

2. "The Last Adam": Alleged Jewish Parallels.

In 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵ Paul contrasts Adam with Christ: οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν; and in v.⁴⁷, ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεῦτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (cf. v.⁴⁶ ἐπουράνιος). Similarly in Rom. 5¹⁴ he speaks of the transgression of Adam, ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος sc. 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 convertisse¹; 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 אָדָם הַרִאשׁוֹן is, indeed, common in the Talmud and Midrashim, and the corresponding Aramaic אָדָם קְדָמָא is found in some of the Targums; but it does not, as Fritzsche supposes, imply a contrast to an *Adamus postremus*; it merely distinguishes אָדָם as a proper name, Adam, from the indefinite אָדָם, 'a man, any man, human kind.' An expression corresponding to Paul's ὁ ἔσχατος (δεύτερος, μέλλων) Ἀδάμ has not been discovered anywhere in the voluminous literature of Jewish tradition.

The passages adduced in the commentaries as evidence of the 'rabbinical' אָדָם הַאֲחֵרִין are all from *Neve Shalom*, book ix.³ Thus, in ix. 8 (fol. 166^b 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 ὁ δεύτερος or ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ"); Grimm, *Lex. s.v. Ἀδάμ*; et al. More cautiously, Schmiedel on Cor. (*Hand-Comm.*, ii. 202).

² *Digest*, vi. 713, on 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵ ff.

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; מִפְּנֵי שְׂאֵדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן הִתְחִילוֹ [הַקְּרֵבָן *sc.*] וְהָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן בְּשִׁלְמוֹת יְקִימֵהוּ כְּדִי לְהַתִּמִּיד הַשְּׁפַע הָאֱלֹהִי בְּאוֹמֶה וְהָאָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן הוּא הַמְּשִׁיחַ כְּמוֹ שְׂאֵמֵר יְרוֹם מִמֶּשֶׁה וְכוּ' : "Because אָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן began it, and אָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן 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. 150^b)⁴ 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, שְׁכַמוֹ שְׂאֵדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן הִיָּה אֶחָד בְּחַטָּא בֵּן הַמְּשִׁיחַ, וְיִהְיֶה הָאַחֲרוֹן לְהַסִּיר הַחַטָּא לְנִמְרֵי יִתְמוֹ חַטָּאִים מִן הָאָרֶץ שְׁכַלְמִם יִדְעוּ אֶת יְהוָה וְכוּ' : "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 (זְכוּת) 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. 170^a), אָדָם הָאַחֲרוֹן 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. 52¹⁸, 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 Maimun 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 (סבט) "*Tseror Hamor*" (צֶרֶר הַמֹּר), 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 אֲדָם אֹהֶר to Adam in his coat of skins. I need hardly say that the cabalistic speculations about the אֲדָם קְדָמוֹן, 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)⁶ 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 אֲדָם הַרְאִשׁוֹן is frequent, "an vero *Secundus Homo* philologis nostris aequè 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 *Tseror 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 אֹהֶר unus in peccato; sic Messias erit הַאֲחֵרִין postremus, ad auferendum

⁶ 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. 18²¹ 2 Ki. 16³ 23¹⁰) and the older Protestant commentators (Fagius on Lev. 18²¹, Drusius on Acts 7⁴³, etc.¹) from the mediaeval Jewish commentaries (Rashi on Jer. 7³¹, Kimchi on 2 Ki. 23¹⁰). These in turn repeat a Midrash which is preserved in two slightly different forms. The first is found in the Yalkut on Jer. 7³¹, where it is quoted from the Midrash Yelamedenu. The Aruch s.v. מַנְיָן (see also s.v. קַנְקַל) 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^a; Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, s.v. קַנְקַל). 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 (קַנְקַלִּים, Low Greek κάγκελλοι).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 Fritzsche gives a reference to Bartolucci, but evidently gave no heed to what he might have learned from Bartolucci.

¹ See also Beyer, Addit. to Selden, *De Dis Syris*, c. vi. 1.

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 מ; in the Yalkut מַנְיָן, which cannot be right before the following מַנְיָן.