the Messiah which Reform Judaism offers ; its repudiation of all idea of a *personal*

Messiah differentiates it in an essential and vital particular from historic Judaism, and is in itself sufficient to justify the assertion that the name 'Reform *Judaism*' is a misnomer. It is true that some Reform Jews regard the idea of the Messianic Age as a figurative expression for any time of prosperity and well-being, but this is probably the same as what Mr. Montefiore means when he says that "we no longer believe in a *personal* Messiah."*

This, then is the attitude of Reform Judaism towards the doctrine of Mediation, and those subjects closely connected with it.

---

* This is somewhat after the manner of the author of the *Book of Jubilees*, excepting that in this work the time of prosperity and well-being is brought about and conditioned by the observance of the Law. See the remarks in the *Appendix* below, on the *Book of Jubilees*.

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Attitude of semi-Reform Judaism towards the Doctrine of Mediation.

In discussing the attitude of semi-Reform Judaism towards the Doctrine of Mediation we take as our text-book, Mr. Morris Joseph's work, *Judaism as Creed and Life*; and it may be confidently asserted that this book admirably represents the views of that large body of Jews—an increasingly large body, as it seems—who have, on the one hand, a love and a veneration for historic Judaism, and on the other, a conviction that the advance of modern knowledge necessitates a restatement of the historic faith and a modification of ancient practice more in accordance with the tendencies and requirements of the age. Mr. Abrahams, the Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge, says of this book that "it is the best presentation, extant in any language, of Judaism from a standpoint which does justice alike to tradition and to progressive thought."*

In his Preface Mr. Morris Joseph explains that the view of Judaism which he sets forth "lies midway between the *Shulchan Aruch*,† or at least the Talmud, as

* *The Jewish Chronicle*, Nov. 5, 1909, p. 23.

† The *Shulchan Aruch* (by Joseph Caro, latter half of 16. cen.) means "Prepared Table," and is a codification of Talmudic law. It contains in clear and definite form all ritual and legal directions which, in accordance with Rabbinical Judaism, have been observed since the

the final authority in Judaism, and the extreme Liberalism which, setting little store by the historic sentiment as a factor of the Jewish consciousness, would lightly cut the religion loose from the bonds of Tradition." He says further: "Almost all the expositions of Judaism which have hitherto appeared in England have been written from the rigidly conservative standpoint. Of these the two hand-books of my much-respected teacher, Dr. M. Friedländer, are notable examples. Something, though far less, has been done to familiarize the public with the conception of Judaism which stands at the other extreme. It has found an able champion in my friend Mr. C. G. Montefiore, whose essay, entitled *Liberal Judaism*, was published almost on the very day that this book was finished. But thus far no attempt has been made to elucidate systematically the intermediate position, and to give a comprehensive account of Jewish belief and practice as they are conceived by men of moderate views. . . . I would demonstrate the possibility of reconciling respect for the claims of modern thought and life with loyalty to traditional Judaism, of being at one and the same time a faithful son of Israel and a true child of the progressive age in which we live."

This is an attitude which must command sympathy; and the study of Mr. Morris Joseph's book shows that he is able in very many instances to claim the support of

destruction of the Temple. By strict orthodox Jews this "Code" has been regarded as authoritative since it was first promulgated. It has been published in a German translation by Löwe, *Der Shulchan Aruch* (1896).

ancient Rabbinical teaching for the position which he upholds. There is, however, one criticism which we feel constrained to make at the outset, and it is this : generally speaking, the choice of Rabbinical quotations is made in accordance with what is required, without drawing attention to the fact that equally telling quotations could be made on the other side ; this is not always the case, indeed, we shall give a pointed instance to the contrary presently ; but as a rule—we trust we are not doing Mr. Morris Joseph an injustice—as a rule, the quotations made are only those which support what is required, and no hint is given that other quotations could be given which would somewhat counterbalance the teaching of those offered. The same criticism may perhaps be made with regard to ourselves, for we have certainly chosen our quotations from ancient sources for a particular purpose ; but we have taken special care to point out that the quotations made represent only one side of the question, and that plenty of others exist, some of which are given, which teach a different doctrine (see pp. 28 f., 36. 93 f., 139 ff.) ; besides which, our object has been to show, in opposition to the belief of most Christians, and possibly also of some Jews, that a doctrine of Mediation *does* figure largely in the authoritative documents of Judaism.

Now, as regards the general attitude of semi-Reform Judaism towards the doctrine of Mediation, it will be seen that much depends upon its doctrine of God ; this is true, of course, also of Orthodox and Reform Judaism, but Mr. Morris Joseph brings the fact out more pointedly than is done by either of the two authorities whose works we have referred to. After finely describing the

transcendent character of the Divine Nature, Mr. Morris Joseph refers to the infinite condescension of God as recorded in the Scriptures: "God is ever near to His people, He works in the midst of their camp; the cloud of glory, the visible token of His Presence, rests upon the Sanctuary; He talks with men from Heaven. Such a Deity needs no mediator to bring Him into touch with humanity. His very nature, nay, theirs, supplies the link between them. The Supreme 'in His love and in His pity' redeems them; 'He bears and carries them' (Is. lxiii. 9.). But man, too, in whom God has breathed the breath of life, can rise to the Divine source of his being without any aid save that which he may get from the inherent power of his own immortal soul. . . . Judaism repudiates the notion of a beneficent Being mediating between the Supreme and man. No go-between can possibly be needed to bring the All-Father into communion with His own children. 'In the hour of the client's need,' say the Rabbins, 'he cannot go without ceremony into the presence of his patron; he must linger at the door and get a servant to announce him. Even then it is doubtful whether he will be received. It is not so when men would approach the Almighty. In this wise does He speak to them: When ye are in trouble call not on any of the angels, neither on Michael or on Gabriel; but cry unto Me, and I will answer you straightway. For doth not Holy Writ say (Joel iii. 5), 'Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered?'* In like manner the Rabbins

* *Berakhoth* ix. 1 (Jerusalem Talmud); see the same quotation, in a compressed form, given above, p. 94.

declare that the Israelites sinned when they asked Moses at Sinai to speak to them in place of God (*Midrash Rabba* to Canticles i. 2)"; under the same reference, however, in this *Midrash* a pointed instance is given of an angel who was the intermediary between God and the Israelites at the giving of the Law; the comment is given in the name of Rabbi Jochanan. Mr. Morris Joseph gives another example of Rabbinical teaching antagonistic to the doctrine of Mediation: "Moses, they say elsewhere (*Shemoth Rabba*, ch. xxi. to Exod. xiv. 15), had no greater power to move the Supreme by prayer than had the humblest man.* At the Red Sea he offered supplication, but God rebuked him. 'Why criest thou unto Me? My sons have already prayed to Me, and I have heard their prayer.'" On the other hand, in the same *Midrash*, chap. xliii., Moses is spoken of as the wise man who makes atonement and pacifies the wrath of God by his prayers. But Mr. Morris Joseph candidly admits that "it cannot be denied that this characteristic Jewish doctrine [*i.e.*, of the non-existence of any mediator] has not always been respected in practice. Invocations to angels and other intercessory beings have found their way here and there into the liturgy, though not, it must be added, into the essential portions of it. But they have done so as the result of foreign influences,‡ and in spite of the disap-

* On the other hand, see the reference to *Shir Rabba* to iv. 4, on p. 80 above, where it is said that all the people who stood at the foot of Mount Sinai were protected by the merit of Moses alone.

‡ We would fain have had some proof of this; but it may be presumed that Mr. Morris Joseph does not mean to imply that *all* Rabbinical teaching on Mediation is due to foreign influence. In any case, the teaching was accepted and assimilated.

proval of the highest authorities. Thus Maimonides says (*Commentary to the Midrash Synhed.*, xi. 1.): 'We have to revere God alone and no lower being. Nor may we invoke the intercession of any such being. To God alone ought we to direct our inmost thoughts, ignoring every other existence but His.' In this explicit utterance Maimonides sets forth the true Jewish doctrine on the subject" (pp. 78 ff.). Later on Mr. Morris Joseph quotes a passage which would seem to run counter to this; it tells of the righteous pleading with God hereafter on behalf of the transgressors; "Go forth and heal them," is the divine response to their intercession; and thus sought out and redeemed, the wicked rise into the life everlasting (*Yalkut* to Malachi iv. 3); but he says: "The idea here emphasized is the abounding grace of God and the power of prayer to evoke it. There is no suggestion of vicarious atonement, or of a Divine or semi-Divine mediator. The intercessors are the souls of the righteous, and they move the Divine mercy not by any suffering of theirs, but by the force of their supplication. The passage represents, perhaps, the furthest point to which Jewish thought has carried the idea of intercession" (p. 147).

Much further light is shed upon the attitude of semi-Reform Judaism towards the doctrine of Mediation in Mr. Morris Joseph's chapter on the Day of Atonement (pp. 250-277); it will be best to quote again the writer's actual words. The Day of Atonement is kept in obedience to the Law as expressed in Lev. xvi. 29-34, xxiii. 26-32, abstinence from all food during the day is undergone also in obedience to the precept of the

Law; so that in this respect, at any rate, semi-Reform Judaism recognizes the authority of the Law. "The Day of Atonement is intended to complete and crown the work of the penitential season by finally reconciling the soul with the Almighty. . . . Implicitly trusting in the Divine forgiveness the Israelite believes that his contrition, if it be really sincere, will atone for him, will make him 'at one' once more with his Heavenly Father." After recalling the manner of celebrating the Day of Atonement in ancient times, with its elaborate sacrifices, and "the most striking part of the Day's ritual," namely, the "formal expiation of sin that was twice made by the Pontiff in obedience to Scriptural ordinance (Lev. xvi.)," Mr. Morris Joseph goes on to say that "we may still lament the loss of the beautiful Sanctuary and the sacred rites that moved our fathers to such fervent worship. . . . But one thought may temper our regret. It is the thought that the grandeur which once marked Israel's public worship had no essential connection with the success of his endeavour after atonement." This scarcely accords with the Biblical teaching on the subject, and yet it is because of its being a Biblical ordinance that semi-Reform Jews observe the Day of Atonement. Mr. Morris Joseph very rightly protests against a belief which is, apparently, prevalent among some Jews, that there is any intrinsic atoning efficacy in the mere fact of observing the Day; there are those, he says, who "attribute a miraculous effectiveness to the Day itself. Its mere advent, they persuade themselves, will adjust their moral account, and automatically strike out their offences from the Heavenly records"; and

again, later on, he says: "When it degenerates into a formal routine, when it is regarded as an effectual atonement in itself, it becomes mere blind superstition, the worst foe of Religion." Such an attitude is, to be sure, deplorable; but it is the misguided outgrowth of an instinct which, in its origin, is purely religious (see above, pp. 1, 3.)

The main object of the Day of Atonement is, according to Mr. Morris Joseph, *Amendment;* this is "the last link in the long chain of spiritual effort which we call atonement. It is the most vital link of all. . . . To purify desire, to ennoble the will—this is the essential condition of atonement. Nay, it *is* atonement. For we speak of reconciliation and pardon; but what are these but figures of speech? The reconciliation we have really to effect is with our higher selves, with our conscience which we have outraged, with our souls which we have sullied. The changeless mind of God knows no such mutations as are implied in the idea of wrath. What we style His anger is really the resentment of our better nature, its stern protest against the shame in which our sin has involved us. And so with forgiveness. 'God is not a man that He should repent.' Changefulness such as the notion of pardon would attribute to Him is inconceivable in the Perfect One. If He knows not the feeling of anger, He knows not the change involved in forgiveness. The only reconciliation possible for us is self-reconciliation. And by that self-reconciliation it is that we, again figuratively speaking, make our peace with God. We who have put ourselves far from Him, we whose iniquities have, in Prophetic phrase, 'separated

between us and our God,' raised 'a barrier of iron,' in the words of the Rabbins, between Him and us, we go back to Him in thought and feeling like a wayward child to the father it has offended; we break down the obstacles to spiritual union with Him that our iniquity has created. And that sense of recovered fellowship we call forgiveness." In another passage he says: "If we could possibly imagine our having to choose between prayer and performance, between contrition and amendment, it would be our duty to let the prayer and the contrition go, and base all our hopes of pardon upon the firm foundation of the good life." The extraordinary doctrine here enunciated would seem to be rather too much for Mr. Morris Joseph himself, for he goes on to say that "in spite of what has just been said, it would be wrong to think that God's anger is, after all, only a figurative expression for our own discontent with ourselves, and therefore nothing to be dreaded. It is this and something more. It stands also for the suffering that transgression inevitably brings in its train sooner or later. It is not because the Divine wrath is a figure of speech that retribution is unreal, and that the sinner may count upon impunity. Though, strictly speaking, God is never angry, man is none the less accountable for his life, and the wholesome ordinance which has decreed suffering as the expiation of guilt, remains unimpugned . . . Let it be said once more that the only remission we have a right to ask for, is the remission of guilt. As to the penalty, not even God Himself, to say it reverently, can forego any part of it. For once the sin has been sinned it must produce its effects, even as the seed begets

the flower. . . . Therefore, when we pray for God's forgiveness, let us not ask for the repeal of a decree that is justice, nay, mercy itself. For how, save through his suffering, is the sinner to pay homage to the great principle of goodness that he has defiled. How, save by punishment, is he to be purged of the taint of transgression, made worthy of enjoying once more the Divine companionship? Those blessings are all that we ought to ask for, and pain will cheaply purchase them." As a comment on these words it is worth while quoting the following from the prayer which comes after the great confession of sins in the Service for the Day of Atonement: "O may it be Thy will, O Lord my God and God of my fathers, that I may sin no more, and as to the sins I have committed, purge them away in Thine abounding compassion *though not by means of affliction and sore diseases.*"

Towards the end of the chapter on the Day of Atonement there is a very fine passage (p. 273); Mr. Morris Joseph truly says: "We are all responsible not only for our own lives, but for the influence they exert upon the lives of others. And from that responsibility there is no escape. . . . Thus, as Amiel has well said, 'every life is, as it were, a beacon which entices a ship upon the rocks, if it does not guide it into port.' The thought must needs give the sinner pause. Against himself he may possibly not refuse to sin, but he will surely shrink from contributing to the moral undoing of others—some of them, perhaps, his own flesh and blood, to whom he is attached by his very heartstrings. For vicarious suffering is a very real thing. The sins of the fathers *are* visited

upon the children,* and the children's upon the fathers."

Finally, Mr. Morris Joseph states, in his concluding words on the subject, once more in plain and definite terms the attitude of semi-Reform Judaism, as represented by him, towards the doctrine of Mediation: "It is the truth that the aspiring soul—the soul that earnestly seeks after redemption—can realize its desire by its own unaided efforts, without the intervention of a mediator, Divine or human. This noble conception has already been enunciated in these pages, but it may appropriately be again set forth here. For it is, so to speak, incarnate in the Day of Atonement. . . . On this Day each worshipper, however sin-laden, is exhorted to take his burden straight to the Almighty, with the certainty of being heard and pitied. He needs no one to plead for him. His penitence and his settled determination to amend will be his best, his only effective plea. . . . The effort after redemption must come from the sinner himself, but the Divine grace will bless it and bring it to fruition."

A word must be added regarding the Messianic beliefs of semi-Reform Judaism; they will be seen to partake of the same mixture of old and new which, as must have been noticed, characterizes so much of what has been said above. "The Jew," says Mr. Morris Joseph (pp. 167 ff.), "looks forward to a future of universal religion and righteousness. He pictures to himself a Golden Age; but, unlike the Pagan peoples of old, he places it

* See the reference on pp. 79, 80 to *Shabbath* 33 ab, regarding the vicarious suffering of children.

in the future, not in the past.* The world, he holds, is progressive; mankind is slowly but surely marching on to a happier time of faith and goodness, when men 'shall not hurt nor destroy, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea' (Is. xi. 9). That time is called the time of the Messiah, or the Messianic era. The great Prophets of Israel loved to dream and to speak about it. . . . Not all the Prophetic descriptions of coming joy refer to a remote future, or foreshadow a condition of world-wide happiness. Some relate exclusively to the Prophet's own time, and announce events affecting the destinies of Israel only. Many of these predictions, however, have been interpreted in a directly opposite sense. They have been regarded as foreshadowing the advent of a Messiah —that is, of a man belonging to the House of David, and endowed with almost superhuman gifts of mind and character, who in an age yet to come is to lead Israel back to Palestine, and to inaugurate the reign of religion and righteousness on earth. But in reality what they announce is the coming of a sovereign like King Hezekiah, for example, who lived in the Prophet's own time, and whose rule brought much-needed peace and well-being to his sorely tried people. Even the word 'Messiah,' as used in the Hebrew Bible, has not that half-supernatural significance which it has come to possess. . . . In like manner, passages which, according to some interpreters, speak of a Golden Age yet to come,

* Some, at any rate, among the Pagan peoples looked for it in the future as well.

were meant only to portray in highly figurative language a happy state of things that was inaugurated, and came to an end, long ago. Forgetfulness of these facts has produced much mischief both within and without the pale of Judaism. History is full of Messiahs, of men who have given out sincerely or insincerely that they were divinely chosen to resuscitate Israel's nationality, and to establish a heavenly Kingdom on earth. Multitudes have believed in them, and have only discovered their mistake after much suffering. . . . It does not necessarily follow, however, that the belief in a Messiah or in the restoration of the Jewish State is a delusion. . . . It may possibly be God's will that Israel is once more to enjoy political independence; and be settled in his own land under his own rulers. Nay, it would be rash to declare positively that even the Prophets could not have had this far-off event in their minds when they dreamed of the future. If, then, we meet with Jews who believe in the Return, in national revival, in a personal Messiah, let no one venture to say dogmatically that they are wrong." Then after describing the position of Reform Judaism which teaches a belief in a 'Messianic era' in the sense of a time of universal peace and brotherly love, but rejects the idea of a personal Messiah, Mr. Morris Joseph continues: "Surely we are no more at liberty to forbid these opinions than we are free to rebuke the minds that reject them. The question whether the Messiah is to be one of the figures of the Messianic Age, or whether Israel is to be a nation once more, and the Temple in Jerusalem the religious centre of the whole world, is not a vital question. We can be

equally good Jews whatever view we hold on these points. They are details on which freedom of thought can be tolerated without injury to the Faith. But the same cannot be said of the Messianic Idea. That is one of the essentials of our creed, without which Judaism would have neither meaning nor life. . . . If the dogma of the Divine Unity is the foundation of our religion, the Messianic Idea is its coping-stone."

There is, finally, one other point, closely connected with our subject, which must not be passed over; it is what Mr. Morris Joseph has to say about the *Paschal Sacrifice*. "On the night of their Deliverance (*i.e.*, from the Egyptian bondage) the people were commanded to partake of a meal that was so solemn and sacred as to be considered sacrificial. It was to consist, first, of the flesh of a lamb or kid that had been roasted whole. The blood of the animal was previously to be sprinkled on the door-posts, which for the occasion became the altar. . . . What was the significance of this lamb? It clearly represents the House of Israel welded into national unity by the hand of its Divine Redeemer. Hence the injunction that not a bone of it was to be broken, and that small families should eat it in common so as to consume it entirely, without leaving aught till the morning (Exod. xii. 4, 10, 46). All the details suggested the idea of a united, a firmly-knit people. The lamb, then, was Israel, and Israel giving himself, like the sacrificial victim, to God, his Deliverer, in obedient and grateful submission. It was, moreover, to be roasted by contact with fire, the purifying agent, again to typify Israel purged of his slavery. . . . And the ancient rite

still survives in these days, though necessarily in a modified form. There is no longer a Paschal sacrifice, for sacrifices are things of the past" (pp. 221 ff.). As an example of Biblical exegesis the above is decidedly interesting, and we should like to have shown the untenableness of Mr. Morris Joseph's interpretation, but that is not our present concern.

The attitude of semi-Reform Judaism, therefore, to the doctrine of Mediation will have been made clear. It is illogical, for the same reason that the attitude of Orthodox Judaism is, towards this doctrine, because it accepts the authority of the Torah and of the Talmud, but rejects the doctrine which both teach; moreover, its position, as it appears to us, is further weakened by its partial acceptation and assimilation of the spirit of Reform Judaism; for this makes its attitude illogical from another point of view. In the long run there can be no real sense of community between Orthodox and Reform Judaism, each is wholly permeated with a spirit antagonistic to the other; the attempt at bridging over the chasm between the two only results in a split at each end of the plank. The spirit which prompts this mediating impulse is altogether admirable, but the attempt is foredoomed to failure where the fundamental principles of either side are essentially antagonistic.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Summary and Conclusions.

Let us now briefly summarize the results of the preceding investigation, and enumerate our conclusions.

Rightly or wrongly, we are convinced that there are two fundamental factors which are the real, the inevitable cause, of impelling man to believe in the doctrine of Mediation, viz., his conception of God, and his sense of Sin, the latter including man's conception of himself; we are, for the moment, not urging the witness of History. That among men the conception of God and the sense of Sin should vary is natural, and it is this variation which accounts for the fact that some do and some do not believe in the doctrine of Mediation. But it is certain that both views cannot be right. It is not our purpose to present the Christian view*; we are dealing only with the Jewish; but how fundamentally conceptions on this subject are made to differ from each other by variations of presentation can be seen by comparing the following utterances of average representatives of the Christian and Jewish standpoint respectively:

"Christ's identification of Himself with the race He came to save is complete. It is not merely 'federal' or 'legal'; it is vital, and this in every respect. His love is unbounded; His sympathy is complete; His purpose

* It is the intention of my friend, the Rev. G. H. Box, to publish a sequel to this volume, which will deal with the Christian Doctrine of Mediation.

and desire to save are unfaltering. He identifies Himself with humanity, with a perfect consciousness (1) of what He is; (2) of what the race He came to save is and needs; (3) of what a perfect atonement involves. Himself holy, the well-beloved Son, He knows with unerring clearness what sin is, and what the mind of God is about sin. He does not shrink from anything His identification with a sinful race entails upon Him, but freely accepts its position and responsibilities as His own. He is 'made under the Law' (Gal. iv. 4.); a Law not merely preceptive, but broken and violated, and entailing 'curse.' Identifying Himself thus perfectly with the race of men as under sin on the one hand, and with the mind of God about sin on the other, He is the natural mediator between God and man, and is alone in the position to render to God whatever is necessary as atonement for sin. . . . The innocent suffering with and for the guilty is a law from which Jesus did not withdraw Himself. In His consciousness of solidarity with mankind, He freely submitted to those evils (shame, ignominy, suffering, temptation, death) which express the judgement of God on the sins of the world, and in the experience of them —peculiarly in the yielding up of His life—did such honour to all the principles of righteousness involved, rendered so inward and spiritual a response to the whole mind of God in His attitude to the sin of the world, as constituted a perfect atonement for that sin for such as believingly accept it, and make its spirit their own."*

On the other hand, a Jewish thinker of no mean

*Prof. James Orr in Hastings' *One Volume Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 74.

power, in discussing the subjects of Sin, and of the conception of God, says :

"Where the all-important difference between Jewish and Christian doctrine in this domain seems to lie, is in the two-fold fact that (1) Jewish thought never elevated the fall of man to the level of a fundamental article of faith as was done by St. Augustine and other Church Fathers, (2) Judaism's opposition to the Pauline idea of a 'saving grace' of God through the agency of an intermediary, and its insistence that man's power of redemption from the thraldom of sin lies within and not without himself. In other words, Judaism superseded the doctrine of original sin with all its dismal associations by its far brighter and more bracing doctrine of Repentance. . . . Instead of encouraging a joyless brooding over the past,* it tells man to take up the cudgels on behalf of the future. His sin can never be so bad as to be beyond repair. Be he sunken never so deeply in the mire of depravity he is not necessarily debarred from the Divine forgiveness. For God has implanted in him a portion of His own Divine self, viz., the power to improve, the will to amend; in other words, Repentance." And in speaking of the relationship between the Divine nature and the nature of man, the same writer says what, in the main, we should all agree with ; the only question is whether in the following words too much stress is not laid on one side of a truth to the entire exclusion of another side which is also supremely important: "The immanence of

* With the obvious non-realization of Christian doctrine here implied we are not concerned.

God is the term to express the indwelling of God in man and in nature. God is not the transcendent Being sitting high above His world wrapped in an impenetrable isolation. He is in the world, eternally present, eternally active. It is this conception which inspired Wordsworth to speak of

> A motion and a spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought
> And rolls through all things.

Philo probably meant to convey some such notion when he coined that oft-quoted phrase, 'Every man in regard of his intellect is connected with Divine reason, being an impression of, or a fragment, or a ray of that blessed nature.' In the whole of English literature there is probably no more eloquent description of the Divine in man and the world, no finer piece of word-painting about the supernatural dignity of man than the passage in the *Religio Medici* of Sir Thomas Browne: 'The earth is a point not only in respect of the heavens above us, but of that heavenly and celestial part within us. That mass of flesh that circumscribes me limits not my mind. That surface that tells the heavens it hath an end cannot persuade me that I have any. . . . whilst I study to find how I am a microcosm or little body, I find myself something more than the great. There is surely a piece of divinity in us; something that was before the elements, and pays no homage to the sun. Nature tells me I am the image of God, as well as Scripture.'"* The truth conveyed here is one which nobody would think of denying; but it must not be permitted to obscure the

* The Rev. J. Abelson, on *Sin*, in "The Jewish Chronicle," September 24th, 1909, pp. 20f.

parallel truth that there is also something non-divine in man. Modern exponents of Judaism sometimes seem to exalt man so highly as to obscure this other side of the truth, with the result that the power of the human will is exaggerated, and man's insignificance in the sight of God is lost sight of. These things do not tend to place the relative positions of God and man in the true perspective ; they engender a conception of God which is not the highest, and they make a real sense of Sin in man impossible.

At any rate, the two quotations given above illustrate the fact that the variation in the presentation of a truth is in itself sufficient to produce fundamentally different conceptions of such truth ; while Rabbinical Judaism and Christianity have a lot of common ground to start from regarding the doctrine of Mediation, Modern Judaism and Christianity seem to be antagonist *ab initio ;* this, one feels, ought not to be.

What has been said, however, bears out the contention stated above that there are two fundamental factors which are the real, the inevitable cause, of impelling men to believe in the doctrine of Mediation, viz., the conception of God, and His sense of Sin ; according as to whether the conception of God is exalted, according as to whether the sense of Sin is deep, so will the intensity of the need of a Mediator between God and man assert itself.

In the Old Testament a long period of history is covered, and within this period development is to be discovered in every line of thought which occupied the minds of Israel's thinkers; this development is as strongly

marked as anywhere in these two conceptions, just mentioned, which condition the whole doctrine of Mediation. In the earliest stages the idea of God is characterised by anthropomorphisms which are strikingly bold and downright; one is forced to the conclusion that in that antique age the difference between God and man was conceived of as being one of degree rather than of kind. Such being the case, the feeling of a need of a mediating agency is one which comes to the fore only because of the superior might of the Deity, who can be propitiated by means of sacrifices; or, if a personal mediator is called for, it suffices that he should be a man, one of outstanding sanctity, but yet only a man. In any case, however, these things witness to the belief in the need of both Mediation and Mediatorship. The conception as to the nature of sacrifices, and their efficacy, is often of a primitive kind, but none the less this bears witness to a sense of need. A higher conception is that of intercession made on behalf of men to God by one who is believed to stand in closer relationship to God than his fellows, such as Abraham; at the same time, the presentation of the idea of God which is found in connexion with the Abraham-narratives is often not an exalted one; and this lies in the nature of things. With the rise of the prophets comes, in course of time, an extraordinarily high conception of God, and with it is ultimately reached, in the person of the Suffering Servant, the zenith of the Old Testament doctrine of Mediation.

So, too, with the development of the Sense of Sin in the period covered by the Old Testament; in the earlier stages sin against God was conceived of, in one sense, as

in the same category as sins against man; each could be compounded for. Moreover, generally speaking, ritual offences were regarded as more grave than moral ones; nor was a ritual offence the less reprehensible for being unintentional; this is illustrated by the fact that the ordinary Hebrew root for "to sin" means "to miss the mark," *i.e.* to make a mistake as regards ritual or traditional observances. Indeed, it is true to say with Clemens—and the truth forcibly bears out what has just been said about the Sense of Sin in the earlier stages of Old Testament history—that originally the Hebrew idea of sin meant the failure to comply with traditional custom; such failure meant, however, sin against God as well, for all national custom was in the first instance based upon religious sanction. Concurrently with the prophetical teaching on the majesty and ethical purity of the God of Israel came the beginning of a deeper sense of Sin; that was bound to be the case, for the higher the conception of God, the greater must be the recognition of man's insignificance and the realization of his sinfulness in the sight of the All-Powerful and All-Good. With this higher conception of God, and with this deeper Sense of Sin came, therefore, the more pressing need of a mediator; and because it was beginning to be felt that the weight of sin was too great for man to bear the divine truth—none the less divine for being exemplified daily in lesser ways in ordinary life†—the divine truth of vicarious suffering

* *Die Lehre von der Sünde*, pp. 22f; Cp. also Stade *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments* pp 200f

† Cf. the interesting example in *Sanhedrin* 18a, where we are told that when the people comforted the High-priest for the loss of a relative, they said: "We will be an atonement for thee"; Rashi

and vicarious atonement in connexion with the doctrine of Mediatorship, was proclaimed by Israel's greatest prophet. The mediator in connexion with whom this truth is taught is a man, and in this respect the teaching of the *Apocrypha* shows an advance upon that of the Old Testament, for although references to the doctrine of Mediation are but rare in the *Apocrypha*, and the teaching in this class of literature is, in the main, antagonistic to the doctrine, nevertheless when a mediator is mentioned he is one who is superhuman. So far as the character of a mediator is concerned the teaching of the *Apocrypha* is an advance upon that of the Old Testament; but, taken as a whole, the doctrine of Mediation here shows a retrograde movement, more, however, by its silence on the subject than by actually antagonistic teaching. The ii. (iv.) Book of Esdras, it is true, contains much that is directly opposed to all idea of Mediation, but this may to some extent be accounted for by the pronounced pessimistic tone which runs through the whole of the book.

When we come to the *Pseudepigrapha* we are faced with some new and somewhat startling elements. The *Apocrypha* and the *Pseudepigrapha* cover periods which are to some extent parallel; some of the most important works among the latter, *e.g.*, parts of the *Book of Enoch* (c. 170—100 B.C.) and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (c. 100 B.C.), coming, more or less, within the limits of the same century as, *e.g.*, *Ecclesiasticus* (c. 170 B.C.,) or

explains this as meaning: "Mayest thou through us be free from every punishment; we will suffer on thy behalf whatsoever may henceforward come upon thee" (Rawicz *Der Traktat Sanhedrin*, p, 89).

Tobit (possibly belonging to about the same period). The lack of teaching on Mediation which is characteristic, in general, of the *Apocrypha*, and the, on the whole, fuller and more developed teaching of the *Pseudepigrapha*, represent evidently two schools of thought within Judaism. Another noteworthy fact in this connexion is that the main characteristic of the *Pseudepigrapha* is the eschatological teaching which is so fully treated in this class of literature, while in the *Apocrypha* this subject is scarcely ever touched upon; it is true that ii. (iv.) *Esdras** with its marked apocalyptic elements figures among the *Apocrypha*, but it may be stated with confidence that the place of this book is properly speaking among the *Pseudepigrapha* and not among the *Apocrypha*. With the exception of this book with its peculiarly pronounced pessimistic tone, it is probably true to say that, generally speaking, the doctrine of Mediation is proper to eschatological thought. And if this is so, it may turn out to be the case that there was an extremely interesting connexion between the concurrent teaching on Mediation and Eschatology in pre-Christian literature, and the teaching on the same subjects in the New Testament. With this point we cannot, however, deal now.

In the *Pseudepigrapha*, as we have seen, some new and important elements touching the doctrine of Mediation are presented, but points of close contact with Old Testament teaching are also in evidence. In the first place, the sacrificial system as a means of reconciliation

*The book belongs to a considerably later date than any of the other books of the *Apocrypha*, about 90 A.D.

with God is in part advocated, but belief in its efficacy *per se* is no more firmly held. Then, again, the intercession of human beings finds a place, though this is not so marked as in some of the books of the Old Testament. On the other hand, a great advance is noticeable in the belief concerning the intercession of angels, while the figure of the Archangel Michael occupies an important place, and he is often identified with Enoch. Another element, which witnesses to development, of great interest is the attempt to combine the specifically Old Testament teaching with that which is more specifically characteristic of the post-biblical writings, namely, that the mediating function which has been exercised by religious leaders while on earth is conceived of as being continued in the realms above; Enoch, Abraham, and Moses are represented as interceding, as spiritual beings, in the presence of God. It is a striking advance in the conception of Mediation when we find the writers of these books teaching that the angels and the spirits of the righteous, rather than human beings and sacrifices, are the mediating agencies between God and man. This teaching is still further developed in the *Targums*, for while in these, following herein the teaching of the Old Testament, human beings are represented as mediators, there is also, for the first time, the further teaching that brings not only super-human, but also *semi-divine* mediators between God and man; *Metatron* and the hypostatized Word of God, *Memra*, take the place of the angels as mediators.

In Rabbinical literature the teaching concerning the quasi-personification of divine attributes is greatly

elaborated ; to *Metatron* and the *Memra* are added the *Ruach-ha-Kodesh* (the "Holy Spirit") and the *Shekhinah* (the divine glory). These occupy an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings. While on the one hand, they are represented as being so closely connected with God as to appear as parts of Him, or attributes, they are, on the other hand, so often spoken of as undertaking individual action that they must be differentiated from God. We are not blind to the fact that over and over again the Rabbis in their teaching opposed mediatorial tendencies ; their literature is full of protests against the idea of any mediatorial person or agency ; even in the *Targums* the Rabbinical use of such terms as *Shekhinah, Memra*, etc., was often directed to the same end ; but there is another side to this, and the presence of much which points in the other direction in Rabbinical literature justifies us in saying that a doctrine of Mediation is clearly to be discerned there. This Jewish doctrine of intermediate beings is of great importance to Christian theologians, for it offers a striking commentary on the Christian doctrine of Mediation ; "in how far the two religions have influenced each other in this respect, it would be difficult to say ; but it is worth remembering that the Talmud and kindred writings only crystallize (though they undoubtedly further elaborate) what had in very many cases been current long before." *

It is significant how in modern hand-books on Judaism this specifically Rabbinical doctrine of intermediate beings between God and man is passed over in silence. While

* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.* p. 169.

everyone would be prepared to concede that the Rabbis, in writing about these quasi-personalities, did not—at any rate, generally speaking—intend their words to be taken literally, there is no getting away from the fact that the conception underlying the whole cycle of these ideas is that of mediatorial activity between God and men ; they may be nothing more than mental pictures, metaphors, or the like, but that they witness in a very striking manner to the belief in the principle of Mediation in a very exalted sense, cannot be denied. In Rabbinical literature, moreover, there are a large number of minor indications pointing in the same direction ; taken singly, these may not amount to much, but in the aggregate they constitute a large body of material, witnessing, in a halting manner it may be, to the belief of the need of something coming in between God and man. It is right to add, and to emphasize the point, that these mediating agencies, such as the Law, Almsgiving, Repentance, Fasting, etc., occupy a position, as regards their efficacy, in Judaism essentially different from that which they occupy in the Christian doctrine, and it is this essential difference which justifies one in saying that while in Judaism they are rightly called "mediating agencies," according to Christian doctrine the term would be inapplicable. That essential difference is this : the accomplishment of *Mitzvoth* (*i.e.*, legal observances, lit. 'commandments') constitutes a meritorious act, and compels, as it were, divine approbation ; they are *per se* the actual means of reconciliation, they are the *cause* whereby a right relationship, an at-one-ment between God and men is established. According to Christian

teaching, those things are also necessary, very indispensable, but there is nothing meritorious about them, their being left undone constitutes a sin which, as a sin, stands in the same category as sins of commission : "When ye shall have done all things that are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants ; we have done that which it was our duty to do," *i.e.*, nothing more than that. According to Christian teaching, no amount of simply doing what it is our duty to do could *per se* effect a right relationship with God, could bring about justification* ; for a state of justification in the sight of God can only be attained by means of the Divine-Human Mediator and Advocate, Jesus Christ. Judaism—or, at all events, Rabbinical Judaism—has its doctrine of Mediation just as Christianity has ; the great difference between the two lies in the fact that, according to the former, the power of bringing about Mediation lies with man, while according to the latter, it is only God Himself, Who, in the Person of Christ, does so. It is the Christian doctrine of Grace which makes all the difference. Jewish theologians frequently seek to differentiate between what they call the Pauline doctrine of grace and the teaching of Christ ; to do so betrays an entire misapprehension of the Gospel teaching ; to give but one example : nowhere could the identity of the teaching of our Lord and of St. Paul concerning Grace be more

* Some modern Jewish teachers deny this, *e.g.* : "Human regret and amendment, prayer and promise, condition, as it were, God's pardon ; they do not command or earn it" (Abrahams' *Festival Studies*, p. 96) ; this is, however, a development of doctrine ; but the whole of Chap. xiv., entitled "God and Man," in Mr. Abrahams' book should be read ; it is very fine and thoroughly worthy of the gifted author.

pointedly and clearly exhibited than by comparing the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matth. xx. 1—15), spoken in answer to St. Peter's demand, "What, then shall we have"? (xix. 27), and such words of St. Paul as: *By the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified* (Rom. iii. 20); *Ye are not under the Law, but under Grace* (Rom. vi. 14).

It is worth while, by way of comparison, to quote here a Rabbinical parallel to the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, as it illustrates, when compared with the Gospel form of the parable, the essential difference between Christian and Jewish teaching on the subject of Grace and Works; this parable was spoken by a Rabbi Sera in his funeral oration over Rabbi Bun,* who lived at the beginning of the fifth century A.D.; the parable, which occurs in the Midrash *Shir ha-Shirim* (*Song of Songs*) to vi. 2, is as follows: "There was a king who had a vineyard, and he hired labourers to care for it. Among these there was one who was far more able than the rest. When the king noticed this he took him by the hand and strolled about with him all over the vineyard. When even was come the labourers came to receive their hire; then also that very clever labourer came forward to receive his hire together with the others; and the king gave to him the same hire as the others received. Whereupon the labourers murmured, and said: 'O lord our king, we have laboured the whole day, and is this man who has only laboured two or three hours to receive equal hire with us?' 'Wherefore murmur ye?' replied the king, 'he has done more work in those two or three hours than ye have done during the whole day!" The parable is told in order to illustrate the fact that Rabbi Bun fulfilled more *Mitzvoth* ('Commandments') in the twenty-eight years of life than many a grey-headed worker at the *Torah* in a hundred years.† The same parable occurs in *Bereshith Rabba*, lxii., and in *Midrash Koheleth*, on v. 12. The contrast between the Rabbinical and the Christian form of the parable—for it

* A shortened form of Abun (=Abin).

† Cf. *Abodah Zara*, 17*a*: "One man earns heaven in how many years! and another in a single hour" (quoted by Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, p. 184).

can scarcely be doubted that both go back to a common source—is highly instructive; the whole point of the Rabbinical form is to emphasize the quality of works, which are accomplished by the exercise of man's free-will; while the whole point of the Christian form is to emphasize the inefficacy of Works apart from Grace.

In the Jewish Prayer Book, and especially in the Sephardic Ritual, there are many re-echoes of Rabbinical teaching; it is true, the semi-divine Beings referred to above scarcely figure at all; the *Shekhinah* is mentioned, but without any trace of personality being attached to it. On the other hand, the principle of Mediation is affirmed in abundant measure; the acception of the whole principle of the Sacrificial System, together with the earnest looking forward to its revival, the avowed mediating agency of the *Torah*, and such meritorious *Mitzvoth* as Repentance, Fasting, Almsgiving, Suffering, and even Death, as also the observance of the Day of Atonement—all these things constitute a recognition of the principle of Mediation, and the Prayer Book follows herein the teaching of the Rabbis. The same is true with regard to the mediatorial function of the Fathers, exercised by means of their merits; the mediator here is but human, but he is a personality, and he has something definite to offer; and teaching which comes very near to that of vicarious suffering and atonement is contained in such words as: "Do this for the sake of them that were slain for Thy holy name," "Do it for the sake of them that were slaughtered for Thy Unity."* Other examples witnessing to the idea of Mediatorship have been given in the preceding pages.

* Occurring in the Daily Morning Service.

But while in the Jewish Prayer Book both the principle of Mediation and the conception of Mediatorship are plainly in evidence, a comparison between the teaching in the Prayer Book and Rabbinical writings on this subject leaves the general impression that the former offers upon the whole, a somewhat pale reflection of what the Rabbis taught; a toning-down tendency is very observable in the Prayer Book in spite of a manifest desire to be loyal to the fulness of Rabbinical teaching. It is difficult to account for this otherwise than by supposing it to be due to the desire to avoid, as far as possible, what might seem to countenance Christian teaching; this supposition is strengthened by observing that in the Prayer Book there are some quite clear indications of an intention to controvert Christian doctrine. It must, however, be pointed out that the Christian doctrine of Mediation is only the final development of a truth which Judaism had for centuries been inevitably unfolding; even the violent shock which pre-Christian Pharisaism gave to the advance of this necessary truth-development was wholly unable to check it excepting in the direction of Pharisaic Particularism; free Judaism with its outlook beyond the confines of legal observance continued the work of preparing the world for the fulness of the truth. How clearly it is now possible to see why the Apocalyptic literature, and its authors were tabooed by the Pharisaic leaders of Judaism! Yet even so, an immense deal of the freer beliefs of pre-Christian Judaism have found their way into later Rabbinical literature side by side with narrower tenets.

The great break which occurred within Judaism during the two pre-Christian centuries had as its final result the placing of Christianity and Judaism in antagonism. There are signs of a new break occurring within Judaism. And, strange to say, the beginnings of these signs are to be discerned in the ranks of those Orthodox Jews who profess loyalty to the ancient faith as preserved in the Old Testament, in the *Targums*, in *Midrash*, and in *Talmud*. Modern Orthodox Judaism, at all events as represented in Dr. Friedlander's hand-book, is an adaptation of Rabbinical Judaism; this is true, at any rate, of the Judaism of Western Europe, as can be shown by comparing the practice of, for example, Orthodox Anglo-Jewry with that of the Polish Jews within the "Pale." It is, however, not only in the domain of practical Judaism that modern Orthodox Jews are beginning to let the ancient landmarks disappear; we have tried to show, in Chap. xxiv. above, that in doctrine too, modern Orthodox Judaism is, in a supremely important respect, out of harmony with the teaching of the *Torah*, the *Targums*, with *Midrash*, and *Talmud*. This tendency is, of course, enormously developed by Reform and semi-Reform Judaism; in most respects a definite break has already occurred between Orthodox and Reform Judaism, but both are agreed in repudiating the teaching of all authoritative Jewish documents on the subject of Mediation. In this respect Orthodox, followed in a half-hearted way by semi-Reform, Judaism is wholly illogical, for it claims to be guided by the teaching of the *Torah*, etc., but repudiates one of the essential doctrines taught here. Reform Judaism is logical in its

attitude in so far as it maintains that its course is a natural development; but when it claims connexion with historic Judaism the claim is untenable, for, with the exception of its Unitarian belief it has practically nothing to do with historic Judaism. But while it is true to say that Reform Judaism is justified in saying that its procedure is logical, it is well to remember where logic, if that is to be the guiding principle, inevitably leads to; if it does not lead directly to a pitiful Agnosticism, it will certainly not lead in the direction of religion, but rather to some such nebulous philosophy as that which a highly cultivated Jew has called "Cosmic Theism," *i.e.*, Spinozism with a touch of that historic sense so lacking in Reform Judaism.* We have great sympathy with Reform Judaism, and especially with its saintly leader in England, because we realize its inevitableness and the free spirit which impels it; but it is an anomaly; we would gladly and gratefully be convinced that we are mistaken, but it seems to us an anomaly. Semi-Reform Judaism compels our admiration, for it is admirable to act as mediator, and it is always a self-denying task. Orthodox Judaism we love; because, of the three, it has most of that religious spirit which Biblical Judaism gave to the world; it is impossible to read much of the Prayer Book without feeling this.

The writer has felt called upon to express himself thus in order that, if any Jews should honour him by glancing at the preceding pages, they may understand that, in spite of fundamental differences of belief, he has a very warm place in his heart for Judaism in each of its forms.

* Joseph Jacob's *Jewish Ideals*, p. 58; see the whole essay on "The God of Israel," which is full of extremely interesting matter.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX:

NOTES ON THE SOURCES UTILIZED.

A brief account of the character and contents of the various ancient books and tractates, etc., from which quotations have been made in the preceding pages may be found useful by some; we therefore append a few notes on these, dealing, however, only with such portions of the material utilized with which, it may be presumed, the generality of readers will not be familiar, *i.e.*, the books of the Old Testament from which quotations have been made will not be dealt with here.

i.—Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

The Second Book of Maccabees.—This book, in the main, professes to be an epitome or a series of extracts from a much larger historical work of a certain Jason of Cyrene, of whom otherwise nothing is known. It comprises, roughly speaking, an account of the Maccabæan struggle during the period 176-161 B.C. Unlike the first Book of Maccabees, which was originally written in Hebrew, this book is without any doubt a Greek work. Its special characteristic is its religious tendency, and its main object is not to write history, but to utilize history for the purpose of glorifying legalistic Judaism.

Ecclesiasticus.—In the Jewish *Chokma-* or Wisdom-Literature "The Wisdom of Ben Sira"* occupies a most

* In the Greek Bible the title is: "The Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach"; the title in the English Bible comes from the Vulgate; *Ecclesiasticus* = the Church Book *par excellence.*

important place. The writer shows a considerable advance in his method of treatment upon the older collections of Proverbs; and although the book cannot be said to exhibit great signs of originality on the part of the writer, he nevertheless adds to the older material, of which he makes abundant use, a wealth of independent thought which witnesses to a certain amount of individuality. The mass of information which the book contains regarding Jewish religion, thought, and ethics, especially during a period of which we have not otherwise much knowledge concerning these, enhances the importance of the book. The purpose of the writer was evidently to offer to his people a kind of text-book in which men (and apparently women too) were intended to seek guidance in almost every conceivable circumstance of life; and this is done with the primary object of setting in a clear light the superior excellence of Judaism over Hellenism; so that in one sense *Ecclesiasticus* is an apologetic work, inasmuch as it aims at combating the rising influence of Greek thought and culture among the Jews.

What may be called the general philosophy of Wisdom presented in the book may be briefly described as follows. In the past, divine and human Wisdom had been regarded as opposed, but in *Ecclesiasticus* (and this is true of the *Chokma*-literature generally) the new truth is taught that Wisdom is the one thing of all others which is indispensable to him who would lead an upright life. The evil of wickedness is represented as lying in the fact that it is folly, and therefore essentially opposed to Wisdom. This thesis was due to the influence of Hellenism. To this must be added a specifically Jewish element which, as is to be expected, is far more pronounced in the book: the Jews were faithful to the Law, or *Torah*, whose ordinances had

always been binding on them because it was the revealed will of God; therefore, in order to reconcile this old teaching concerning the Law with the new teaching that Wisdom was man's main requirement, Wisdom became identified with the Law. "The fear of the Lord (*i.e.*, respect and observance of the *Torah*) is the beginning of Wisdom" (Ecclus. i. 14. 16); this is the foundation-thought of all the *Chokma*-literature, and formed the reconciling link between Judaism and Hellenism in this domain. This is nowhere more practically illustrated than in *Ecclesiasticus* where mankind is divided into two categories, the wise and foolish, which correspond respectively to the righteous and the wicked.

Ecclesiasticus was written in Hebrew, the major part of which has been discovered within recent years; it was translated into Greek by the author's grandson in 132 B.C., as the Prologue tells us, so that the original must have been written some forty to fifty years earlier.*

The Book of Tobit.—This is a composite work; originally a legend which was widely circulated, it was taken over and adapted by a Jew who probably added certain elements to make it more acceptable to his own people. From the point of view of folk-lore the book is of great interest. The importance of it for the subject which has been considered in the preceding pages is the developed angelology which it exhibits. It has come down to us in several forms; the original language in which it was written in its Jewish

* Mr. J. H. A. Hart, in his recently published *Ecclesiasticus in Greek*, contends for an earlier date, and believes that the Greek translation was made soon after 247 B.C., the original, therefore, going back to about half a century, at least, earlier. The present writer does not find himself able to agree with this.

dress was probably Aramaic, though this cannot be positively asserted. There are reasons for giving as its date 150 B.C. (*circa*), but here again there is no certainty.

The Wisdom of Solomon.—This is one of the finest and most remarkable products of the *Chokma*-literature. It shows, far more than is the case with *Ecclesiasticus*, the influence of Greek philosophy; it teaches, for example, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul as distinct from the resurrection of the body. "Materialism was always a snare to the Jews, in view of their doctrine of a future life. If the only prospect after death was that of a non-moral existence in Sheol, there was to grosser natures no reason why the cup of pleasure should not be drunk inordinately: and further, there was no satisfying solution of the problem of the prosperity of the wicked and the sufferings of the righteous." * It was in order to rectify false notions such as these, and to solve the problem of the prosperity of the wicked and sufferings of the righteous, that the author of this book framed his teaching concerning the hereafter, and taught that "death opened a gate of blessedness for the righteous, that prosperity and length of days were not the criterion of a successful life, and that persecution was only one side of a picture, the other (and strangely unexpected) side of which would be revealed after death." †

It was written in Greek, probably an Alexandrine work; its date is a matter of some uncertainty, and it is difficult to give anything more precise than 125-50 B.C., probably nearer the earlier than the later limit.

* J. A. F. Gregg *The Wisdom of Solomon*, p. xxiii.
† *Ibid.*

The ii. (*iv.*) *Book of Esdras.*—In the English Version this is called the *Second* Book of Esdras, in reality it is the Fourth Book. It is a highly important Jewish apocalyptic work, belonging to the end of the first Christian century, but it embodies many conceptions of pre-Christian times; it is the only representative of the Apocalyptic literature embodied in the official *Apocrypha* of the Old Testament, and the only book belonging to this body of (*Apocryphal*) literature in which the figure of the Messiah, both the earthly and the heavenly, figures in really definite form. It was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The most striking feature in the whole book is the section known as "The Vision of the Man ascending out of the Sea" (xiii. 2-13), which purports to describe the Advent of the Messiah, with the accompanying occurrences.

It must be pointed out that the books of our *Apocrypha* were not accepted by the official Judaism of the Talmud, though some of them have always been recognized as more or less orthodox even from the strict Jewish standpoint, viz., *Ecclesiasticus*,* *Tobit*, *Judith*, i. *Maccabees*. Though uncanonical, they were "allowed," and were not included among the "external books" (i.e. books of a heretical character which are uncanonical). It is a mistake to suppose that by the "external books" mentioned in early Rabbinical literature were understood *all* apocryphal books indiscriminately; the term only included *heretical* apocryphal books. Uncanonical books like the four just mentioned were, and are, regarded as good orthodox Jewish literature.

The *Pseudepigrapha* of the Old Testament embrace a series of writings considerably more extensive than the books of the *Apocrypha* proper. "Indeed, the distinction

* A number of quotations from this book are embodied in the Talmud.

between the two classes of literature implied by the common use of the term 'Apocrypha' to denote a specified number of deutero-canonical books is an arbitrary and artificial one. It is due to St. Jerome. Originally the term 'Apocrypha' (= 'hidden,' 'secret') denoted the secret books or teaching current among certain religious or philosophic sects. The term is neither specifically Jewish nor Christian to start with; in the first instance it was used by the writers of the books themselves, not as a term of reproach, but of distinction. In this wider sense it naturally included the books now described as Pseudepigraphic. In the early centuries of Christianity, down to about 200 A.D., many of the apocalyptic books which were described under the general term 'Apocrypha' (*e.g.*, the book of *Enoch*) were highly regarded in Christian circles; later, in the third century, a change took place, when, under the influence of the Greek Church, the oriental element in ancient Christianity was, by gradual steps, largely eliminated*; under this influence much of the apocryphal (apocalyptic) literature disappeared from general orthodox use. The works described by the general term 'Pseudepigraphic' are mainly apocalyptic in character. The apocalyptic literature is distinguished broadly by some common, general characteristics. It is, first of all, a *popular* literature; that is to say, it reflects (in literary form more or less elaborated) the thoughts of religious circles which were outside the recognized Rabbinical schools; and it embodies religious ideas which in many points conflicted sharply with the strict scholastic orthodoxy of the Pharisees. Next, it emphasized the individual side of religion equally with that of the righteous community; not the nation as such, but the com-

* Cp. Prof. Burkitt's very instructive book, *Early Eastern Christianity* (1904).

munity of the righteous in it—the 'plant of righteousness,' as the book of *Enoch* terms it—will inherit the divine reward. The exalted religious scheme which dominates these books tended to overcome national and particularistic limitations. It is, however, on the side of the Messianic Hope that this literature is most significant; and here the points of contact with the New Testament are most striking and important." * In the preceding pages quotations have been made from the following *Pseudepigrapha*:—

The "Ethiopic" Book of Enoch.—This is the most important representative of the apocalyptic literature that has survived. It is a composite work, the constituent parts being, according to Prof. Charles,† as follows:

"The Book of Enoch"; Chaps. i-xxxvi (170 B.C.), lxxxiii-xc (166-161 B.C.); xci-civ (134-95 B.C.).

"The Book of Celestial Physics"; Chaps. lxxii-lxxxii (166-161 B.C.).

"The Book of Similitudes"; Chaps. xxxvii-lxx (94-64 B.C.).

"The Apocalypse of Noah"; extracts from this work are interspersed throughout the above. This Apocalypse is referred to in *The Book of Jubilees*, x. 13-14, xxi. 10.; § its date is uncertain, but it was undoubtedly written before the commencement of the Christian Era.

The name "Ethiopic" Book of Enoch is given because

* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 33f.

† *The Book of Enoch*, translated and edited, with Notes, etc., by R. H. Charles (1893).

§ Cp. also the mediæval *Midrash* called "The Book of Noah," which probably re-echoes in many respects ancient legendary matter concerning Noah. This Midrash has been published by Jellinek in his *Bet ha-Midrasch*, iii., pp. 155-160; a German translation has recently appeared, see Wünsche *Aus Israels Lehrhallen*, iii., pp. 201-210.

the earliest version of the work which has been preserved is in Ethiopic, originally it was most probably written in Aramaic or Hebrew. The most striking section, and most important because of its picture of the transcendental Messiah who is called 'the Son of Man,' is the "Book of Similitudes." The entire work has for its characteristic features a strongly developed Angelology and Demonology, the doctrine and the description of the Messiah and the Messianic Age, an exposition of the secrets of the unseen world, and of celestial physics. "With the earlier Fathers and Apologists it had all the weight of a canonical book, but towards the close of the third and beginning of the fourth centuries it began to be discredited, and finally fell under the ban of the Church." *

The "Slavonic" Book of Enoch.—The more correct title is "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch"; the name "Slavonic Enoch" is given on account of the only extant form of it being in the Slavonic language; originally it was written in Greek. Though belonging once to the voluminous "Enoch literature," it is quite distinct from the "Ethiopic Enoch," † which it resembles, however, in general character; but it has been influenced to a larger extent by Greek thought. According to Dr. Charles, the book "in its present form was written somewhere about the beginning of the Christian Era. Its author or final editor was an Hellenistic Jew, and the place of its composition was Egypt." ‡

The Book of Jubilees.—This work is also called the "Little Genesis," because it follows the history as given in

* Charles *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

† But "in many respects it is of no less value" than this, Charles *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, p. xi. (1896).

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. xii.

the book of Genesis; but it divides this history into fixed periods of time, or Jubilees," * hence its name. It purports to have been given through angels to Moses on Mount Sinai. The Book is strongly Pharisaic in tone and character, laying great stress on legal observances; it exalts the Sabbath, Circumcision, the Dietary laws, the laws of purification, etc., and is accordingly characterized by a spirit of exclusiveness. As would be expected from this, its attitude towards Messianism is wholly antagonistic; the figure of the Messiah disappears almost entirely, and (anticipating herein, in one respect, a form of modern Judaism) the book represents the Messianic Kingdom as the outcome of a gradual process which is bound up with the study of the *Law*. The date of the book is uncertain, but the end of the second century B.C. seems most probable. The original language was either Hebrew or Aramaic, the former is more likely. It has this in common with *Ecclesiasticus* that one of its main objects is to combat the growing influence of Hellenism.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.—There is something particularly interesting about the contrast between this work and the *Book of Jubilees;* both are approximately of the same date, and both are of Pharisaic origin, but they exhibit a striking contrast on the subject of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom; we have seen the attitude of the *Book of Jubilees* towards these; the writer of the *Testaments*, on the contrary, believes in a

* "The word 'Jubilee' is directly derived from the Hebrew term *Jobel* which, modern scholars are agreed, has the meaning 'ram' or 'ram's horn.' The year of Jubilee thus means literally, 'The year of the ram's horn'; the fiftieth year was so called because it was proclaimed by the blowing of the rams' horns, see Lev. xxv." Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

Messiah, who is, moreover recognized in the person of John Hyrcanus, and he "already sees the Messianic Kingdom established, under the sway of which the Gentiles will in due course be saved, Belial overthrown, sin disappear from the earth, and the righteous dead rise to share in the blessedness of the living."* But, as Prof. Charles says further, "the main, the overwhelming value of the book lies not in this province, but in its ethical teaching, which has achieved a real immortality by influencing the thought and diction of the writers of the New Testament, and even those of our Lord. This ethical teaching, which is indefinitely higher and purer than that of the Old Testament, is yet its true spiritual child, and helps to bridge over the chasm that divides the ethics of the Old and New Testaments."† It was originally written in Hebrew. Apocalyptic elements are in evidence in the testaments of Levi and Naphthali.

The Sybilline Oracles.—The most striking Jewish portions of this curious work (viz. Books iii. iv.) belong, probably, to the end of the second century B.C. Written in Greek, the matter contained in these "Oracles" was partly adapted and derived from similar heathen "Oracles," in imitation of which they are set in poetical form. This mode was adopted for the purposes of the Jewish propaganda in the Dispersion, with the object of commending the truths of the Jewish religion to pagan circles. Apocalyptic elements are pronounced in Book iii.; they deal with such subjects as the fate of the successive kingdoms which are to bear rule over the Jews, signs of the end of the world, the day of

* Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, translated . . . p. xvi. (1908).

† *Ibid*, p. xvii.

Judgement, the blessed age to come. They display an amount of interest in the conversion of non-Jews to the Jewish religion that is unusual in strictly Jewish writers.

The Assumption of Moses.—This is a composite work, being made up of two books which were originally distinct, namely, *The Testament of Moses* and *The Assumption of Moses*. It was written in Hebrew, most probably, and belongs to about the beginning of the Christian Era. In form the book assumes the character of a prediction regarding the future history of Israel, delivered by Moses to Joshua. According to Prof. Charles, it is the work of a Pharisaic Quietist, who inculcates, as the main business of life, the faithful observance of the precepts of the *Law*.

The Life of Adam and Eve and *The Apocalypse of Moses.*—These two works run to a large extent parallel, and cover in great measure the same ground; they evidently go back to one original, which was written in Hebrew. They deal with such subjects as Adam in the Garden of Eden, his expulsion from Paradise, his repentance, illness, and death. The Rabbinical literature often refers to legends connected with Adam,* probably all these legends go back to an original popular legend which became elaborated as time went on. Apocalyptic elements in the strict sense of the word are rarely in evidence in these two works, but the resurrection, paradise, and future bliss are referred to. They possess a certain amount of importance for the study of the Jewish doctrine of Sin. Their date is approximately the middle of the first century A.D.

The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.—Belonging to the latter part of the first century A.D., and written in Hebrew

* e.g., in *The Book of Noah* referred to above.

or Aramaic, this work offers an example of Orthodox Jewish thought and religious feeling as it existed in the early days of Christianity, and before the period of Talmudic Judaism had fully set in. In form it assumes the character of a series of visions connected by narrative. It is only extant in Syriac.* The book is of great importance for the study of Judaism at the time of Christ and of the Apostles. It may perhaps best be described as an apology for Orthodox Pharisaic Judaism of the first century A.D., with an implicit polemic against Christianity. It throws valuable light on such parts of Jewish theology as are concerned with Original Sin, Free Will, Works and Justification, Mediation, and Forgiveness.

The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch.—This is quite a distinct work from that just referred to; it is, probably, of somewhat later date. It tells of how Baruch was conducted through the heavens, and gives an account of the wonderful sights he saw. An interesting element in it is its reference to the offering of the prayers of men to God by Michael. On the whole, however, the religious element in the work is not conspicuous.

The Testament of Abraham.—The date of this work is uncertain; some scholars place it in the second century, A.D.,† others claim an earlier date for it.‡ The original language was Hebrew; its whole *venue* is very Jewish, but it has been subjected to later Christian influence. It describes Abraham's refusal to yield up his soul; his death is ultimately brought about by the help of the Angel of Death, for Michael, who had been sent by God to fetch his soul, finds himself unable to do so. The book has an important

* An English translation has been published by Prof. Charles (1896).

† M. R. James *The Testament of Abraham*, p. 51.

‡ *Jewish Encycl.* I. 95b, etc.

bearing on the doctrine of Mediation; for in it the Archangel Michael appears as intercessor on Abraham's behalf, and Abraham himself is represented, together with Michael, as procuring a sinner's entry into Paradise by means of their intercession (Chap. xiv.). A striking characteristic of the book is its developed Angelology and Demonology.

ii.—The Targumim.

The Targum of Onkelos to the Pentateuch.—Also known as "Targum Babli," as although most probably written originally in Palestine, it was re-edited in Babylon. The compiler, Onkelos, was a pupil of Gamaliel the elder, who died in 70 A.D. The fact of this Targum having been written almost within the life-time of Christ, and of its embodying material which was centuries older, shows its value as a witness to Jewish exegesis and theology during the period between the Old and New Testaments. Like all the Targums it avoids, whenever possible, anthropomorphisms, but unlike the others, the *Haggadic* element (i.e., the anecdotal mode) is rare, when it does occur it is only in the poetical passages.

The Targum of pseudo-Jonathan to the Pentateuch.—Also known as "Targum Jerushalmi" or the "Palestinian Targum." The name as given above is the most usual one, it is a correction of what used to be the current title, namely the "Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel to the Pentateuch"; this title was given owing to a mistake, a mistake which arose in this way: "The Targum was often indicated briefly as 'Targum *J*' (i.e. Targum Jerushalmi); the *J* was mistaken for an abbreviation of 'Jonathan,' and it was supposed that the Jonathan ben Uzziel, to whom the

Targum to the Prophets is ascribed, was also responsible for this Targum to the Pentateuch." *. This Targum also exists in another form, likewise known as the "Jerusalem Targum," but frequently referred to as the "Fragment Targum" owing to the fragmentary form in which it has come down to us.

The Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets.—Written by Jonathan ben Uzziel, who is described as a pupil of Hillel (early part of first century A.D.). This comprises the historical books, called in the Hebrew Canon the "Former Prophets," as well as the prophetical books proper, called in the Hebrew Canon the "Latter Prophets." It is full of interesting Haggadic matter; Zunz says: "Even in the case of historical books Jonathan often acts the part of an expositor; in the case of the prophetical books, again, such a style of exposition is uninterruptedly pursued as makes it really a *Haggadic* work." †

The Targum to Canticles.—"The Targumist handles the 'Song of Songs' as an allegorical outline of Jewish History from the Exodus to the coming of the Messiah and the expectant building of the third Temple." ‡ This Targum forms part of a work which comprises Targums on the five *Megilloth* or "Rolls" (viz., *Ruth*, *Lamentations*, *Ecclesiastes*, *Esther*, and *Canticles*). According to Zunz, all are, most likely, by the same author, who lived "very probably a considerable time after the Talmudic period." §

* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

† *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt*, p. 66, (2nd ed. 1892).

‡ H. Gollancz, *The Targum to the 'Song of Songs,'* p. 3.

§ *Op. cit.*, p. 68.

iii.—The Midrashim.

Although most of the Midrashic literature is chronologically later than the Talmudic, we shall consider it before this latter because the idea of Midrash is older. "Midrashic elements can already be detected in the text of Scripture itself. The Chronicler cites as one of his sources a 'Midrash' [rendered 'Commentary' in the English Bible] on the book of *Kings* (ii. Chron. xxiv. 27), and the books of *Chronicles* exhibit many of the characteristic features of Midrash proper, as can be seen by comparing the parallel narratives contained in *Chronicles* and the earlier historical books (*Samuel* and *Kings*) . . . The Midrashic features were already developed in the sources used by the Chronicler, and may not primarily be due to the latter." * What has to be borne in mind when dealing with the Midrashic literature is admirably stated in the following words: "We have to bear in mind a fact familiar enough to students of the Talmudic and Midrashic literature, . . . the inveterate tendency of Jewish teachers to convey their doctrine, not in the form of abstract discourse, but in a mode appealing directly to the imagination, and seeking to arouse the interest and sympathy of the man rather than the philosopher. The Rabbi embodies his lesson in a story, whether parable or allegory or seeming historical narrative; and the last thing he or his disciples would think of is to ask whether the selected persons, events, and circumstances which so vividly suggest the doctrine are in themselves real or fictitious. The doctrine is everything; the mode of presentation has no independent value. To make the story the first consideration, and the doctrine it was intended to convey an afterthought as we, with our dry Western literalness, are predisposed to do, is to reverse the

* Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

Jewish order of thinking, and to do unconscious injustice to the authors of many edifying narratives of antiquity."* The *Midrashim* from which quotations have been made in the preceding pages are the following†; we give them in alphabetical order:

Bemidbar Rabba.—The name "Bemidbar" (= "In the wilderness") is the Hebrew title of *Numbers*; "Rabba" (= "Great") indicates that it belongs to the collection known as the "Midrash Rabba" which comprises a Midrash on each of the five books of the Pentateuch, and on each of the five *Megilloth* (= "Scrolls"). In its present form this Midrash belongs in part to the twelfth century and in part to a somewhat earlier date, for it is not a homogeneous work, at least two authors having had a share in its composition; much earlier Midrashic material has been incorporated in the work.‡

Bereshith Rabba.—"Bereshith" (= "In the beginning") is the Hebrew title of *Genesis*. Wünsche, in the Introduction to his German edition of this work, says: "It consists of a hundred chapters; the second part of Chap. xcix. is a later addition, which contains a variant explanation of Jacob's Blessing, and which for the most part agrees with the corresponding passages of the *Midrash Tanchuma* (see below). The time of its composition is certainly after the completion of the Jerusalem Talmud, from which our Midrash contains many excerpts not only of Haggadic,§

* C. J. Ball, in his Introduction to *The Song of the Three Holy Children* (Speaker's Commentary on the *Apocrypha*), Vol. II., p. 307.

† See also p. 153 above.

‡ Zunz *Op. cit.*, pp. 270 ff.

§ i.e., Narrative matter.

but also of Halakic † content." ‡ Zunz gives conclusive reasons for assigning this Midrash to the sixth century A.D.; but, as he shows, it contains a large amount of earlier material. ‖ Every verse of *Genesis* is quoted as a different heading and is separately commented on; these comments are often of great interest. From the Christian point of view the importance as well as the interest of *Bereshith Rabba* lies in the fact that in a number of instances it is found to throw light upon and to illustrate sayings in the Fourth Gospel. §

Debarim Rabba.—"Debarim" (= "Words"), from the Hebrew title of *Deuteronomy*. This is not nearly such a large work as the preceding; only a certain number of verses from most of the chapters, but not all, of *Deuteronomy* are dealt with. According to Wünsche this *Midrash* contains comparatively more Halakic matter than any of the others of the *Rabboth* collection.** An interesting detail is the way in which Moses is represented as protesting to the Angel of Death his unwillingness to die (xxxi. 14); it reminds one of the somewhat similar action of Abraham in the *Testament of Abraham*. The same episode, as regards Moses, is recounted in *Wajjikra Rabba* c. xviii., and in *Bemidbar Rabba* c. xvi. This Midrash belongs to the ninth-tenth century A.D., so Zunz; †† but as is the case with all these *Midrashim* a great deal of the material embodied belongs to much earlier times.

† i.e., Legal matter.
‡ *Der Midrasch Bereshit Rabba*, p. v.
‖ Zunz *Op. cit.*, pp. 185f.
§ For some examples see Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 139f.
** *Der Midrasch Debarim Rabba*, p. viii.
†† *Op. cit.*, p. 264.

Midrash Tehillim.—"Tehillim" = "Psalms." Originally this work dealt only with the first one hundred and eighteen psalms, the remainder was added later. The original portion is regarded as decidedly ancient both by Buber and Wünsche,* the rest is late, belonging, according to the same authorities, to the thirteenth century. Much use has been made of older material, many quotations occurring especially from the Jerusalem Talmud,† while in the latter portion great use has been made of the Babylonian Talmud.‡ This Midrash is not a running commentary on the Psalms, as a rule only a few verses from each psalm are commented on. The titles to the Psalms are dealt with at great length, many of the explanations being extremely artificial. The place of origin appears to be Palestine.

Pesikta.—"Section." This Midrash takes its name from the fact that it consists of about thirty homilies based upon the special Pentateuchal or Prophetic "Sections," or Lessons as we should call them. It is a Palestinian work of undoubted antiquity, probably of the same date as *Bereshith Rabba* or even earlier. ‖

Shemoth Rabba.—"Shemoth" (="Names") is the Hebrew title of *Exodus*. This work is composite, the later portions belonging, according to Zunz, to the eleventh or twelfth century; a great deal of earlier material is embodied in it. The special characteristic of this Midrash is its wealth of parables. §

* *Midrasch Tehillim, oder Haggadische Erklärung der Psalmen*, I. p. vi. The original has been published by S. Buber (Wilna 1891).

† Wünsche, *ibid.*

‡ Zunz, *Op. cit.*, p. 279.

‖ See further *Jewish Encycl.*, VIII., 559.

§ Zunz, *Op. cit.*, p. 269.

Shir Rabba.—"Shir" = "Song," an abbreviation for *Shir ha Shirim*, "Song of Songs." In this Midrash much has been incorporated from *Bereshith Rabba* and the Jerusalem Talmud.* In its present form it belongs to the first half of the ninth century. The work is a running commentary on every verse of *Canticles*, many quotations being given from well-known Rabbis, some of very early date.

Sifra.—"The book"; it is called also *Torath Kohanim*, "The Law of the Priests"; it is a commentary on *Leviticus*, and of great antiquity; it is frequently quoted in the Talmud, and most probably emanated originally from the schools of Rabbi Akiba † and Rabbi Ishmael ‡; in its principal parts it is a Midrash of Rabbi Jehudah ‖; there are also later additions. §

Sifre.—"Books"; a Midrash on *Numbers* v.-xxxvi. and *Deuteronomy*; like *Sifra* this Midrash is of great importance; it also belongs to the schools of Rabbis Akiba and Ishmael; both are composite works, and both are controversial in tone.

In conjunction with *Sifra* and *Sifre* should be mentioned *Mechilta* * ("Measure"), or Midrash on *Exodus* xii. to the end; this, likewise, from its early age, is a very important work.† "This group is of first-rate importance. In their

* Zunz, *Op. cit.*, pp. 274f., Wünsche *Der Midrasch Schir ha-Schirim*, pp. viii.f.

† Died 135 A.D.

‡ Flourished about 120-140 A.D.

‖ *Circa* 190 A.D.

§ See the article *Sifra* in the *Jewish Encycl.*, XI., 330.

* The word means properly "The law which guides action," see Winter and Wünsche *Mechiltha*, p. v.

† Interesting details of this Midrash are given by Dr. L. A. Rosenthal in *Semitic Studies in memory of Alexander Kohut*, pp. 463-484.

original form these three Midrashim go back to the earlier part of the second century A.D. (to a time anterior to the Bar-Kokba revolt, 132-135 A.D.) The disciples of Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai, viz., Ismael, Akiba and Eleazar of Modin,‡ appear to have redacted the principal contents of the exposition on the basis of the still older and anonymous stratum of the exegetical tradition." ‖

Wajjikra Rabba.—"Wajjikra" (= "And he called") the Hebrew title of *Leviticus*. This belongs to the "Rabboth," or "Midrash Rabba" collection mentioned above. Zunz places it in the seventh century and believes to have been compiled in Palestine. § It is characterized by its many proverbs, in imitation of the earlier *Chokma-* ("Wisdom") literature.

Tanchuma Wajechi, *Tanchuma Shophetim*, and *Tanchuma Haasinu*, are the names of sections (of which there are altogether a hundred and forty) of an immense work known by the name of "Midrash Tanchuma." The name comes from a famous Palestinian Rabbi, called Tanchuma, who belonged to the fifth generation of *Amoraim.** Originally the "Midrash Tanchuma" comprised three different collections of commentaries on the

‡ All belonging to the early part of the second century, A.D.

‖ Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, p. 79.

§ *Op. cit.*, pp. 262f.

* Those Rabbis by whose work the Mishnah became expanded into the two Talmuds are called *Amoraim* (= "Speakers" or "Interpreters"); they are classified according to their generation, of which there are five, dating from 220 to 500 A.D. The fifth generation is dated 427-500 A.D. In like manner, the *Tannaim* (= "Teachers"), a name given to the Rabbinical authorities who flourished during the first two centuries, are divided into four generations, ranging from 10-220 A.D.

Pentateuch; two are extant, the third is known only by citations. "These Midrashim, although bearing the name of Rabbi Tanchuma, must not be regarded as having been written or edited by him. They were so named merely because they consist partly of homilies originating with him (this being indicated by the introductory formula 'Thus began Rabbi Tanchuma,' or 'Thus preached Rabbi Tanchuma'), and partly of homilies by haggadic teachers who followed the style of Rabbi Tanchuma. It is possible that Rabbi Tanchuma himself preserved his homilies, and that his collection was used by the editors of the Midrash. The three collections were edited at different times."* This Midrash is also known by the name *Yelammedenu*, derived from the formula "Yelammedenu Rabbenu" ("Our teacher teaches us") with which eighty-two of the sections begin.† According to Zunz, the work in its present form was compiled in Southern Italy in 850 A.D. ‡

Yalkut Shimeoni.—"Yalkut" = "Collection"; this enormous work was edited by Rabbi Shimeon in the thirteenth century. ‖ It consists of a "chain" of quotations, something after the manner of the patristic *Catenae*, explaining not only the Pentateuch but all the books of the Bible; the quotations are gathered from the entire Midrashic and Talmudic literatures. The real value of the work lies in the fact that it has preserved much which would otherwise have been lost. §

* *Jewish Encycl.*, XII., 45.
† Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. xxix.
‡ *Op. cit.* pp. 238ff.
‖ Zunz, *Op. cit.*, pp. 302ff.
§ Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. xxx.

iv.—Talmudic Tractates.

For the following brief notes we are indebted, in the main, to H. L. Strack, the fourth edition of whose *Einleitung in den Talmud* has recently appeared. Use has also been made of Goldschmidt's edition (as yet incomplete) of the Talmud. We give the Tractates from which quotations have been made in the order in which they come in the original.*

Berakhoth.—"Blessings"; the tractate deals with the subject of prayer.

Shabbath.—"Sabbath"; as the name implies, this tractate gives minute directions of every imaginable kind about the observance of the Sabbath.

Yoma.—("Day"), i.e., the Day of Atonement, which is the subject of this tractate.

Sukkah.—("Booth"); here again the name clearly indicates, the subject dealt with, viz., the Feast of Tabernacles.

Rosh Hashshana.—("New Year's Day," lit. "The Head of the year"), details are given as to the mode of observing this Feast.

Chagigah.—("Festival"); this tractate deals with the observance of the three great festivals, Passover, Weeks, and Tabernacles.

Gittin.—("Bills of Divorce"); directions are here given as to the preparation of the bill of divorce, the mode of delivering it, witnesses, etc., etc.

Sotah.—("A woman suspected of adultery"); the subject of this tractate is the unsavoury one indicated in the title.

* It will, of course, be understood that the Tractates from which quotations have been made comprise only a few of the sixty-three contained in the Babylonian Talmud.

Baba Bathra.—("The last gate)" this tractate deals with the subject of landed estate, boundary marks, the difference between public and private land, sale of land, and with innumerable other details both relevant and otherwise.

Sanhedrin.—("Court of Justice"); a valuable source of information concerning the administration of justice, and legal procedure, among the Jews from early times.

Aboth.—("Fathers," called also *Pirke Aboth*, "Ethics of the Fathers)"; the finest of the tractates; it contains sayings of many of the most notable Rabbis, and is full of interest; its primary object is to show the continuity of the Tradition, or Oral Law, and with continuity, of course, the authority thereof. Parts of it have been incorporated in the Jewish Prayer Book.

Zebachim.—("Sacrifices"); an important source of information on the ritual of the Sacrificial System and its doctrinal significance.

It must be remembered that in all these tractates an immense quantity of irrelevant matter finds a place.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

(Roman figures denote Chapters.)

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE MESSIANIC IDEA: A study in Comparative Religion. (Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1, Amen Corner, E.C. 3s. 6d., net.)

"It is stimulating, earnest, frank, and full of interesting information."—*Athenæum.*

"Here is sound apologetic."—*Church Times.*

"An illuminative piece of scholarship in Comparative Religion."—*Outlook.*

"A clear and sane study of the antecedents, inside and outside Israel, of the Messianic Idea."—*British Weekly,*

"The book is written from the standpoint of a devout Christian, and contains much valuable material."—*Cambridge Review.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS: Jewish and Christian. (John Murray, 50A, Albemarle Street, W. 3s. 6d., net.)

"The book deserves the notice of theological students and preachers, who will find in its pages much to interest and instruct."—*Catholic Times.*

"Dr. Oesterley has succeeded in producing an intensely interesting book, and in digesting for the average reader an enormous quantity of apocalyptic literature."—*Irish Times.*

"This is certainly one of the best short books on a great subject."—*Methodist Recorder.*

OUR BIBLE TEXT: Some recently discovered Biblical Documents, with an Appendix. Five plates. *Second and enlarged edition.* (Skeffington and Son, 34, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C. 2s. net.)

"We shall be surprised if it does not find a place on the shelves of Bible Students."—*The Record.*

Charles Cull and Son 15, Houghton Street, Aldwych, and at Chiswick.


THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES