
In 1 Cor. 15th Paul contrasts Adam with Christ: οὖν καὶ γέγραπται Ἔγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἄδαμ εἰς φυσιᾷ ζώσαν· ὁ Ἰσχαγός Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεύμα ζωομον; and in v. 47, ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χωτῆς, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ οὐρανοῦ (cf. v. 46 ἐσπουδάζει). Similarly in Rom. 5th he speaks of the transgression of Adam, δὲ ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτοῦ Ἀδάμ.

Modern commentators on these passages, almost without exception, represent this comparison of the first Adam with the last Adam, that is, the Messiah, as a piece of Paul's Jewish learning. Fritzsche, for example, writes: Videtur autem hanc Messiae appellationem (ultimus, futurus Adamus) non Paulum excogitasse, sed in Judaeorum scholis multum tum temporis frequentatam in rem suam convertisse 1; while Bloomfield asserts that "nothing was more common with the Jews than to use these very expressions [the first Adam, the last Adam] of Adam and the Messiah." 2

There is, however, no evidence of any kind that such terms as 'the last, the second, the coming Adam' were current among Jewish scholars in Paul's time as a designation of the Messiah, or that they have ever had any general currency among the Jews. The phrase Ἄνθρωπος ζωομόν is, indeed, common in the Talmud and Midrashim, and the corresponding Aramaic מַדְרֶשׂ מַדְרֶשׂ is found in some of the Targums; but it does not, as Fritzsche supposes, imply a contrast to an Adamus postremus; it merely distinguishes מַדְרֶשׂ as a proper name, Adam, from the indefinite מַדְרֶשׂ, 'a man, any man, human kind.' An expression corresponding to Paul's Ἰσχαγός (δεύτερος, μᾶλλον) Ἀδάμ has not been discovered anywhere in the voluminous literature of Jewish tradition.

The passages adduced in the commentaries as evidence of the 'rabbinical' מַדְרֶשׂ מַדְרֶשׂ are all from Neve Shalom, book ix. Thus, in ix. 8 (fol. 166b ed. Venet. 1575) the author is arguing that

---

1 Comm. in Rom., i. 318; cf. 319. See also Meyer on Rom. and Cor.; Sanday on Rom. ("the Rabbinical designation of the Messiah as δ δεύτερος or δ Ισχαγός Ἀδάμ"); Grimm, Lxx. s.v. Ἀδάμ; et al. More cautiously, Schniedel on Cor. (Hand-Comm., ii. 202).
2 Digest, vi. 713, on 1 Cor. 15th.
3 The references have been copied by one from another without verification so often that certain accidental errors and inconsequences of citation have become part of the learned tradition; the commonest reference, ix. 9, is such an error.
sacrifice, because it teaches the unity and the providence of God, will not be done away in the world to come; because it teaches the unity and the providence of God, will not be done away in the world to come; because it teaches the unity and the providence of God, will not be done away in the world to come; because it teaches the unity and the providence of God, will not be done away in the world to come;

"Because it began it, and will confirm it in perfection, in order to make permanent the divine influence in the people. The last man (Adam) is the Messiah, as it is said, 'He shall be higher than Moses,' etc. Then follows a description of the perfections of the Messiah, according to the prophecies. In ix. 5 (fol. 150a) we read: The heifer which the Messiah will offer [in distinction from that which Moses offered after the sin of the golden calf] will be an atonement for sin universally, to do away transgression and put an end to the sin of the human race, and the heifer shall be an atonement for sin universally, to do away transgression and put an end to the sin of the human race,

"As the first Adam was first in sin, so the Messiah shall be the last (sc. Adam) to remove sin utterly; sinners shall cease from the earth; for all of them shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest," etc. Hereupon follows a comparison of the merit (замені) of Abraham and Moses with that of the Messiah, who by his greater merit will be able to accomplish completely what they did but partially.

In a third passage (ix. 9. fol. 170a), יעררְּנָה seems to be, not the Messiah, but the perfect man of the Messianic age, as we might say 'the coming man.'

The resemblance, especially of the second passage quoted, to Paul's argument is indeed noteworthy, and the parallel would be still more striking if it were possible to produce the entire context — the first Adam, by whom sin entered into the world, and death by sin; the Messiah, the opposite of the first Adam, who removes sin and restores man's lost immortality, etc.

But however interesting these parallels may be, they are wholly irrelevant for the purpose for which they are commonly cited; namely, to show that "the last Adam" was used by the Jews in New Testament times as a name for the Messiah. For the book in which they occur was written at the end of the fifteenth century of our era. Its author, Rabbi Abraham ben Isaac Shalom, a Spanish

4 Yalkut on Is. 52:13, from Tanchuma [Par. Toledoth, ed. Buber, fol. 70a].

5 The folio is falsely numbered 161; numerous other typographical errors in the pagination occur in this first edition.
(Catalan) Jew, is one of the epigoni of the philosophical school of R. Moses ben Maimon and R. Levi ben Gerson. The work itself deals with a wide range of questions, theological and philosophical, physical and metaphysical; Aristotle and the Cabala and Christian controversy jostle one another in it. In the very passage in which we have found the most significant coincidences with Paul's teaching, the author pauses to refute the error of the Christians that the sin of Adam involved all the men of the race, and that its penalty falls upon them all. In a word, the book is not only separated from New Testament times by fourteen centuries, in which Jewish thought had been not less active than Christian, but does not pretend to represent Jewish tradition.

Besides Neve Shalom, reference is sometimes made to R. Abraham Seba's (עַבְרַיָּא) *'Tsoror Hamor* (תֶּשֶׁרְו הָמוּר), a cabalistic commentary on the Pentateuch, written about 1500. This work I have not seen, but from Rhenferd's quotation it appears that in the course of a running analogy between the building of the tabernacle and the creation, Aaron in his priestly robes is compared as רֶכֶם לְדָי to Adam in his coat of skins. I need hardly say that the cabalistic speculations about the יַעַרְו לָדֵי, or the upper and lower Adams, or the three Adams respectively 'created,' 'formed,' and 'made,' have no relevance to the matter before us.

The history of the quotations from Neve Shalom and the use made of them is instructive. They were first brought to light, so far as I am able to ascertain, by Rhenferd (d. 1712) in his Observationes III. ad 1 Cor. xv. 45–47, published by Meuschen, *Novum Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, p. 1048 f. Rhenferd says that יַעַרְו לָדֵי is frequent, "an vero Secundus Homo philologis nostris aeque ex magistrorum scriptis notus sit, equidem haud scio." Having thus plainly said that he knew no parallel in ancient Jewish writings,—a testimony which comes with great weight from a man whose rabbinical erudition has not often been surpassed among Christians,—he adduces the passages from Neve Shalom and Tsoror Hamor, as showing that such a conception was not altogether foreign to Jewish modes of thought.

Schoettgen quotes Neve Shalom at second hand from Edzard on Berachoth i. p. 176, "Quemadmodum Adam primus fuit רֶכֶם unus in peccato; sic Messias erit יַעַרְו postremus, ad auferendum

* Neither Buxtorf in his *Lexicon* nor Lightfoot in his *Horae* is acquainted with them.
peccata penitus.” 7 From Schoettgen and Rhenferd the passages have been handed on from one generation of New Testament scholars to another, until the “rabbinical doctrine of the second Adam” has become an accepted article of learned tradition,—I was going to say of Christian faith. No one seems to have thought of inquiring when Neve Shalom was written or what manner of book it might be. 8

3. The Image of Moloch.

The current descriptions of this idol come through Nicolaus a Lyra (on Lev. 18:21 2 Ki. 16:23 19:10) and the older Protestant commentators (Fagius on Lev. 18:21, Drusius on Acts 7:53, etc.) 1 from the mediaeval Jewish commentators (Rashi on Jer. 7:3, Kimchi on 2 Ki. 23:10). These in turn repeat a Midrash which is preserved in two slightly different forms. The first is found in the Yalkut on Jer. 7:3, where it is quoted from the Midrash Yelamedenu. The Aruch s.v. מָלֹך (see also s.v. מָלֹך) gives the more exact reference, Yelamedenu, Par. Kodashim, end. The Yelamedenu seems to be lost; but in one of the manuscripts collated by S. Buber for his edition of the Midrash Tanchuma the passage quoted in the Yalkut is found in an addition to the Par. Ethchanan (see Tanchuma, ed. Buber, Debarim fol. 8°; Kohut, Aruch Completum, s.v. מָלֹך). Comparison of the text in the Yalkut, the Aruch (so far as it is quoted there), and the Tanchuma manuscript shows numerous variations; but none which materially affect the sense.

Unlike the other heathen gods, Moloch had his place of worship outside the walls of Jerusalem. His idol stood in the innermost of seven chambers or cells, separated by grated doors (מָלֹך, Low Greek Καθελλος). 2 The worshipper who offered a bird was admitted to the first or outer cell; he who offered a goat, 3 to the second; a

7 Of course Schoettgen, like Edzard and Rhenferd, was under no illusion as to the age and value of this parallel.
8 Fritzschte gives a reference to Bartolocci, but evidently gave no heed to what he might have learned from Bartolocci.
1 See also Beyer, Addit. to Selden, De Dis Syris, c. vi. i.
2 In Echa rab. the word still has its original meaning, ‘gratings, grated doors’; in Yelamedenu it is used of the room within these barriers; cf. the Eng. ‘chancel.’
3 Tanchuma תְנָךְ; in the Yalkut מָלֹך, which cannot be right before the following מָלֹך.