THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE APOCRYPHAL SCRIPTURES.

I. THE MESSIANIC HOPE.

§ 1. *Introductory.*

THE following Notes embody the results of a fairly complete examination of the leading eschatological ideas of the apocryphal and pseud-epigraphic books of the Old Testament, and are offered as the first instalment of an independent study of Christian Origins. It is now, I take it, generally recognized that the Christian synthesis had its roots deep in the past, and that the most various elements contributed to form the intellectual and spiritual *milieu* in which the Gospel arose. I hope at a future date to attack the larger problem; meantime, an attempt to survey some of the Jewish elements in the syncretism and to trace their historical evolution should prove of service to students. So far as my knowledge extends, the only recent book in English which deals historically with Judaic Eschatology is Dr Charles's *Jowett Lectures*.¹ Since the appearance of this excellent work, much has been written on the subject in Germany, where the publication of a complete translation of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha under the editorship of Prof. Kautzsch has given a fresh impulse to the study of this form of literature. In the course of my exposition I shall refer to some of the more important recent works, and thus afford the reader some idea of my indebtedness to previous workers in the same field. This and the fact that most of the works cited are comparatively little known in England will account for, if it does not wholly justify, the number of the references themselves. One of my objects will be to employ the available material for the purpose of throwing light on the genesis of the eschatological ideas of the period.

§ 2. *The Earthly Messianic Rule.*

I begin with the idea of the Messianic Kingdom, which is constantly placed at the end of Time, and thus conceived, in a way, eschatologically. It matters little whether we say with Volz² that the Messianic Expectations form merely a special chapter in Eschatology, or with Hühn,³

¹ *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity*, London, 1899.

² *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, Tübingen 1903.

³ *Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu dem Targumim*, Tübingen 1898-1900.

that Eschatology forms a part of the Messianic Hope. In any case, it is tacitly presupposed that the Kingdom will not appear till the end of the present era, although, to be sure, the precise date of its manifestation is nowhere very clearly defined. With the thought of the Kingdom is closely connected that of Judgement which, as is rightly pointed out by Bousset,¹ follows logically from the notion of 'the Law', itself so characteristic of the so-called post-exilic period. For the sake of convenience, however, I will keep the treatment of these two ideas separate. The separation is the more justified in that the descriptions of the Messianic Kingdom to be met with in the apocryphal scriptures present it almost without exception as established *on earth*, and as constituting as it were a transition-stage to the final End of All Things, when the present world shall be destroyed, and the Resurrection and the Last Judgement consummated. Traces of this belief in an earthly Kingdom are found in the prophetic books of the Old Testament,² but it was not till after the composition of the Book of Daniel (*circa* 160 B. C.), 'the pattern Apocalypse', as Dr Cheyne calls it,³ that the idea rose into prominence. Thenceforward, we can trace it in an unbroken series of writings up to the time of R. Akiba.

In Judaism the henotheism of the Old Testament had developed, under Persian influence, into nominal and official monotheism, and the God of Israel had already become King and Lord of the whole Earth.⁴ Thus, we find him called King (βασιλεύς) 2 Mac. i 24; 3 Mac. ii 9; Tob. xiii 10; Eccclus. li 1; Ps. Sol. xvii 1; Eth. Enoch lxxxiv 2; King and Lord (κύριος βασιλεύς) 3 Ezra iv 46; King and God (βασιλεύς θεός) Sib. Proem. 80; King of Kings (βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων) 2 Mac. xiii 4; Eth. Enoch lxxxiv 2⁵; King of the Universe (παμβασιλεύς) Eccclus. l 15; Great King (μέγας βασιλεύς) Tob. xiii 15; Ps. Sol. ii 32; King of Gods and Lord of all Rule (βασιλεὺς τῶν θεῶν καὶ πάσης ἀρχῆς ἐπικράτων) Suppl. Esth. iii 23; King of Heaven (βασιλεὺς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) 3 Ezra iv 46, 58, (βασιλεὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν) 3 Mac. ii 2; Tob. xiii 7, 11; King on the lofty seat (*rex in alta sede*), Ass. Mos. iv 4; Holy King (ἅγιος βασιλεύς) 3 Mac. ii 13; Immortal King (ἀθάνατος βασιλεύς) III Sib. 48, 616, 707; King of all Creation (βασιλεὺς πάσης κτίσεως) Jud. ix 12; Lord of Heaven and Earth (κύριος [δεσπότης] τοῦ [τῶν] οὐρανοῦ [-ῶν] καὶ τῆς γῆς) Tob. vii 16; Jud. ix 12; Test. Naph. (Hebr.) 9; Lord of Glory (κύριος

¹ *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2. Aufl., Berlin 1906) pp. 233 f. Referred to as *B. R. J.*

² See below.

³ *Bible Problems* (1904) p. 214. So Volz.

⁴ In the time of Herod the idea of a divine World-King was universally current throughout the Roman Empire. Cf. Lublinski, *Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur* (Jena 1910), pp. 64-85; A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, 1908) pp. 264 ff.

⁵ Note here the ἀπὸ λεγόμενον 'God of the Whole World'.

της δόξης) Eth. Enoch xxii 14; xxv 3, 7; xxvii 3, 5 *al.* Such passages might be multiplied almost indefinitely.¹ This conception of God's Rule over His people and the world extends to all time, including therefore the periods in which the various writings were composed. Thus, Ps. cxlv 13, 'Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations'. Again Ps. ciii 19, 'The Lord *hath* established his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all'. In Sap. Sol. x 10, Jacob beholds in a dream the Rule of God established in Heaven. (So Tob. xiii 16; Jud. xii 19; Ps. Sol. ii 32; v 18f; Eth. Enoch viii 42; ciii 1 &c.) In particular, Israel's expectations for the future are summed up in the phrase יְהוָה מְלִיכָה, βασιλεία (τοῦ) θεοῦ² or מַלְכוּת שׁוֹמֵר, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, in which, as is rightly pointed out by Dalman³ and Bousset (*R. J.* p. 245), the term מַלְכוּת יְהוָה always means Rule (*Regiment Herrschaft*), and not Kingdom (*Reich*) of Yahwè. Ever stronger waxes the belief that this Rule of God will manifest itself in a quite special way in the future (cf. ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος, ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος Lk xviii 30); and this, i. e. its eschatological application, is the aspect of the belief which most nearly concerns us here. We find it expressed in Obad. v 21, 'And Yahwè will maintain his Royal Rule'; Is. lii 7, 'Thy God will reign' (LXX reads βασιλεύσει); more clearly Is. xxiv 23, 'Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed; for Yahwè of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients shall be glory' (or 'gloriously'). In one group of Psalms (Ps. xciii-xcix), the phrase 'Yahwè has become king' recurs several times.⁴ Turning to the 'apocryphal' books, we find a repetition of the same idea, though less frequent than might be expected. Instances are:—III Sib. 47, 767, where it is said that God will finally assert His Rule over all men; Ass. Mos. x 1, 'Then (i. e. at the beginning of the last mighty Revolution) shall his rule over all creatures appear'; further, Test. Dan. 5; I Bar. xxi 23, 25⁵ (cf. Ap. Joh. xi 15; xii 10).

¹ I have used mainly Kautzsch *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 2. Bd. (Tübingen, Mohr, 1900), but have constantly referred to the best editions of the originals, e. g. those of R. H. Charles. In the selection of passages I have found L. Couard *Die relig. u. sittl. Anschauungen d. alttestl. Apokryphen u. Pseudepigraphen* (Gütersloh 1907) helpful. For the O. T. Kittel *Biblia Hebraica*, and Kautzsch *Die heil. Schrift d. A. Ts.*² (1908 ff), with Swete's LXX.

² This use of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ probably accounts for Rom. xiv 17, Mk. x 15. For the Christian conception, cf. Dalman *Worte Jesu* (Leipzig 1898) pp. 83-119.

³ *Worte Jesu* p. 77.

⁴ Cf. Gunkel *Ausgewählte Psalmen* p. 162 (2. Aufl., 1905); Gressmann *Ursprung d. israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* pp. 294 ff (= *Forschungen u. Rel. u. Lit. d. Alt. u. Neu. Test.* VI, 1905). The significance of this conception will appear as we proceed.

⁵ I cite the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch as I Bar., and the Greek Apoc., first published by James, as II Bar.

It is easy to understand how all the future expectations of Judaism centred in this belief, since the ideas of the coming βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and of Israel's rule over the world were intimately connected. It was incredible that God's 'chosen people' should always remain in subjection; eventually the Kingdom of Power and of Glory must be theirs. This leading thought of later Judaism is expressed Dan. xxiv 4, 'And in the days of those kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall shatter and consume all those kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever': Dan. vii 27, 'And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him'. Sap. Sol. iii 8, 'the "pious" shall judge the nations, and shall rule over the nations'. Jub. xxxii 19, 'I will give to thy seed the whole earth which lies under the sky (heaven), and they shall rule over all nations as they will; and thereafter shall they possess the whole earth, and inherit it unto eternity'. Eth. Enoch xc 30, 'I saw how all the sheep that were left, and all beasts on the earth, and all birds of the sky fell down to adore those sheep, they supplicated and obeyed them in every word'. *Ibid.* xcii 4, 'God will be gracious to the just man, and will give him righteousness and grant him lordship'. See further, Jud. xxii 11; I Bar. lxxii 5; Eth. Enoch xci 5; xcvi 3 ff; xcvi 12; Sap. Sol. iii 8. In Sap. Sol. v 13, 16, we see the conception of the 'Kingdom' already passing into that of 'eternal life'; and it is worth while noting here that in the New Testament the two ideas are finally identified.¹ It should also be pointed out that from the time of Daniel onwards (cf. passages above cited) the Rule of the saints or holy ones is not unfrequently emphasized. In other words, membership of God's Kingdom is viewed as ethically conditioned. Here again we may legitimately assume that Persian influences (Mazdaism) were at work.²

In the Old Testament the coming of the New Kingdom is assigned to the 'latter days', when the 'Day of Yahwè' (יום ימה)³ and His Judgement will usher in a new and perfect condition of things destined to endure thereafter for ever unchanged. Originally the 'Day of Yahwè' seems to have meant merely a catastrophic prelude to a time of unbroken material prosperity to be secured for Israel through Yahwè;

¹ Charles *Doct. of a Future Life* pp. 314 f, 368-370.

² Cf. Vollers *Die Weltreligionen* (1907) pp. 88 f. Schürer *Geschichte d. jüd. Volkes II* (1907) p. 587. Further refs. *ibid.* p. 413.

³ For the history of this 'Day', see Charles *Doct. of a Future Life* pp. 84 ff, and especially Gressmann *Israelitisch-jüdische Eschatologie* pp. 141-158, Volz *Jüd. Eschatologie* 188-190.

but the popular unethical conception gave place, at any rate in the post-exilic period, to the prophetic view of a regenerate kingdom, and the notion of a preliminary Judgement stands out boldly in the later Jewish literature. See, for example, Is. ii 6-21; viii 1-4; ix 8-20; xxviii 2; Dan. ii 44; vii 14, 27. In one passage Isaiah foretells the Kingdom: 'Therefore this is the oracle of the Lord Yahwè Šabaoth, the Hero of Israel: Ha! I will appease me of mine adversaries and avenge me on mine enemies; and I will bring back mine hand upon thee, and will smelt out in the furnace thy dross and will take away all thy alloy; and I will bring back thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning; afterwards thou shalt be called Citadel of Righteousness, Faithful City.'¹ It is important to observe that the Kingdom is to be established on *earth*, as appears plainly from the terms of the description of the 'golden age', Is. ii 6 ff,² so materially conceived as to be unthinkable in 'heaven'. A similar view is found in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic scriptures (Sirach, Judith, Tobit, 1 Macc.), but, significantly enough, only in those which know nothing of the Resurrection or of life after death³ (cp. especially Sirach vii 17; x 9-11; xiv 17-19; xvii 28; xxii 11; xxxviii 21; xli 1-4). A further development first appears in one of the oldest portions of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch,⁴ cc. xci 12-17; xciii, which describe the history of Mankind in ten world-weeks of varying duration. I will quote the first-named passage at length:—

'12. And after that there will be another week, the eighth, that of righteousness, and a sword will be given to it, that judgement and righteousness may be executed on those who commit oppression, and sinners will be delivered into the hands of the righteous. 13. And at its close they will acquire houses⁵ through their righteousness, and the house of the Great King will be built in righteousness for evermore. 14. And after that, in the ninth week, the righteous judgement will be revealed to the whole world, and the world will be written down for destruction,

¹ i 24-26 (Cheyne's transl.).

² Here a piece of traditional myth-material is transferred to the end of the world, as is pointed out by Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895) p. 13. Cf. Gressmann *Ursprung* pp. 195-200. The point will come up for discussion later.

³ The variety of views need cause us no surprise. As Schürer aptly remarks, 'Während die gesetzlichen Vorschriften bis in ihr kleinstes Detail hinein verbindlich waren und darum unverändert von einer Generation der anderen überliefert werden mussten, war dem Glauben wenigstens ein relativ freierer Spielraum gestattet: sofern nur gewisse Grundlagen festgehalten wurden, konnte das individuelle Bedürfnis sich hier viel freier ergehen'. (*Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes* II⁴ (1907) p. 583, cf. p. 588.)

⁴ So Beer (in Kautzsch *Apokr. u. Pseud.* ii 230), who places the passage before 167 B. C. On the other hand Charles in his masterly edition puts it as late as 104-95 B. C. See further van Loon *Eschatologien van de Hasmoneentijd volgens het boek Henoch* (Theol. Tijdschr., 1902, pp. 421-463). The point is immaterial here.

⁵ Cf. Is. lxxv 21.

and all mankind will look to the path of uprightness. 15. And after this in the tenth week in the seventh part there will be the great eternal judgement in which he will execute vengeance amongst the angels. And the first heaven will depart and pass away, and a new heaven will appear, and all the powers of the heavens will shine sevenfold¹ for ever. 17. And after that there will be many weeks without number for ever in goodness and righteousness, and sin will no more be mentioned for ever.'²

Furthermore, III Sib. *vv.* 632-731 (Kautzsch ii 197 ff) tell of a temporary Messianic Rule, to precede the establishment of God's final and universal kingdom on earth. Here, however, there is no new creation, and no resurrection; while in Eth. Enoch xci 10 a resurrection, of the righteous only, is admitted. It is true that neither of these compositions appears to have exercised much direct influence, though their indirect influence must have extended to certain circles in Palestinian Judaism, as the growth of belief in the resurrection impelled men to seek for a final consummation of things in another world than this. The two ideas of a final heavenly abode, and a resurrection in the spirit, as in Eth. Enoch, are possibly conjoined in Ass. Mos. (written before A.D. 30), where we read in x 9, according to Charles, that God will 'exalt' Israel, and establish its habitation among the stars. The text of this verse is, however, uncertain,³ and must not be pressed. In any case, the idea that the Rule of God meant simply His reign on earth over His chosen people was too deeply implanted in the national consciousness to be easily got rid of. It was only by slow degrees that an effort was made to bring together the notions of an earthly and a heavenly kingdom. And what was done was to synthesize the Sibylline idea of a temporary Messianic sway with that of an everlasting heavenly kingdom as set forth in the Book of Enoch, the former being made to precede the latter. The synthesis is complete in Ap. Joh. xx, a fact which, I apprehend, clearly points to the Jewish origin of the chapter. But such a temporary Messianic Kingdom is described Ps. Sol. xi 1-8. In these Psalms, it is followed by the (?) spiritual resurrection of the righteous into eternal life (iii 12). The date of these Psalms is, roughly, 50 B.C. Somewhat similarly, the Book of Jubilees—before 10 A.D. (Charles)—sketches the gradual advent of a Messianic Kingdom (xxiii 27-29), and the blessed immortality into which the righteous will enter after the final judgement (xxiii 11, 31). More important, however, in this connexion, are I Bar. and 4 Ezra. The former describes (lxiii-lxiv) a somewhat sensuously conceived Messianic Kingdom, which is

¹ Cf. Is. xxx 26.

² Charles's Transl.

³ See Cremer's note, in Kautzsch ii 328.

'the consummation of that which is incorruptible' (lxiv 2). According to this book, man is the master of his fate—each one of us is 'the Adam of his own soul' (liv 19)—and the majority will eventually be saved (li 4 f). The affinities of 4 Ezra with Christian teaching are close, and it has always enjoyed a high reputation in the Christian Church. Gunkel (in Kautzsch ii 335 ff) has shewn that it is a unitary composition (see especially p. 351 and references), and assigns as its date the last decade of the first century A. D.¹ The author grapples vigorously with the old problems of evil in the world, which he 'solves' by postulating a better world to come. Not till the end of time will the full solution appear (iv 26, 43). But he finds comfort, like so many of his contemporaries, Christian as well as Jewish, in the thought that the world is growing old and the end near at hand (iv 26, 44-50; v 50-55). The signs of the last times are vividly depicted in v 11-13, vi 11-29. 'Then will the invisible city appear, and the hidden land be revealed' (vii 26). 'The Christ' will be manifest and give joy to those that are left for the space of 400² years (vii 28), after which he will die, and with him all men (vii 30). Seven days of primaeval silence will follow; then 'the Age which now sleeps will awake, and all perishable things pass away' (vii 31-32). The Most High will appear on His Judgement seat (vii 33), and the general judgement, to which the dead will rise (vii 32) will last for a week of years (vii 43). It would appear from vii 75 that the day of judgement is to be a 'new creation'. So, vii 113, 'But the day of judgement is the end of this world, and the beginning of the eternal world to come; therein corruption has passed away'.

It is not perhaps possible to decide just when this synthesis of the two kingdoms was first made; in any case, the tendency becomes more marked, as might be expected, with the collapse of the Jewish polity after the fall of Jerusalem. Couard³ thinks the outbreak of the war in A. D. 66 and the later rebellion of Bar Kōhba in 132-135 point to the continuing existence of the belief in the establishment of an earthly Messianic kingdom; but the existence of a belief that has persevered into our own day scarcely needs to be proved.

We now come to the question how far the figure of the Messiah is an integral element in the Jewish national hope. An *organic* connexion of the two is, perhaps rightly, denied by Charles,⁴ who observes that two,

¹ A separate edition of Gunkel's Translation with introduction and notes has been published (*Der Prophet Esra*, Tüb. 1900). The best English edition is Bensley's, with introduction by M. R. James (Camb. Texts and Studies iii 2, 1895).

² Cf. Gunkel in Kautzsch ii 370, note h; Charles *Doct. of Immortality* p. 286.

³ *Anschaunngen* p. 192.

⁴ *Doct. of a Future Life* p. 83. Cf. Gressmann *Ursprung* p. 7. It should be remembered that the eschatological ideas of the O. T. are in general of a fragmentary character. And since the true date of the prophetic books is by no means certain,

and two only, features are essential to the Old Testament conception of the Messianic kingdom, viz. it must be (1) a *community* in which (2) *God's will is fulfilled*. It may be true that Isaiah alone of the earlier prophets refers to the conception of the (?) Messiah,¹ and that only in one place, i 24-26. But without deciding this point here, it is easy to shew that the Messianic kingdom was frequently regarded as a manifestation of God alone. No mention is made of the Messiah in any of the following Old Testament passages, Is. xiii 7; xxiv-xxvi; xxx 18, 26; xxxi 47; Micah iv 7; vii 8f; Zech. x 6; xiv 9; Ps. xlvii 4; nor at all in Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk. Just in the same way, a considerable number of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic books describe the blessed future kingdom though knowing nothing of the Messiah. This is the case in Jub. i 23; Eth. Enoch i 5 ff, x, xci 12-17, Slav. Enoch, I Bar., Jud., Tob., II Mac.,; Ass. Mos. *passim*. In all these, it is God Himself who in the fullness of time is to subjugate Israel's foes, and to exalt His chosen people to dominion over the nations. I do not, of course, suggest that the idea of the Messiah ever wholly disappeared from the national consciousness; but the passages just referred to are surely to be taken as proving that its presence was confined within certain, not easily definable, circles.

Turning, now, to the other side of the picture, we find the Messiah depicted alike in the Old Testament (cf. Is. ix 1 ff, 11 ff; Micah v 1) and in the 'apocrypha' as ushering in the period of bliss which is to bring the present age to a close. Nor need we wonder at the existence of the two opinions side by side. For after all it was the hope of the eventual triumph of Israel over her enemies which lay nearest the heart of the people: whether the Saviour was to be Yahwè Himself or His Messiah was a matter of minor importance. As regards the position of the Messiah in the 'apocrypha', three views may be distinguished. Thus:—

i. The Messiah does not appear at all. The chief instances of this view have been enumerated above.

ii. The Messiah becomes the central figure in the Messianic kingdom. He frees his people from the yoke of the stranger, bringing them salvation and establishing his Rule of Righteousness among them. The

we must use great caution in inferring from them the existence of such ideas in pre-exilic times, however methodologically sound such procedure may be.

¹ This is the view of Cheyne *Introd. to Isaiah* (1895), and is supported by Charles, Volz, Stade, Marti, Bruckner, and other scholars. For the opposite view, cf. G. A. Smith in Hastings *D.B.* 488-489; Gressmann *Ursprung* 272. A discussion of this topic will be found in a subsequent paragraph. In any case the idea of a Messiah is very ancient. So, too, the general scheme of Israelitish prophecy, which, as Ed. Meyer has shewn, is identical with that of the Egyptian prophets. See his remarks, *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906) pp. 451 ff; *Geschichte d. Allertums* i 2 § 297 (2. Aufl., 1909).

earliest extant literary instance would seem to be III Sib. 652-759 (? 140 B. C.). Here we read how God will send His King from the East, to put an end to war and fulfil the promises of God, by whom he will be guided in all things. Here the Messiah is still a shadowy figure, but he becomes much more distinct in Ps. Sol. xvii, xviii, as likewise in 4 Ezra xiii. I will set out the contents of this important chapter at some length. It recounts a vision (the sixth) in which the prophet beholds 'as it were the likeness of a man' rising from the bosom of the sea and flying on the clouds of heaven. At his countenance all things tremble, and at the sound of his voice they melt away like wax before the fire. A mighty army of men assembles from the four winds to oppose him. He cuts out a mountain and takes his stand thereon. Though stricken with fear, the army advances to the attack, only to be reduced in a moment to 'dust of ashes and the smell of smoke' by a flood of fire and flame and sparks which issues from his mouth. Thereupon, he descends from his mountain, and summons to himself another army or multitude—a peaceable one this time—and there draw near the forms of many men, some exultant, others gloomy, some bound and being led by others by way of sacrificial offerings. We are here, plainly, dealing with an ancient myth which our author struggles—not always successfully¹—to interpret allegorically. The sole point which concerns us at this juncture is that 'the man' is identified in terms with 'my [God's] son' (xiii 22), and is explained as 'him whom the Most High has preserved for long ages, through whom he will redeem Creation, and who will stablish the new order of things among those that are left' (xiii 26).

iii. In the third place, in some of the pseudepigrapha the Messiah or Christ does not enter upon his office of Ruler until after the foundation of the Messianic kingdom by God Himself. Thus, the Messiah² ('one resembling a man') in Dan. vii 13 does not make his appearance till the close of the world-drama, and the same is true of the white bullock, i. e. the Messiah,³ in Eth. Enoch xc 35, who is here, however, a person or figure of no special importance.

Before leaving the subject of the earthly Messianic kingdom, it will be convenient to discuss the views of last or penultimate judgement, so far as they are connected therewith. We shall return to this subject later, but may as well deal with it here so far as it is represented as an

¹ Cf. Gunkel, in Kautzsch ii 347, and for the origin of the phrase 'the man', Gunkel *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen 1903) p. 47 note 2, and especially Schrader *Die Keilinschriften u. d. Alte Testament* (3. Aufl., Berl., 1902-1903) pp. 391 f. (This important work is cited as *K. A. T.*) We shall return to the point later.

² Cf. for justification of this interpretation, Cheyne *Bible Problems* pp. 213-235.

³ Cf. G. Beer, in Kautzsch ii 298 note a.

earthly manifestation of divine justice. Since the majority of the apocryphal books recognize a quasi-universal judgement at the opening of the Messianic kingdom, it is not surprising that those which distinguish the Messianic period from the final consummation of the world should admit a twofold judgement, at the commencement and at the conclusion of the temporary Rule of the Messiah. A preliminary judgement of the sinners is found in Eth. Enoch xci 12; xcv 7; xcvi 1; xcvi 12; which, like that in Dan. ii 44, is to be executed by the saints. Couard¹ finds such a double judgement in the Sibylline Books, but I have been unable to verify this, though I must confess I have not read through the whole of these rather tedious performances. On the whole, the idea of one final judgement predominates, in which earthly and transcendental elements are often curiously compounded. So, too, a lack of unity obtains as to the personality of the Great Judge. Sometimes it is God Himself who assumes the rôle, sometimes the Messiah. But this is only one more proof that the figure of the Messiah belongs originally to a circle of ideas different from that in which the conception of a universal judgement finds place (see below).

In this connexion, there falls to be treated the overthrow of His enemies by God or His Messiah, which forms a constantly recurring prelude to the description of the last end. It has recently been maintained that what here appears in the guise of a quasi-judicial act originally formed part of a mythological narrative of a conflict between the powers of good and evil, which at an early period was viewed as taking place before the Creation, but was gradually transferred to the *Endzeit*. We owe it to the thoroughness of Gunkel that the mythical origin of much of the material worked up in Ap. Joh., as well as of a lengthy row of allied passages in the Old Testament, can no longer be disputed.² The same line of investigation leads, of course, to similar results elsewhere. For a conspectus of these results, the reader must be referred to Zimmern's *Étude documentelle* in the second half of Schrader's *Keilinschriften* (third edition). We are here concerned only with reminiscences of ancient mythology in the apocryphal and apocalyptic books. That such passages as Dan. vii continued to be interpreted in reference to contemporary events is, of course, no argument against their mythical origin.³ In any case, as we shall presently see, such quasi-historical interpretations explain nothing. We shall first deal with some typical passages in the Old Testament.⁴ In the prophets, as

¹ *Anschaunngen* p. 194.

² *Schöpfung u. Chaos* (1895) *passim* (especially pp. 202-210, 236-239, 255-257, 379-397); supplemented by *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (= *Forschungen* i 1903).

³ See Meyer *Israeliten* 452 note 4.

⁴ In what follows, I rely in the main on Gressmann *Ursprung* pp. 174 ff.

is well known, the יום הדין is frequently represented as a day of struggle, in which Yahwè calls the nations to the destruction of Israel and Judah. Instances are, Jer. i 15; vi 22; Is. v 26 ff; viii 9 ff; xvii 4 ff, &c. A second array of passages describe how the nations assemble to attack Jerusalem and are annihilated by Yahwè. Thus, for example, Is. lxvi 18 ff; Joel iv; Zech. xii 14; Micah 4 ff; Zeph. iii 9 ff; and above all the chapters in (?) Ezekiel (38 f) in which the 'enemy' whom the earlier prophets leave unnamed is called 'Gog of the land of Magog'.¹ It is not unlikely that the prophecy in Ezekiel refers to the Scythians: it fits them no worse, and no better, than the Babylonians or 'Chaldeans' or others who might occur to the reader as hinted at. But it is idle to set down such stories as mere inventions of their authors; their very frequency demands a more searching explanation, while mere literary dependence will not account for the variety in the details. Gressmann's view is as follows:—

'We are here confronted with the same problem as in general regarding the view touching the Day of Yahwè. In popular belief it embraces . . . two apparently mutually exclusive opposites, Salvation and Doom. To these correspond exactly the two forms of the narrative recognized above: Israel spared and Israel destroyed. Now since the literary prophecy of the pre-exilic period placed in the foreground the conception of Doom, it employed preferably the corresponding scheme, without indeed making use of it exclusively. After the exile, the reverse is most frequently the case.'²

He then proceeds to shew that not only the myth of the 'enemy from the north country', but the Eschatology of Salvation, as well as that of Doom, in general probably represents a fragmentary mythology already current in Palestine in the preprophetic period.³ This attractive hypothesis is not indeed fully confirmed as yet, but it is unquestionably the outcome of a sound methodological procedure. It is scarcely possible to reconstruct the original form (or forms) of the myth, or to state definitely the time and place of its origin. But the main contention that we are here dealing with reminiscences of a story in which Yahwè overcomes the assault of (?) demons on the 'navel of the earth' is confirmed, to some extent, by an examination of certain passages in the

¹ One may compare the LXX version of Num. xxiv 7: ἡγελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν καὶ ὑποθήσεται ἡ Γῶγ βασιλεία, where the Hebrew text merely reads, 'and his king shall be mightier than Agag'. On the origin of the name Gog, cf. Winckler *Allorientalische Forschungen* ii 160 ff. Clemen's remarks (*Religionsgeschichtl. Erklärung des N.Ts.* (Giessen 1909) pp. 104 f) are not in point here, since we are concerned not with what the author of Ez. 39 had in his mind, but with the origin of the form of his utterance.

² O. c. p. 179. Cf. p. 241. For criticism of Gressmann see Clemen, *op. cit.*

³ *Ursprung* pp. 180–192, 242.

apocryphal and apocalyptic literature, which I will now go on to discuss.

In tracing the history of ancient myths, we should expect *a priori* to find considerable variations in detail: and such is in fact the case here. As regards the point immediately before us, we may register the following variations as most material.

1. Nature of the events related. Sometimes it is a regular stand-up fight; again, the occurrences are conceived forensically as a judgement executed on the enemies of Yahwè or of His people.

2. Sometimes the people of Israel are conceived as actively engaged in the strife. This is so in a passage of Eth. Enoch (xc 19; xci 12), where 'a sword' is given to 'the sheep' (i. e. Israel) or to 'the week', whatever that may mean. The 'sword' is characteristic of the Macca-bean period (Bousset). More usually, the events are catastrophic and wholly supernatural.

3. In the latter case the hero is either (α) Yahwè Himself, or (β) the Messiah, or (γ) Michael. The last two are probably identical.¹ We must consider the cases separately.

And first, as to Yahwè, the 'Hero of Israel'. In Ecclus. xxxii 22-25, we read:—

'22. And he will judge justly (or will secure justice for the righteous) and will establish justice: And the Lord will not tarry, nor will he long have forbearance with them (i. e. the merciless ones), until he crushes the loins of the merciless. 23. Until he requites the proud with his vengeance (נִקְמָה not נִקְמָה), until he uproots the multitude of the violent and shivers the sword of the unrighteous. 24. Until he requites man according to his actions, and men according to their designs. 25. Until he secures justice for his people, and rejoices them by his mercy.' Again, Eth. Enoch lxii 12: 'They (i. e. the heathen kings) will be a spectacle to the righteous, who will rejoice over them (!), because the anger of the Lord of Spirits is upon them and his sword² is drenched in their blood.' Further, Jud. xvi 18: 'Woe to the nations that rise up against my kindred: the Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgement, by putting fire and worms in their flesh (δοῦναι πῦρ καὶ σκώληκας εἰς σάρκας αὐτῶν), and they shall howl with pain for ever.'

Once more, Ps. Sol. ii 28-34:—

'28. Tarry not, O God, to requite him in kind. 29. To turn the haughtiness of the Dragon (i. e. Pompey) to shame! 30. And he tarried not: then God shewed me his haughtiness brought to shame on the mountains of Egypt, yea, scorned beyond the least of creatures on land

¹ Cheyne *Bible Problems* 213-235, and refs.

² For the 'sore and great and strong sword' cf. Is. xxvii 1; xxxiv 5 *al.* *Gressmann op. cit.* pp. 76-81.

or sea. 31. The waves tossed about his corse in wanton sport, and no man buried him¹: foully dishonoured was he. For he had not be-thought him he was but man. 32. He had forgotten the end. 33. He had said: I will be Lord of Land and Sea; he had not acknowledged that God is greater than man, mightier in his great Might. 34. Who alone is King in Heaven and ruleth kings and kingdoms.'

I regard this last passage as particularly important, as supplying evidence of the mythical tradition underlying all such descriptions. The shameful usage of the dragon's body connects it with the obviously mythical allusion, Job xxvi 13, where, as Gunkel has shewn,¹ the correct reading is *לֹא יִהְיֶה* not *לֹא יִהְיֶה*. It is thus brought into relation with a long series of passages which go back to the primordial chaos-myth.² To this series also belongs the Dragon-myth of Ap. Joh. xii, the *pièce de résistance* of that extraordinary mixture of mythological ingredients. It is quite true that nowhere in the literature that has come down to us is the story of Yahwē's encounter with the dragon and his friends related at length. Such tales savoured too much of paganism to be altogether acceptable to the pious Jews to whom we owe the collection of canonical scriptures (Gunkel). But we are amply warranted in concluding from the numerous allusions, both within and without the canon, that such myths enjoyed a widespread popularity throughout long ages: and the distinguished scholar just referred to has demonstrated once for all what can be done in the way of reconstructing their original form. No doubt, we ought not to limit our outlook by assuming a single source for all the current stories. Gressmann is possibly right in thinking that the mythical 'enemies from the north country' in Jer., Is., Ez., Zech., Joel, Dan., are not originally connected with the *תַּיַּמַּת*-Tiāmat narrative. Still, however this may be, the originally mythical character of all these persons, events, and topographies, must be taken as wellnigh certain.³

I pass over the Michael-stories which have been fully dealt with in an easily accessible work (Lueken *Michael*). The chief of these are Dan. xii, Ass. Mos. x, Ap. Joh. xiv 14 ff. From the time of Daniel (160 B.C.) allusions to this class of myth become much more frequent, and the mythical colouring is intensified.⁴ In this period, as we shall find later, Persian influences were probably strong.

¹ *Schöpfung* p. 31 n. 4; the nature of such shameful usage is explained, *ib.* p. 33 n. 3.

² Enumerated *Schöpfung* pp. 82 f, q. v. Cf. *K. A. T.* 506 ff.

³ In view of the above, Couard's remark (*op. cit.* p. 195 n.), *doch darf man hier (Ecclus. xxxii 22 ff) die Ausdrücke sicherlich nicht pressen und in ihnen nicht den Rest des alten Mythos vom Kampf Gottes mit einem oder mehreren Ungeheuern finden*, needs no further refutation.

⁴ Gunkel gives the reason: *So lange die israelitische Religion kräftig genug war,*

We now come to the Messianic passages in the stricter sense. In general, the Messiah is conceived as the emissary or representative of Yahwè (his 'official manifestation', as some one has put it), through whom the people of Israel are to attain to material prosperity, rulership, and ethical perfection. For the moment, however, we are concerned with him merely as the initiator of the final catastrophe which marks the 'turning of the tide', מִן הַיָּם הַזֶּה the point at which time passes over into eternity, into עוֹלָם הַבָּא in the narrower meaning of the terms. In Ps. Sol. xvii 21-25 the psalmist prays:—

'21. Behold, O Lord, and raise up for them their king, David's son, at the time which thou, O God, hast elected, that he may rule over Israel thy bondsman. 22. And gird him with strength that he may shatter the unrighteous rulers, and purge Jerusalem from the heathens that rend her pitifully: 23. Wise and righteous, may he drive the sinners forth from the earth, and shiver their pride like potsherds. 24. With rod of iron may he smite them to destruction, and bring to naught the godless heathens with the word of his mouth,' 25. that at his threat the heathens may flee before him, and he may reprove the sinners for the thought of their hearts.'

In III Sib. 652 ff (already referred to) the King from the East (= Messiah) is to 'slay' the kings who refuse to come to terms with him. In Jub. xxxi 18, 19 there is perhaps a reference to a militant Messiah, though on the whole David seems to be meant. It is worth nothing that Philo refers to the Messiah as militant—ἐξελεύσεται γὰρ ἄνθρωπος φησὶν ὁ χρησμός καταστραταρχῶν καὶ πολεμῶν ἔθνη. (*De praem. et poen.* 16, ed. Cohn and Wendland.) We next meet the Warrior-Messiah in I Bar. xl 1-3, an important passage in this connexion:—

'(1) The last leader of that time will be left alive, when the multitude of his hosts will be put to the sword, and he will be bound, and they will take him up to Mount Zion, and my Messiah will convict him of all his impieties, and will gather and set before him all the works of his hosts. (2) And afterwards he will put him to death, and protect the rest of my people which shall be found in the place which I have chosen. (3) And his principate will stand for the age, until the world of corruption is at an end and until the times aforesaid are fulfilled.'²

Again, in the passage (quoted above) 4 Ezra xiii 2 ff, the 'one as it were a man' destroys the hostile multitude of men from the four winds

hat sie diese fremden Stoffe stark amalgamirt; in späterer Zeit aber, als die Religion erschlaffte, hat sie das Fremde mit Haut und Haar verschlungen. (*Verständnis* p. 24.)

¹ Cf. 2 Thes. ii 8; Wendland, *ZntW.* 1904, 343, 349 f; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* p. 273.

² Charles's Transl.

of Heaven with a flood of fire from his mouth (cf. xiii 38, 39). Lastly, the 'Lion' of the Eagle-Vision, 4 Ezra xi, is expressly identified with 'the Christ' *qui orietur ex semine David* (xii 32). The same appears in Ap. Joh. v 5 (ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ῥίζα Δαυείδ).¹

It only remains to add that the people are represented Eth. Enoch xc 19 (see above) as co-operating in the destruction of their foes. Cf. lvi 7; I Bar. lxx 10.

Now, to adopt Gunkel's way of putting a similar case, let any candid reader go carefully through these passages and ask himself what kind of narrative he is here dealing with. Surely he will answer without hesitation: *Das ist ein Mythos!* But we must not leave the point to be decided by a mere subjective impression. I will therefore set out the most important features of these *Wellkampf*-stories for which mythological parallels are forthcoming, and endeavour to trace their origin. A complete investigation must not, of course, be looked for here, but I will do my best to put the reader in the way of carrying on this line of enquiry for himself, should he be so minded.

1. To begin with, we find almost everywhere a period of wrath and confusion described. As Volz puts it, *es geht alles drunter und drüber, man kommt aus dem Entsetzen nicht hinaus*.² Surely this is ultimately connected with the mythical (Babylonian) *מִן־בְּרִית* of Gen. i.³

2. As in the *Enuma eliš* story, and the Persian account of the overthrow of Añra Mayñu by Ahura Mazda, the combat precedes the new creation. It is no objection that the contest is here eschatological, since the transference of myths from *Urzeit* to *Endzeit* is a well-established fact, of which further instances will come before us later on. (Cf. Cheyne's Art. *Jonah* in Ency. Bibl.)

3. In the Persian Myth Añra Mayñu or Druj (= Serpent, Snake) is defeated and finally destroyed by Ahura Mazda. So Jub. xxiii 29 ('there shall be no Satan'); III Sib. 73 (Βέλιαρ φλέξει); Test. Jud. 25; Test. Levi 18; Ap. Joh. xx 10 (καὶ ὁ διάβολος ὁ πλανῶν αὐτοὺς ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ θείου), &c. (The Persian and Babylonian dragon-stories are almost certainly connected, *K.A.T.* 513.) Lastly, we may recall the New Testament passage, Jude 5-7, in which 'Jesus'⁴ is represented as keeping the fallen angels in everlasting bonds.

¹ See also: V Sib. 101; I Bar. lxx 2-9; xxxix 5 ff; lxxii 2-6.

² *Jüdische Eschatologie* p. 181, cf. pp. 173-188; *B. R. J.* 286 f., M. Friedländer *Der Antichrist* (Gött. 1901) pp. 129-144; Klausner *Die messianischen Vorstellungen d. jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter d. Tannaiten* (1904) pp. 47-57. The Messianic Woes (מִן־בְּרִית) will be discussed later.

³ Gunkel *Schöpfung* pp. 111 f, 114-117; *K.A.T.* 393, 506-514. Clemen *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N. Ts.* (Giessen 1909) pp. 101-104.

⁴ Cf. T. Whittaker *Origins of Christianity* (2nd edition, 1909) p. 27. Incidentally

4. In 4 Ezra xi 38-42; xii 13 the Messiah rebukes the eagle. A similar *Scheltrede* Ps. Sol. ii 28 ff; cf. I Baruch xl 1; and in the Old Testament Ps. civ 7; Job xxxviii 11; Is. xvii 13.¹ This feature goes back to the Babylonian creation-epos, where Marduk rebukes Tiamat immediately before his encounter with her.²

5. The characteristic of the Dragon in Ps. Sol. ii 28 ff. is Haughtiness or Arrogance. So of the Dragon in Old Testament (תנין, שחנן, etc., *Schöpfung* p. 84), i.e. Tiamat, whose arrogance in 'uprising' against the gods is emphasized in the Babylonian creation-myth.

Other parallel features might easily be traced, but enough has perhaps been said in support of the view that in the Messianic *Weltkampf* we have an echo of a very ancient myth. We turn, therefore, to a closer scrutiny of the figure of the Messiah himself.³

§ 3. *The Messiah as World-King.*

In the literature of later Judaism we meet with two very different views as to the nature and origin of the Messiah. On the one hand, he appears as a merely human ruler who is to bring about a period of quasi-material prosperity in the future, to destroy the enemies of Israel, and to inaugurate an era of ethical regeneration on earth. On the other hand, he is represented by the apocalyptic writers (in close

it may be observed that the reading 'Jesus' (so the Vulgate) is well attested in the MSS. Prof. W. B. Smith writes (in a letter to Prof. Drews of Karlsruhe, kindly communicated to me by the latter):—'The reading Ἰησοῦς in Jd. 5 seems 'certainly the older. It is given in A, σι Ἰησοῦς, in B, σι ἰδ, with a number of 'minuscules and versions, including Amiatinus, which you quote. So, too, Hieronymus, who refers it to Joshua. [For the equation Joshua = Jesus, cf. Bolland *De evangelische Josua* (Leiden 1907) pp. 3-7.] N gives κδ, where κ may 'easily be mistake or correction for ι. C gives ο θδ, where again difference of only 'one letter, . . . We can easily see how and why the ι was changed to κ, but never 'why κ should have been changed to ι. So we must accept ἰδ as the original reading. 'This same is completely confirmed by the foregoing and by the general usage of 'Jude. Even if κύριος be read the reference is still to Ἰησοῦς, for in 4 we read τὸν 'μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. It is impossible for I. X. to be κύριος 'in v. 4, and not also κύριος in v. 5. Again this same I. X. is κύριος in v. 17 and v. 21 'and v. 25. God alone appears as Sotēr, which is again only Gnostic for Ἰησοῦς. 'Jude thus bears strong and direct testimony to the divinity of Jesus in the 'primitivum conception.' For the 'binding' process parallels are not wanting, especially in Mazdaism (cf. Clemen *Religionsgeschichtl. Erklärungen d. N. T.* 124 and refs.), *K. A. T.* 511.

¹ The meaning of וָל is explained, *Schöpfung* 59 n. 2. Is it a mere coincidence that Jesus 'rebukes' (ἐπετίμησεν) the winds and the sea, Matt. viii 26?

² See the passage (*Enuma eliš*, Table iv 76-82) in *Schöpfung* p. 412.

³ For a succinct statement of the case with regard to the non-indigenous character of Israelitish eschatology in general cf. Gressmann *Ursprung* pp. 160, 245-250.

connexion with the idea of divine judgement) as a wholly supernatural being, depicted in characteristically mythical colours, and viewed as the initiator of the new 'Golden Age'; in other words, emphatically as a God-king. It will be best to keep the treatment of these two conceptions separate.

A very brief account of the evolution of the idea of a national (non-divine) hero in Israel is necessary before we pass to an examination of the passages in the Apocrypha in which this idea emerges. In the Old Testament, it would seem, the title Messiah (Hebr. מָשִׁיחַ, Aram. מְשִׁיחָא) is applied to *any* king (מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה). The origin of this designation is not quite clear. It is possible that the rite of anointing was transferred from gods to kings. In Egypt the images of gods were anointed with oil,¹ and similar rites are known to have been practised in Babylonia,² where, however, no anointing of kings can be made out. In Egypt and (?) Babylon the rite is thus connected with the 'divine' character of kings. And in the former country, at all events, the deification of kings was already a religious dogma; while evidences of its prevalence in Babylon up to the time of Hammurabi is not wanting.³ In Israel, on the other hand, as might be expected, the kings are no longer termed gods; but the fact that a king is addressed as 'god' in Ps. xlv 7 ('Therefore, God, thy God hath anointed thee') suggests that the absence of the title in the Old Testament may be partly due to the scruples of late editors. Without deciding this point, we may observe that the title Messiah came to be applied to kings especially in their relation to Yahwè. As Dalman rightly remarks, the kings of Israel are called Yahwè's anointed, not merely in reference to the ceremonial anointing at their coronation, but 'because through this anointing they belong to the special circle of God's servants, and hence are holy and inviolable'.⁴ The term is, then, applied to the reigning king; its connexion with the future expected ruler is therefore secondary. The point of connexion becomes clear when we advert to the conventional language in which the wide rule of Israelitish kings is described, e.g. Ps. ii, lxxii, cx, &c. The language of such passages, extravagant as applied to Israel, points to the existence of a technical courtly style (*Hofstil*), which can be exactly paralleled from Babylonian sources.⁵ At no period of its history could

¹ A. Erman *Die ägyptische Religion* (Berl. 1905) p. 49. The anointing was part of their daily toilet.

² *K. A. T.* 526, 602.

³ Cf. *K. A. T.* 379 (for apotheosis, 639). Further, Ed. Meyer *Geschichte d. Altertums* i 1 (2. Aufl.) § 54; i 2 §§ 219 f (Egypt), §§ 402, 414 and note (Babylonia). The term *pašṣu* (= anointed) is applied to Babylonian priests.

⁴ *Worte Jesu* p. 241.

⁵ So Gressmann *Ursprung* pp. 250 ff; 270 ff; 305 ff. The basis of the *Hofstil* is of course mythological.

Israel lay claim to widespread rulership—the accounts of Solomon's empire are largely legendary¹—and the phraseology in question may have come (possibly about the time of Solomon himself), as Gressmann thinks, from Phoenicia, though its ultimate origin is Babylonian. Now, it is not unlikely that all this phraseology² is ultimately derived from the description of some semi-mythical (? Babylonian) founder-king, whose reign was looked back to as an original golden age. Certainly, the representation of new kings as heaven-sent bringers of an epoch of bliss was fairly common in Babylonia,³ and what was easier than to combine this latter notion with that of a world-ruler, project both into the future (from *Urzeit* to *Endzeit*, as usual), and apply to the coming World-King all the conventional phraseology (including the designation Messiah) concerning the personality of the monarch and the blissful period of his rule? That the Messianic rule is conceived mainly as a period of general prosperity, conquest, and increase of population is, of course, no objection to the above hypothesis. For, as will be shewn hereinafter, the transcendent God-King was no mere invention of the Apocalyptists, but can be traced back to an early period; while *he* certainly cannot be explained otherwise than by supposing an ancient myth of foreign origin as the basis of the apocalyptic tradition. The dropping of the mythical features in certain circles is only what we should anticipate. In any case, the origin of the conception of a world-rule in the tiny kingdom of Israel is simply unthinkable.⁴

The Jews were not, indeed, the only people who looked forward to a 'Messianic' king. The belief existed among the Samaritans, and in the period of the Diadochi was wellnigh universal. In Persia it was specially prominent, and in Rome the court poets adopted it to flatter their patrons.⁵ Hence one is inclined to be surprised at the relatively infrequent appearance of the Messiah in later Jewish literature. In the Apocrypha proper he is hardly mentioned; not at all in pseudo-

¹ Winckler *Geschichte Israels* (1900) ii 284.

² To this courtly phraseology belong also such formulae as 'First-begotten of God' (Ps. lxxii 9), and especially 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee' (Ps. ii 7), for which an exact Babylonian parallel is forthcoming.

³ K. A. T. 381 f. For later uses of *σωτήρ* see Deissmann *Licht vom Osten* 265 f.

⁴ So Gunkel: 'Jedenfalls muss die Religion, die so die Prophetie beeinflusst hat, eine solche gewesen sein, die mit dem Weltkultus in Verbindung stand; die Idee von einem kommenden Weltreiche, das über alle Nationen gebietet, und die damit zusammenhängende von einer künftigen Weltreligion, der alle Völker anhängen, eine Idee, die in der israelitischen Eschatologie so häufig auftritt, kann sicherlich nur auf dem Boden eines grossen welt herrschenden Volkes, und nicht in einem Winkel der Erde, entstanden sein.' (*Verständnis* p. 24.)

⁵ Further details in B. R. J. 259-260.

Aristaeus, Jubilees, Eth. Enoch 1-36, 91-108, Slav. Enoch, Assumption of Moses, I (Syriac) Baruch; while the part he plays in Eth. Enoch 85-90, III Sib., II (Greek) Baruch, Apoc. Abr. is insignificant, and perhaps due to mere literary reminiscences. In some cases (Ecclus., Ps. Arist.) the subject-matter of the writings sufficiently explains the phenomenon: for the rest we may accept the explanation of Bousset,¹ who points out (1) that the enlargement of the Jewish view of the world, so clearly evidenced by the later Eschatology, involved a re-casting of the final drama on a far larger scale. No mere national hero (even of the stock of David!), but only Yahwè or His accredited representative, could successfully engineer the overthrow of the powerful rule of the Diadochi, the displacement of Greek culture, and the destruction of the Roman Empire. (2) In the second place, the Jews of the Maccabean period may well have believed themselves to be living in the Messianic age, and could point to the Maccabees themselves as a race of Messiahs. And if they expected further developments, as they probably did, in the near future, these again were to be on a scale too large to be realized by a mere Messiah ben David.

For a complete picture of the expectations of a personal non-divine Messiah as cherished in the first century B.C., and of the form in which the people expected him to appear, we must turn to the Psalms of the Pharisees or Psalms of Solomon (written about 60-40 B.C.). This collection of eighteen psalms, probably by different hands, displays no marked originality, but as summarizing the national hopes, is specially important in the present connexion. It falls into two well-marked groups, 1-16, which depict the restoration of the tribes,² but contain no reference to the Messiah, and 17, 18, which give a vigorous description of the origin, time of appearance, mission, and rule of the *χριστὸς κύριος*.³

The Messiah is king of Israel,⁴ and of the house and lineage of David, xvii 23 (21),⁵ "Ἰδε, κύριε, καὶ ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς (the Israelites) τὸν βασιλεία αὐτῶν υἱὸν Δαυὶδ. Cf. xvii 5 (4). God is to send him εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ὃν εἶλον σύ, xvii 24 (21); cf. xvii 51 (45), Ταχύναί ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. He is called *χριστὸς κύριος* xvii 36 (32) (? κυρίου, as in xviii 6 (5), 8 (7), see Kittel's note). Further, he is βασιλεὺς δίκαιος καὶ διδασκὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ, xvii 35 (32). He is in a special sense the king of Israel, and is related to the heathens in a quite external way. His

¹ *Ibid.* p. 256.

² xi 1-8.

³ Probably a mistranslation of מָלִיךְ מִשְׁמֵי. See Ryle and James *Psalms of the Pharisees* (1891) pp. 141 ff.

⁴ That the people of God can alone represent God's kingdom on earth—so Daniel—is the primary idea underlying the מָלִיךְ מִשְׁמֵי.

⁵ The references in brackets are to Kittel's translation in Kautzsch ii 144-148.

primary mission is to overthrow the *ἔθνη*, whom he is summoned to destroy, xvii 23 (21) καὶ ὑπόξωσον αὐτὸν ἰσχύϊν, τοῦ θραῦσαι ἄρχοντας ἀδίκους. Thus, he will have strength, ἐκτρώψαι ὑπερηφανίαν ἁμαρτωλοῦ ὡς σκεύη κεραμέως, ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ συντρίψαι πᾶσαν ὑπόστασιν αὐτῶν· ὀλοθρεῦσαι ἔθνη παράνομα ἐν λόγῳ στόματος αὐτοῦ, xvii 26, 27 (23-24). With the last words we may compare xvii 37 (33) οὐ γὰρ ἐλπιδί ἐπὶ ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην καὶ τόξον, οὐδὲ πληθυνεῖ αὐτῷ χρυσίον οὐδὲ ἀργύριον εἰς πόλεμον, καὶ πολλοῖς¹ οὐ συνάξει ἐλπίδας εἰς ἡμέραν πολέμου. After the destruction of the hostile nations, the others will be subject to his yoke, xvii 32 (30) καὶ ἔξει λαοὺς ἐθνῶν δουλεῖν αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν² αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν κύριον δοξάσει ἐν ἐπισήμῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς. As to the Jews, οὐκ ἀφήρει ἀδικίαν ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν αὐλισθῆναι ἔτι, καὶ οὐ κατοικήσει πᾶς ἄνθρωπος μετ' αὐτῶν εἰδὼς κακίαν· γινώσεται γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὅτι πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν αὐτῶν, xvii 29-30 (27). He will bring back the Dispersion, συνάξει λαὸν ἁγίων, οὐ ἀφηγήσεται ἐν διακοσύνῃ, xvii 28 (27). The work of regeneration is further emphasized, xvii 36 (32) καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, ὅτι πάντες ἅγιοι καὶ βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν χρυσὸς κύριος (κυρίου). His rule will be spiritual, xvii 49 (43) οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ὡς λόγοι ἁγίων ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν ἡγιασμένων. Cf. xvii 44-46 (40-41), xviii 7-10 (6-9). He himself is καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας, xvii 41 (36) καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενήσκει ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θεῷ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κατεργάσατο αὐτὸν δυνατὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, καὶ σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ συνέσεως μετὰ ἰσχύος καὶ δικαιοσύνης, xvii 42 (32-33). Again, his rule is religious, he is κραταῶς ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ, ποιμαίνων τὸ ποίμνιον κυρίου ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, xvii 44-45 (42). Finally, he is God's Vice-Regent on earth, κύριος αὐτὸς βασιλεῖς αὐτοῦ, xvii 38 (34); and he is mortal, as we gather from the expression οὐκ . . . ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ, xvii 42 (32). So Kittel, who renders *nie in seinem Leben*.

We shall now take up in order the several details in this portrait, and consider how far they are reiterated or modified in the rest of the literature of our period.³

1. The Messiah as King of the House of David. In Ecclus. xlv 25 f we read of Yahwè's compact with 'David of the tribe of Judah', whose lineage will endure, and whose kingdom will be eternal. Similarly, xlvii 11; 1 Mac. ii 57 (cf. 2 Sam. vii 16). The thought is carried further, as we have seen, Ps. Sol. xvii 4, 21; so Test. Jud. 22-24.

¹ James and Ryle change πολλοῖς to πλοίοις, Gebhardt adds λαοῖς, Hilgenfeld conjectures παλταῖς or ὄπλας.

² They will not, however, be admitted into Jerusalem, xvii 30-31 (27-28); the *κρινεῖν* here must not be understood forensically.

³ I have not scrupled to avail myself of the results of others' labour in bringing together passages bearing on a particular point. To adopt the words of Gressmann, 'was ich etwa mein Eigen nenne ist nicht das Einzelne, sondern das Ganze'. Volz and Bousset should be specially mentioned.

Again, III Sib. 47 f, we hear of a βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος to be revealed when Rome shall rule over Egypt, and of a coming ἄγιος ἀναξ, who may be connected with the 'kingly stock whose lineage shall not fail', i. e. David's, *ibid.* 288 f. The 'Christ' of 4 Ezra xii 35 will arise from the seed of David.¹ The prevalence of this belief is specially evident from the frequent references thereto in the Synoptics: thus, Mt. xii 23 μῆτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ; Mt. xxi 9 Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυεὶδ. Mk. xii 35 πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι ὁ χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ ἐστιν; cf. x 47; Lk. xviii 39 Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ, ἐλέησόν με. Rom. i 3 ὁ γενομένος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα. Cf. 2 Tim. ii 8 Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς . . . ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ: Ap. Joh. v 5; xxi 16; *Didache* ix 2, ἄμπελος Δαυεὶδ.²

Alongside of this tradition we find here and there expressed or alluded to the view that the Messiah will come forth not from the seed of David, but of Levi. In the stirring times of the Maccabees this view naturally comes to the surface. In the Book of Jubilees, which surely dates from this period (Charles), the descendants of Levi are vaunted as chieftains, warriors, rulers (xxxi-ii). More clearly in the Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, which in its original form dates from (?) the same period, we are told of a (semi-divine) Messiah of the tribe of Levi (Test. Levi ii, xviii), who will possess an eternal priesthood, will judge as a king, bind Beliar, open the gates of paradise, to give to the 'pious' to eat of the tree of life. The book has been worked over in the Christian interest, and the other passages in which the ideas of a Messiah ben David and a Messiah ben Levi are combined are of Christian origin (cf. Sim. vii; Levi ii; Gad viii; Naphth. viii; with Rub. vi; Sim. 5; Jud. 25).³

2. The Messiah as Son of God. This designation occurs relatively seldom. Of course it bears as yet no metaphysical meaning. We find it *Vita Adae* xlii (Kautzsch ii 520) *Christus filius Dei*; Eth. Enoch cv 2 'My (God's) son'; 4 Ezra vii 28 *filius meus Messias*.⁴ I can find no other instances of its application to the earthly Messiah.

3. The Christ. This is the commonest of all the titles of the Messiah. We have it (χριστός, *unctus*) I Bar. xxix 3; xxx 1; *ibid.* xxxix 7; xl 1; lxx 9; lxxii 2 ('my Messiah'); 4 Ezra vii 28. It is

¹ For refs. in Talmud and Targum see F. Weber *Jüdische Theologie* (2. Aufl. Lips. 1897) pp. 356-358.

² For the Bethlehem tradition see Schürer *Geschichte d. jüdischen Volkes* ii⁴ (1907) 615.

³ For the Messiah ben Joseph, who does not strictly belong here, see *B. R. J.* 264-266.

⁴ Cf. Dalman *Worte Jesu* 221 f; Volz *Jüdische Eschatol.* 199. The reader should remember that we are here concerned only with the non-divine national king.

unnecessary here to refer to the New Testament usage in detail. Messiah is, of course, the title of the (transcendent) God-King; its frequent occurrence rather tends to rebut the assertion of Dalman that Ps. ii 2 was rarely interpreted Messianically in later Judaism.

4. The Messiah and the Nations. As a rule, the conquest or destruction of the hostile nations is the first task of the Messiah. This tradition goes back to Ps. ii 9 'Thou shalt break them (i. e. the nations) with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel', and is, as we have seen, in the last analysis of mythical origin. It is expressed,¹ III Sib. 653 τοὺς μὲν ἄρα κτείνας, τοῖς δ' ὄρκια πιστὰ τελείσας, (cf. Is. xi 4); V Sib. 108, and, more fully, 416-420:—

καὶ πάντων ἐκράτησε καλῶς πᾶσιν τ' ἀπένεικε
τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τὸν πλοῦτον ὃν οἱ πρότεροι λάβον ἄνδρες.
πάσας δ' ἐκ βάθρων ἔλεν πόλιος πυρὶ πολλῶ
καὶ δήμους ἔφλεξε βροτῶν τῶν πρόσθε κακούργων.

Other references are: Philo *De praem. et poen.* xvi; I Bar. xxxix 7; lxx 9. So far as I can discover the earthly Messiah never appears as judge—the 'judgement' of Ps. Sol. xvii 29 is not forensic—but only as warrior; while the sphere of his activity is wholly confined to Palestine.² In our period Judaism had reached the stage of transition from a national cult to a universal religion. Universalistic tendencies were operative throughout—their strength is shewn in the ultimate triumph of Christianity—but were constantly checked by the national exclusiveness. In general, the latter tendency prevails in the conceptions of the future earthly (i. e. national) kingdom, the former in the apocalyptic literature; though it is true that the ultimate fate of the heathen remained to the end a matter of small interest. Sometimes they are damned without scruple, Eth. Enoch xxii 11 ff, xci 9; Ps. Sol. xvi 2 (2); xv 11 (10); xiv 6 (9), see below. Among the Jews of the Dispersion, however, we meet with the idea of a 'conversion' of the heathen. So especially in the Sibyllines, e.g. III 616 ff, 716 ff *al.* One hardly expects to find the idea so early as the Book of Tobit (second century B. C.), where, however, we read: 'Many nations will come from far to the name (? presence) of the Lord our God, with presents in their hands, gifts for the King of Heaven. From generation to generation they will extol thee and sing thy praises' (xiii. 11). More clearly still, xiv 6 f, 'And all the heathen will revert to the truth and the fear of God, and will bury their idols; and all the heathen will praise the Lord.' So, again, Eth. Enoch x 21; xc 30; xci 14, where

¹ Volz *op. cit.* p. 223 f.

² *Ibid.* pp. 234 f. See, however, Kautzsch ii 146 note g.

the motive is supplied by God's loving care for His people. The Messiah himself converts the nations, Test. Zeb. ix; Test. Jud. xxiv; Test. Levi viii; I Bar. xli 3; Eth. En. xlviii. 5; Ap. Abr. xxix. As a rule, indeed, the converts will not be admitted into Jerusalem: Jub. l 5; V Sib. 264; cf. I Bar. xxix 2; xl 2; and in the New Testament, Matt. xix 28; Ap. Joh. xx 4 ff. Or, if they are received into the kingdom, it is only on sufferance as tributaries of Israel's rule, and in order to provide the wherewithal for the upkeep of the temple. (Cf. Zech. xiv 16 f.) So Tob. xiii 11¹; Eth. Enoch xc 33, 37; III Sib. 716-726, 772 ff.² Nowhere is Jewish exclusiveness more prominent.

5. The Messiah and Israel. As in the Old Testament—Amos ix 12 f, xi 11; Jer. iii 11 *al.*; Ez. xxxvi 24, and often elsewhere—the dwellers in the Holy Land have a sort of *prima facie* right to enter the Messianic kingdom. So I Bar. xxix 2 'At that time I will protect only those who are in that land'; cf. xl 2; lxxi 1. But, in immediate dependence on Is. xxvii 13,³ we find the hope that the Jews of the Dispersion will be 'collected' and finally united with their brethren. It is expressed Ecclus. xxxvi. 16-22; Tob. xiii 10, 13; xiv 5; 2 Mac. ii 7, 18; Eth. Enoch xc 32; I Bar. iv 36—v 9 (cf. Ps. Sol. xi). Frequently, they assemble at the sound of Yahwè's trumpet, e.g. Ps. Sol. xi 1 ('Blow the trumpet in Zion', &c.). See further, Ps. Sol. viii 27; Jub. i 15; Ap. Abr. xxxi; Philo, *De Execrationibus* cc. viii, ix. The thought lived on, and meets us in Christian sources (gathering of the elect), Mk. xiii 27; Mt. xxiv 31; *Didache* ix 4; x 5.⁴

A good deal of mythology is mixed up with this tradition of the 'return', especially in the descriptions of the wonders of the Messianic kingdom. This will have to be fully discussed in connexion with the idea of a coming God-King, but some features of the earthly paradise may properly be adverted to here. Thus, when the heathen have been delivered into the hands of the righteous, there commonly ensues for the latter an eternity of blissful peace. So Wisd. iii 8; Jub. xxxi 18, 20; xxxii 18 f; Eth. Enoch xc 30; xci 12; xcvi; xcix 10 (for the woes of the godless see this and the preceding chapter *passim*). A standing feature of this myth is the splendour of the new Jerusalem⁵ and of the Temple. 'For Jerusalem will be built of sapphire, emerald, and ivory, thy walls and towers and fortifications of pure gold. And

¹ Possibly in part of non-Jewish origin, Schürer *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes* iii¹ 178-180.

² Cf. Couard *Anschauungen* pp. 181 f.

³ Cf. Deutero-Is. xlix 22, and (1) Trito-Is. lx 4, 9; lxxi 20.

⁴ Cf. Hennecke *Handbuch z. d. neutestamentl. Apokryphen* (1904) p. 270.

⁵ Further discussion Bousset *Die Offenbarung Johannis* (6. Aufl. 1906) p. 509 (= Bd. XVI of Meyer's *Kommentar über d. N. T.*); Volz *Jüd. Eschatol.* 34, 369 ff; Gunkel *Verständnis* pp. 47 f; see especially p. 48 n. 3.

the streets of Jerusalem will be paved with beryl and carbuncle and precious stones from Ophir. And all her streets will cry "Halleluja!" and will extol with the words "Praised be God, who hath exalted thee for all eternity", Tob. xiii 16. Its walls will reach to Joppa, V Sib. 251. The rebuilding of the temple is described, Tob. xiv 5 ff. It will be splendid as of old, III Sib. 294. It will teem with riches, and be decked with gold and silver and purple, III 657 f, built in splendour for all eternity, Eth. Enoch xci 13; Jub. i 17, 27, 28. Cf. 2 Mac. ii 4 ff; I Bar. vi 5 ff. A more spiritual conception of the new Jerusalem, I Bar. v 1 ff.

The delights of the new order of things are almost everywhere materially conceived. A good instance is the naïve description I Bar. xxix 4-8:—

'And Behemoth will be revealed from his place and Leviathan will ascend from the sea, those two great monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation, and I kept them until that time; and then they will be for food for all that are left.' 5. The earth also will yield its fruit ten thousandfold, and on each vine there will be 1000 branches, and each branch will produce 1000 clusters, and each cluster will produce 1000 grapes, and each grape will produce a cor of wine. 6. And those who have hungered will rejoice: moreover, also, they will behold marvels every day. 7. For winds will go forth from before me to bring every morning the fragrance of aromatic fruits, and at the close of day clouds distilling the dew of health. 8. And it will come to pass at that selfsame time, that the treasury of manna will descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they that have come to the consummation of time.'¹

Ibid. lxxiv 1:—

'And it will come to pass in those days that the reapers will not grow weary, nor those that build be toilworn, for the works will of themselves speedily advance with those who do them in much tranquillity.'²

Similarly, III Sib. 744-749, 783; Eth. En. x 19; xi 1; Jub. xxiii 27-29.

The consummation of peace is specially insisted on,⁴ e.g. III Sib. 751 ff; 780 f; V 253, 382 ff; Test. Sim. vi; Jud. xxii; Jub. xxiii 29 f; xxv 20; I 5; all kings are reconciled, III Sib. 756, under the general

¹ Cf. Eth. Enoch, lx 7 ff, 4 Ezra vi 49 ff. Bousset *R. J.* 584 note 2, and Böklen *Verwandschaft* 113, compare 'the food and drink of immortality' in Mazdaism (flesh of the bullock Hadhayos slain by Saosyant), while Clemen (*Religionsgeschichte. Erklärung d. N.T.* 129) refers to Is. xxv 6, and thinks of a Messianic festival as in the Gospels. But these explanations are not mutually exclusive.

² Charles's transl.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Volz *Jüd. Eschatol.* 345 ff.

Rule of the Lord, *id.* 767 f; who dwells among his people, Jub. i 17, as a father among his children, Ps. Sol. xvii 30 (27). As in the golden age of Isaiah (xi 7 ff), we read again, III Sib. 777 ff, wolves and lambs, panthers and kids, will feed together, and the like. So I Bar. lxxiii 6. Peace and Plenty shall reign over the whole earth, Eth. En. i 8; xxv 6; 4 Ezra viii 52, and elsewhere often. Extensive propagation of children is mentioned, Eth. En. x 17, also absence of the pangs of childbirth, I Bar. lxxiii 7. Eternal youth is promised, Jub. xxiii 27; Eth. En. v 7-9; xi 1-2.

It is only fair to add that ethical regeneration finds a place in these strange descriptions. It is especially brought out V Sib. 429-433:—

οὐκ ἔτι γὰρ πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖς τότε δεινά,
οὐδὲ γαμοκλοπία καὶ παίδων Κύπρις ἄθεςμος,
οὐ φόνος οὐδὲ κυδοιμός, ἔρις δ' ἐν πᾶσι δικαίη.
ἵστατός ἐσθ' ἁγίων καιρός, ὅτε ταῦτα περάνη
θεὸς ὑψιβρεμέτης, κτίστης ναοῦ μεγίστου.

Also, III Sib. 376; Eth. En. xci 8, 14; xcii 5; I Bar. lxxiii 4.

On the whole, however, the criticism of Charles is abundantly justified. He writes:—

'Sin and wickedness have no place in [the Messianic kingdom.] But . . . there is no adequate account given of the cause of this spiritual transformation. This transformation is brought about catastrophically and in the main mechanically. By the eternal fiat of the Almighty, sin is banished at once and for ever from the hearts of the members of the Messianic kingdom. This catastrophic change is in itself at variance with all the spiritual experience of mankind.'¹

6. The time of the Messiah's coming. A few words may be said on this point here, though it properly belongs to a later section. Only vague indications are as a rule given²; and it is pretty certain that the idea of the immediate approach of the End first gained general currency with the emergence of Christianity. In Tob. xiv 5 the end comes when the world-periods have been fulfilled; in I Bar. xxiii 4 it is delayed until the full complement of Adam's descendants—whose number appears to be pre-ordained—be born. That the world is already old is a thought often expressed, e.g. Ezra v 55; xiv 10; I Bar. lxxv 10. The near approach to the end is hinted at, I Bar. xx 6; lxxiii 1; 4 Ezra iv 26.

The duration of the Messianic Rule is variously estimated. According to Eth. Enoch i-xxxvi it is of eternal duration on a purified earth;

¹ *Doct. of Immortality* p. 276.

² How such conclusions are reached will be discussed later, as also the origin of the theory of world-periods, etc.

so *ibid.* lxxxiii-xc, less clearly, 2 Mac. vii 33, 37; xiv 15. A temporary Messianic kingdom appears for the first time in Eth. Enoch xci-civ, followed by Ps. Sol. (see above) IV 53-56, 60, 61; Ass. Mos. ix 1; x 1; Jub. xxiii 11, when 'the day of the great judgement' seems to follow on the close of the Messianic kingdom. The Millennium is mentioned, Slav. Enoch xxxii 2; xxxiii 2; while in 4 Ezra vii 28 the duration is given as 400 years. In the Apocalypse of Baruch the kingdom appears to be of indefinite duration.

Only two further points in the conception of the national Messiah remain to be dealt with here: and for these we must look elsewhere than in the Psalms of Solomon. In Mal. iii f we hear of an angel or messenger of Yahwè, who is to prepare the way for the day of Judgement, to refine and purify Israel, and to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and of the children to their father. By a later-hand this 'angel of the covenant' is identified with Elijah. The personage in question surely belongs, as here conceived, to the class of Messiahs; but was subsequently viewed as a precursor of the Messianic Rule. The prophet reappears as a quasi-Messianic figure in Ecclus. xlviii 10-11, where the phraseology closely resembles that of Malachi. Again, in 1 Macc. iv 46 occurs the phrase *μεχρὶ τοῦ παραγενθῆναι προφήτην*, and similarly *ibid.* xiv 41 *ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν*. Here the *προφήτης* may be Elijah. The idea may be that a prophet must return and effect the purification necessary before the manifestation of the Messianic Rule.¹ So far, however, there is no indication that Elijah is other than a forerunner of Yahwè Himself. His connexion with the Messiah proper is secondary and popular. We have it explicitly, Mk. ix 11-13; vi 15; viii 28; Jn. i 21; cf. Mk. i 2; Mt. xi 10-11. Others besides Elijah are mentioned as precursors or assistants of the Messiah. Thus Moses,² Lk. ix 30, and often in the Targumim.³ So in the Transfiguration narrative, Mk. ix and parallels; also, it may be that the 'two witnesses', Ap. Jn. xi 3, are Moses and Elijah (Bousset). A reappearance of Enoch seems to be expected, Eth. En. xc 31. See further 4 Ezra vi 26 ('those who have never tasted death', i. e. Elijah, &c.); *ib.* xiv 9, 49 (Ezra); 1 Bar. vi 8; xiii 3; xlv 7; lxxvi 1-3 *al.* (Baruch); 2 Mac. ii 1 ff; xv 13; Mt. xvi 14 (Jeremiah). Judging from one's experience elsewhere, I find it hard to believe that this tradition is wholly derived

¹ So Weber (*Jüd. Theol.* 353): *Hiermit löst sich die Antinomie zwischen Forderung und Wirklichkeit hinsichtlich der Zeit vor der Ankunft des Messias. Israel wird in Verfall gerathen sein, ehe der Messias kommt; Elia aber richtet es auf und macht es äusserlich und innerlich würdig für die Erscheinung des Messias.*

² Possibly another originally Messianic figure. (? = the *προφήτης* of Jn. i 21; vi 14; vii 40; Acts iii 22.)

³ Weber *ibid.* 354. Cf. Volz *Jüd. Esch.* 193; Bousset *Antichrist* (1895) pp. 134 ff.

from Malachi. It is at least worth recording in this connexion that the Persian Saošyant is likewise accompanied by a varying number of the famous men of old.¹

The second point to which I desire to direct the attention of the reader is the mysterious 'revelation' of the Messiah to which allusion is here and there made in the post-canonical books. In III Sib. 652 God is to send His King ἀφ' ἡλίου (i. e. from the East).² Similarly V Sib. 414 ἦλθε γὰρ οὐρανίων νῶτων ἀπ' ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης, i. e. the Messiah. Again a gradual 'revelation' of the Messiah is mentioned I Bar. xxix 3. In Test. Levi xviii a mysterious 'star' is to arise on the coming of the 'new priest', bringing peace to the whole earth. Weber³ refers further to Jn. vii 27 ὁ χριστὸς ὅταν ἐρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἔσται, and connects it with a Jewish tradition as to the hidden origin of the Messiah. So Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* viii, cx, knows of a tradition that the Messiah is already born and dwells somewhere unknown. We can hardly be wrong in treating all these passages as echoes of one and the same tradition, and referring them to Is. xlv 15 'Verily thou art a hidden God, O God of Israel, a Saviour'. Gressmann⁴ observes that the epithet 'hidden' cannot have originated in Israel, but makes no suggestion as to its source. He, however, notes the parallel instances of the 'epiphany' of a θεὸς σωτήρ.⁵ Now, we know that not only the transcendent Messiah (so 4 Ezra xiii 26⁶), but also the national Messiah is occasionally called 'saviour', e. g. Test. Levi ii *ad fin.* ('he who is to save Israel'), especially in rabbinical literature.⁷ And when we find in the cuneiform texts a precisely similar conception of a king mysteriously summoned to establish a rule of peace, we are strongly tempted to conclude that the latter is the true original of the passages in question. Zimmern⁸ quotes from a prayer of Assurnasirpal (son of Tiglat-Pileser I) to Ištar the following, which seems to me quite in point here:—

'I was born in the midst of mountains which no man knows,
I bethought me not⁹ of thy lordship, nor did I pray continually to thee.

¹ Söderblom *La Vie future d'après le Maédisme (Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'Études T. ix, 1901) p. 257*; Böhlen *Die Verwandtschaft d. jüdisch-christlichen mit der persischen Eschatologie* (1902) pp. 100 ff.

² Cf. Is. xli 25, where LXX reads ἐγὼ δὲ ἤγαιρα . . . τὸν ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀναταλῶν, and see Weber *Jüd. Theol.* § 79, 1 (p. 358).

³ *Jüd. Theol.* 358. See also Schürer *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes* ii³ (1898) pp. 531 f.

⁴ *Ursprung* p. 311.

⁵ Collected by P. Wendland in his article ΣΩΤΗΡ, *ZntW.* v (1904) pp. 335-353. Also Harnack *Der Heiland (= Reden u. Aufsätze, Giessen 1904, i 307 ff.)*. In Is. xliii 3, liv 21, xlix 26, lix 20, lx 16, lxiii 18, the σωτήρ (σώζων) is of course Yahwē.

⁶ See Gunkel *ad loc.*; Kautzsch ii 396.

⁷ Weber *op. cit.* 364.

⁸ *K. A. T.* 382.

⁹ Cf. Is. xlv 4, 5 ידעתי לֹא (Zimmern).

The people of Assyria knew not thy Deity, prayed not thereto.
 Then hast thou, O Ištar, revered Mistress among the gods,
 Cast thy glance upon me, hast desired me to rule,
 Hast brought me forth from the mountains, hast called me to
 shepherd¹ the people,
 Hast given me a righteous sceptre,¹ &c.

The application of such language to kings is doubtless secondary, and belongs to the *Hofstil* of the period. The legend is most probably based on the story of Marduk-Bêl, who after his conquest of the dragon is raised to the dignity of king.²

It seems better to conceive the connexion in this way than to suppose that on the contrary the eschatological notion of a coming ruler who should establish a new golden age grew out of the conventional language applied to actual sovereigns. For in the latter case the origin of the *Hofstil* would still have to be explained; while it is easy to understand how, once the belief in a golden age, originally mythical, existed, it would be the highest form of flattery to salute a king on his accession as the inaugurator thereof.

This is all that can be said at present: but we shall return to these questions in a later section, after dealing meanwhile at length with the idea of a God-King as it emerges in the later apocrypha. Not till we have discussed the whole elaborate setting in which this figure appears can we fully appreciate the significance of the details we have already encountered in what precedes.³

§ 4. *The Messiah as God-King.*

By this time it will be obvious to the careful reader that the Messiah is no unitary personage whose attributes and functions are consistently represented throughout, but that on the contrary there exist a number of variously conceived figures to which the general designation 'Messianic' may fairly be given. Thus we have (a) the popular and rabbinical (? indigenous) conception of a national hero of the race and lineage of David; (b) the sinless but quite human Messiah (likewise a scion of David), of the Psalms of Solomon; (c) the Peacemaker of the Sibyllines,

¹ Cf. 2 Sam. v 2; vii 7; Jer. iii 15; Micah v 3; Nah. iii 18; Ez. xxxvii 24, and the uses of *ποιμήν* in the N. T.

² See especially the text from the library of Assurbanipal transl. in Gunkel *Schöpfung* pp. 417 f. Note the mention of *clouds*, as in Dan. vii 13, and often elsewhere.

³ For the method adopted cf. Gunkel: '*Unser Verfahren muss . . . vielfach in diesen Dingen das sein, dass wir die ihrem Ursprung nach oft fast unkenntlichen altprophetischen Schilderungen aus den viel deutlicheren spätprophetischen und apokalyptischen zu verstehen suchen*' (*Verständnis* p. 24).

and lastly (*d*) the semi-supernatural Priest-King of Test. Levi xviii.¹ Yet, however much they differ in detail, all these have certain features in common. Though often connected with wholly supernatural occurrences they are all alike human, and, above all, their common business is to secure for Israel a period of prosperity and happiness. Their relation to the nations is, as we have seen, merely external. But as Judaism tended more and more to become a religion for all mankind, a new development of the Messianic idea takes place. Or rather, an ancient tradition (whose continuous existence is revealed, as we shall seek to shew, by a diligent examination of the older scriptures) is revived to meet the demand for a personage of sufficient dignity to be the bearer of the enlarged functions of a cosmical ruler and judge.² To the examination of this exalted personage we must accordingly address ourselves in earnest.

The transcendent or superhuman Messiah appears unequivocally in three, and only three, of the apocalyptic compositions, viz. Daniel, 4 Ezra, and the 'Similitudes' of the (Ethiopic) Book of Enoch. The three are mutually complementary, so that their chronological order is for us a point of minor importance. I will discuss them in the order named, which seems best adapted for bringing out the full details of the conception.³

The first passage, Dan. vii, stands thus in the Revised Version:—

13. 'And I saw in the night visions, and behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man (כְּבֶן אָדָם), and he came even unto the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

¹ Volz *Jüd. Eschatol.* 211. The Messiah in Test. Levi xviii and I Bar. i 29 though truly much more than a national hero, is nevertheless not divine. In calling the God-King 'Messiah', I do not, of course, imply that the two figures are identical in origin. This will be clear from the sequel.

² It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that these various conceptions are not always sharply differentiated in our literature. But no methodological objection can be raised against their separation for the purpose of bringing out more clearly the logical development of the Messianic idea. Indeed the impossibility of accurately fixing the date of the several books in which the Messiah is mentioned renders any other procedure wellnigh impossible. A further point calls for notice here. Why, it may be asked, should Yahwè be displaced as judge by the Messiah? The answer is (1) that He is not always so displaced, but that on the contrary the thought that only the creator of the Universe can discharge the function of cosmical judge is often strongly emphasized, e.g. 4 Ezra v 66-vi 6. On the other hand (2) the position of the Messiah is explicable only in terms of the ancient (and, as I hold, mythical) narrative which forms the basis of the apocalyptic tradition. For the justification of this account the reader is referred to the subsequent discussion.

³ The best attempt to trace the historical evolution of the Messianic idea in later Judaism with which I am acquainted is that of Schürer *Geschichte* ii⁴ 590-609.

14. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.¹

The expression 'one like unto a son of man' first demands attention. This rendering agrees with the apparent meaning of the LXX ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, but is in reality misleading. That the בר in אִנָּשׁ denotes merely, as it were, specific humanity, so that the phrase אִנָּשׁ בָּר properly means 'one resembling a man', is now generally admitted, and is confirmed by the occurrence of the title 'man' elsewhere (see below). Next arises the question, Who is this mysterious 'man' who comes 'on the clouds of heaven'?² It is quite irrelevant to reply that he is merely a symbol of the people of Israel; cf. v. 27. Even granting this, the further question remains, Whence does this symbolic figure come? It will hardly be contended that it originates with the author of Daniel. The one fact that the entire material of the chapter represents an ancient tradition 'worked up allegorically is, or should be, decisive against such a view. But, further, the suggested exegesis runs counter to the facts.³ Our author entirely fails in his interpretation to make any headway with the mythical personage in question. No explanation is given of his appearance 'on the clouds',⁴ which is surely a characteristic feature and must have found a place in the allegory, if really invented *ad hoc*. Again, it is beyond the reach of question that this passage in Daniel was

¹ This passage is acutely handled by Cheyne *Bible Problems* pp. 213-235. My own conclusions have, however, been reached independently, and though following the same lines, advance the question, as I venture to think, a stage further.

² I hardly feel called upon to overhaul the voluminous recent literature on this topic. Most of the discussions seem to me to rest on a false critical basis, and we shall find, as we advance, ample reason to conclude that we are here dealing with an individual figure of a wholly supernatural kind. That is, after all, the main point. For the benefit of those who wish to go further into the linguistic (?) problem, I will subjoin a few references. N. Schmidt, art. 'Son of Man', *Encyc. Bib.* iv cols. 4705-4740, renews exhaustively the whole question, and discusses the views of other scholars. See also Volz *Jüd. Eschatol.* 214-216; *B. R. J.* 301 n. 2, 307 n. 2, 305 n. 1; Gressmann *Ursprung* pp. 334-339. The last two give full refs. Other recent literature will be mentioned as occasion arises.

³ The LXX reads ἐν τῶν νεφελῶν, while Theodotion has μετὰ, and the Masoretic text מֵעַל עֲנַנִּים. See Dalman *Worte Jesu* 198, who argues that since Yahwe alone comes 'on the clouds' (Is. xix 1; Ps. clv 3) the substitution of עֲנַנִּים for מֵעַל may be due to a desire to obscure the divinity of the 'man'. This may be so; in which case it would be clear that the LXX interpreted the figure as, practically, divine. Cf. *B. R. J.* 303 f.

⁴ i. e. the Chaos-myth; cf. Gunkel *Schöpfung* 323-335.

⁵ Cf. Volz *Jüd. Theol.* 10-12.

⁶ Gressmann *Ursprung* 340 f, 347 f.

not only interpreted Messianically, but had a vast influence in shaping the development of the Messianic idea. But is it not in the highest degree improbable that a unique conception such as that of the transcendent Messiah should have grown out of a mere blunder in exegesis?¹ I incline, however, to rely most on the line of argument pursued by Gunkel² who points out that the phrase 'the man' is but one of a number of technical terms occurring only in the apocalyptic literature and all obviously bearing a hidden meaning. Such are (to name only the most important) 'the day', 'the end', 'the (Messianic) woes', 'the abomination of desolation', 'the Lion', 'the Lamb', &c.³ And is it not plain that our author assumes his readers to be already acquainted with the 'man' in question; else why introduce him at all? It follows that the first step towards clearing up the significance of the entire supernatural framework in which the transcendent Messiah appears must be to enquire into the original character and function of this 'man on the clouds of heaven', who, it may be noted in passing, is but one of a series of heavenly 'men', whereof more in the sequel.

Before, however, we can enter upon such an enquiry, it will be necessary to scrutinize more closely the details of his personality as presented in the apocalypses. From Daniel we gather that he is destined to assume the rôle of World-King (*ver.* 14). This and his divine, or quasi-divine, nature is all the information concerning him which the author vouchsafes us. Nothing is said as to his origin or the place whence he comes; but we are perhaps justified in regarding his pre-existence⁴ as implied, while his coming 'on the clouds of heaven' at any rate suggests that heaven itself is his abode. The portrait is, however, completed, to a certain extent, in the later apocalypses, and accordingly we turn to the account in 4 Ezra xiii. Although the substance of portions of this important chapter have been set out in a previous section, it will be convenient to quote the whole here.⁵

¹ B. R. J. 607 f. Clemen observes: 'Das Missverständnis ist aus einem doppelten Grunde unmöglich. Einmal hätte doch dann aus der Stelle nur entnommen werden können, was irgendwie in ihr lag; sowohl Henoch als der vierte Esra wissen aber viel mehr über den Menschensohn auszusagen. Und dann wird er, so gut wie die Tiere, schon bei Daniel auf eine Tradition zurückgehen, denn das Kommen auf den Wolken des Himmels, das von ihm ausgesagt wird, passt gar nicht auf Israel und wird daher auch nachher nicht ausgedeutet' (*Religionsgeschichtl. Erklärung d. N. T.* 117).

² See his art. *Aus Wellhausens apokalyptischen Forschungen*, in the *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.* N. F. Bd. vii (1899) pp. 582-590.

³ Such employment of common words in special meanings is characteristic of the 'Mysteries' of the period in which the Jewish Apocalyptic arose. See examples in Gunkel's *Verständnis* p. 20.

⁴ Traces of a pre-existent Messiah are found in the LXX, *Volz Jüd. Eschat.* 208; B. R. J. 304 f.

⁵ I have followed mainly the text of Bensley-James (*The Fourth Book of Ezra*,

1. 'After the seven days, it happened that I dreamed in the night a dream. 2. Behold, there arose a mighty wind from the sea and stirred up all the waves thereof. 3. And I looked, and behold, that wind brought up from the heart of the sea as it were the likeness of a man (*tanquam similitudinem hominis*); I looked, and behold, that man was flying (*conuolabat*) with the clouds of heaven. And whithersoever he turned his countenance and gazed, there all trembled which he gazed upon; 4. and whithersoever the voice of his mouth proceeded, there all things which heard his voice were molten even as wax melts when it feels the fire. 5. Again I looked, and behold, there gathered together from the four winds of heaven a countless army of men to fight with the man who had arisen from the sea. 6. Then I looked, and lo, he graved (*sculpsit*) for himself a great mountain and flew thereon. 7. But I strove to learn the region or place whence the mountain had been graven; but I was not able. 8. Thereafter I looked, and lo, all those who had gathered together to war against him fell into a great fear; but nevertheless they dared the combat. 9. But when he saw the onslaught of the army which came against him he raised not a hand, nor brandished a sword or other instrument of war; but I saw only 10. how he sent forth from his mouth as it were a stream of fire, and from his lips a flaming breath, and from his tongue there issued a tempest of sparks; but all these mingled together, the stream of fire, and the flaming breath, and the mighty tempest. 11. It fell upon the assaulting army which was prepared for battle, and consumed it utterly; so that in the same moment there was naught to be seen of the countless army but dust and ashes, and the smell of smoke. When I saw this I was amazed. 12. Thereafter I saw how that man came down from the mountain and called unto himself another peaceable multitude. 13. Then there drew nigh unto him the forms of many men, some exulting, others gloomy; some were in bonds, some brought others with them as sacrificial offerings.'

Hereupon the dreamer awoke, and besought of the Most High the interpretation of the vision. And his prayer was answered in the following words:—

25. 'This is the interpretation of the vision: When thou sawest a man rising from the heart of the sea, 26. that was he whom the Most High has reserved throughout long ages, through whom he will deliver Creation, and who will himself establish the new order among those that are left. 27. When thou sawest how fire and flame and tempest issued from his mouth, 28. how he brandished no sword nor other instrument

in Robinson's *Texts and Studies* vol. iii No. 2 Camb. 1895), but have constantly referred to Gunkel's translation in Kautzsch ii 395-398. I have not thought it necessary to note deviations from the Benaley-James text.

of war, and yet brought to nothing the assault of that army which took the field against him, that signifies, 29. 10, days will come when the Most High will deliver the inhabitants of earth. 30. And there will come amazement of mind upon the inhabitants of the earth, 31. so that they shall plot to war one against the other, city against city, place against place, people against people, and kingdom against kingdom.¹ 32. Then when these things will come to pass and the signs will happen which I told thee of before, my son will be revealed, him whom thou sawest as a man ascending. 33. And then, when all the nations will hear his voice, every man will leave his own land, and they will give over their mutual warfare; 34. and a countless army will be gathered together into one place,² as thou sawest, desiring to come and battle against him. 35. But himself will stand on the top of Mount Zion. 36. But Zion will appear and be revealed to all men, builded in perfection, even as thou sawest the mountain graven without human hands. 37. But he, my son, will punish the impieties of the nations which came against him,—these are like unto the tempest—he will reprove them for their evil designs, and will prepare their future torments,—38. these are as it were the fire,—then he will bring them to naught without pity by his word,—that is like unto the flame. 39. But when thou sawest him summoning and gathering unto himself another peaceable multitude, 39. that is the ten tribes which were carried away out of their land in the days of King Josiah³ . . . 48. Moreover, that [multitude] is also those that are left out of thy people, and who are in my holy region.⁴ 49. Therefore when he has brought to naught the multitude of the assembled heathens, he will protect the people [of Israel], so much thereof as is left. 50. And he will shew unto them many other great portents. 51. Then I spake: Lord God, shew me why I beheld the man rising from the heart of the sea. And he spake to me: 52. Even as no one can fathom or learn what is in the depths of the sea, so no one who dwelleth on earth can behold my son or his companions, until the hour of his day be come.'

Now, as in the case of Dan. vii 13 f, it is obvious on examination that the material of this chapter is not something freshly imagined *ad hoc*. The artificiality of the interpretation points to an already existing tradition which refuses to fall completely within the allegorical scheme of the author.⁵ Thus the interpretation of the graven mountain as typifying the building of the new Jerusalem is hardly satisfactory—the *tertium comparationis* is altogether wanting. Especially is this the case in vv. 37–38. It is Gressmann who says:—

¹ Cf. Is. xix 12; Matt. xxiv 7 (Gunkel).

² i.e. Armageddon, as we learn from Ap. Joh. xvi 16 (Gunkel).

³ Their further history does not concern us here.

⁴ Perhaps interpolated: so Gunkel.

⁵ Cf. Gunkel in Kautzsch ii 347.

'The form of this sentence . . . is illogical. The author intended to express in the first two members as well as in the last that the punishment of the impieties is like the tempest,—the future torments are like the fire,—the pitiless annihilation like the flame, or better: Like tempest, fire, and flame, he will punish, torment, annihilate them. But apart from this, the interpretation could not possibly be worse. For how can fire be distinguished from flame? How can the former symbolize future torment, and the latter—in contradistinction thereto!—instant annihilation? Even should these symbols be capable in themselves of bearing such a meaning, where they are united and expressed in the same breath, they cannot at any rate be differentiated in this fashion.'

From *vv.* 3, 25, we learn something concerning the place whence 'the man' makes his appearance. But who would have expected 'the heart of the sea' to be mentioned in this connexion? True, in Dan. vii 2, 3 'the four winds of the heaven brake forth upon the great sea', but it is the 'four great *beasts*' who 'come up' from thence. Again, I Bar. liii 1, a 'cloud' arises from 'a very great sea', but is subsequently explained as symbolizing 'the wide *world* which the Almighty created when he bethought him to create the world' (lvi 3). The latter passage can hardly be in point here, but it might be maintained that the author of 4 Ezra had confused the personages in Daniel vii. However, I prefer the suggestion of Gunkel,¹ that a star-myth has somehow got mixed up with the Daniel-Ezra-Enoch tradition of a heaven-sent king. Anyhow the trait in question does not fit in with the interpretation. Surely it is the secrets of *heaven* which no mortal may explore! Furthermore, the fragmentary character of the whole tradition is seen in the additions which the author makes in the interpretation, and for which parallel features are wanting in the vision itself. Thus 'the man' is to appear with certain 'companions' (xiii 52), probably the angelic host; and there will be mutual wars among the nations (xiii 31).

A comparison of this account with the passage in Dan. vii discloses the following noteworthy points. (1) In 4 Ezra 'the man' plays an active rôle, whereas in Daniel his conquest of the last beast is but tacitly implied. (2) Here, too, 'the man' appears explicitly as both Judge and Deliverer, the latter conception predominating in the 'inter-

¹ *Ursprung* p. 352.

² Kautzsch ii 397 note u. So Volz 220 bottom. We shall see the force of this suggestion later. Gressmann's criticism (*Ursprung* p. 354) seems to me irrelevant; this author indeed concedes all that Gunkel contends for. The latter is supported by Jeremias *Babylonisches im N. T.* (1905) 41; Zimmermann *K. A. T.* 392; Bousset *R. J.* 303 note 1; H. Schmidt *Jona: eine Untersuchung s. vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte* (1907) 184 ff.

pretation', the former in the 'vision',—another proof of the manifold character of the tradition. (3) The pre-existence of 'the man' is here clearly asserted, xii 32, xiii 26. So vii 28 ('my son, the Messiah, will be revealed'); xiv 9 ('thou shalt dwell with my son'; cf. Gunkel *ad loc.*).¹ (4) If we include the passage in c. vii just referred to, we have here four distinct titles for the transcendent World-Saviour, viz. (a) the Old Testament designation Messiah, (β) the apocalyptic 'man',² (γ) the Hellenistic σωτήρ, and (δ) the synoptic Son of God. (5) The Messiah is described as inaugurating a new order of things (xiii 26), a conception for which parallels are not wanting. Thus the function of the 'angel of the covenant', Mal. iii, may originally have been to restore all things to their primordial order.³ So Test. Levi xviii the Messiah appears as restorer of the condition of things lost through the sin of Adam; and this is perhaps the explanation of the name Taxo (= τάξων) in Ass. Mos. ix 1.⁴ (6) Lastly, the pre-existent Messiah is hidden. God 'reserves' (*reservat*) or 'keeps' him till the time when he is to be revealed as eschatological king (xii 32; xiii 26); in a place where he can be seen only by the elect, cf. xiii 53; xiv 9. The last passage, by the way, shews once more that several distinct traditions are worked up in 4 Ezra, since it is implied that the prophet will be caught up to heaven and will there abide with the Messiah and his companions. Still whether hidden in heaven or in the heart of the sea, the Messiah is at any rate pre-existent.

We come next to the 'Similitudes', which consist of chaps. xxxvii–lxxi of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.⁵ We have seen that 'the man' of 4 Ezra cannot be explained by mere literary dependence on Dan. vii, and the same holds good of 'the man' in the Similitudes. All three writers employ the same traditional myth-material. We must now consider how the author of the Similitudes has dealt with this tradition, and the best way will be to summarize the Messianic content of the relevant chapters.

¹ Syr. Ar.¹ *filius meus Messias*, Eth. *Messias meus*, Arm. *Messias dei*, Ar.² *Messias*. The Lat. has *filius meus Iesus*, obviously a Christian interpolation.

² xiii 3 *ille homo*; xiii 5 *homo qui ascenderat de mari*; xiii 12 *ipse homo*; xiii 25 *vidisti virum*; xiii 32 *ut vir ascendens*; xiii 51 *vide virum ascendentem de corde maris*.

³ Cf. Mk. ix 12 (Ἡλείας μὲν ἔλθων πρῶτον ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα), and parallels.

⁴ Cf. Clemen's note Kautzsch ii 326.

⁵ I have used (1) Charles *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford 1893), (2) German Translation with introduction and useful notes by G. Beer in Kautzsch ii 217–310, (3) J. Flemming and L. Radermacher *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig 1901), in the series *Die griechisch-christl. Schriftsteller d. ersten 3 Jahrhunderte*, hrsg. v. d. Kirchenväter-Kommission d. Königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften. There is a short but excellent résumé of the Messianic ideas of the Similitudes in Charles *Doct. of a Future Life* pp. 213–217.

First of all, then, as to the titles here borne by the Messiah. These are:—(1) 'The Son of Man'.¹ This, of course, goes back to the Aramaic בֶּר אִנְשָׁא , and we have already suggested reasons for concluding that the proper rendering is simply 'the man'. It occurs, with unimportant variations,² xlvi 2-4; xlviii 2; lxii 5, 7, 9, 14; lxiii 11; lxix 26, 27, 29 (twice); lxx 1; lxxi 14, 17 (the last two refer to Enoch himself).³ The variations referred to mostly concern the use or omission of the demonstratives 'this' and 'that'; and it is now practically settled that in the Ethiopic version these simply represent the Greek article.

More remarkable are the phrase *walda 'ēguāla 'emahayāw*, literally, 'the offspring of the mother of the living', which occurs in the Ethiopic text, lxii 7, 9, 14; lxiii 11; lxix 26, 27; lxx 1, and the reading *walda bē 'ēsit* = 'son of woman', which is occasionally found in some of the later MSS, e. g. in lxii 5. There is, of course, no reason *a priori* why the title 'son of woman' should not occur,⁴ and we shall, later, adduce instances of its employment. Still, no argument must be founded upon its use in the Ethiopic text, since (a) the reading *walda bē 'ēsit* (= son of woman) for *walda bē 'ēsit* (= *filius uiri*) in lxii 5 may be due either to Christian tampering with the text, or, possibly, to a confusion with *walda* and *bē 'ēsit* which stand in the preceding verse.⁵ Further, (β) Dalman, Schmidt, and Charles⁶ hold that in Ethiopic no difference of meaning exists between *walda sab'e* (= *filius hominis*,—found, seemingly, xlvi 2, 3, 4; xlviii 2 only) and *walda bē 'ēsi* (= *filius uiri*), while the odd phrase 'the offspring of the mother of the living' 'is regularly used in Ethiopic for "mortal man", . . . [and] is the constant equivalent for $\delta \nu\theta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in the New Testament, at least in the printed texts'.⁷

(2) The Messiah or Christ. This title occurs only twice, xlviii 10 ('because they denied the lord of spirits and his Christ') and lii 4 ('all this which thou hast seen serves to shew the glory of his Christ'). Dalman⁸ would strike out the words 'and his Christ' in the first instance, on the ground that the 'lord of spirits here' = the Messiah; he regards lii 4 as an interpolation as breaking the connexion between 3 and 5.

¹ If any one doubts that the 'son of man' is here really a title of the Messiah, let him read carefully Charles's note (*Doct. of a Future Life* pp. 214-215), where the point is convincingly made out.

² For these see *B. R. J.* 301 n. 2; Volz *Jüd. Eschat.* 214; and Beer's note to xlvi 2 (*Kautzsch* ii 262).

³ See Beer in *Kautzsch* ii 277 note o.

⁴ Cf. *Is.* vii 14.

⁵ These suggestions come from Beer's note *ad loc.* (*Kautzsch* lxxxviii 271).

⁶ Refs. in Dalman *Worte Jesu* 199, Volz 214.

⁷ Prof. Burkitt, 'Four Notes on the Book of Enoch' in the *Journal of Theological Studies* viii (1906-1907) p. 447. This note disposes of certain difficulties I had previously felt owing to my unfortunate ignorance of the Ethiopic language.

⁸ *Worte Jesu* 221.

The grounds assigned are no doubt slender; a better argument would be the absence of the designation elsewhere in the Similitudes. In any case, there can be no question but that 'the man' is none other than the Messiah.

(3) The Elect One (רִיבּוֹן, ἐκλεκτός). This is a standing title of the Messiah in the Similitudes. It is found, xxxix 6 ('the Elect One, of Righteousness and Truth or (?) Faith'); xl 5; xlv 3; xlix 2, 4; li 3, 5; lii 6, 9; liii 6; lv 4; lxi 5, 8; lxii 1.¹ The companions of the Messiah are styled the 'elect ones', e.g. xxxix 6, also the 'righteous ones', and even the 'saints' (xxxix 4; xl 1; lxii 8).

(4) The righteous one.² This occurs several times, e.g. xxxviii 2; liii 6. So xlv 3 ('this is "the man" who hath righteousness, and with whom righteousness dwelleth'); lxxi 14 (where the quasi-Messianic Enoch is addressed by Michael: 'Thou art "the man" who art born unto righteousness').

The next point to be considered is the rôle played by the Messiah in the last act of the great World-Drama. In general, he is represented in the Similitudes as less active than was the case in 4 Ezra xiii; but he is none the less an imposing figure. He discharges two main functions, (i) as cosmical Judge, in which case he appears as more or less passive by the side of God, and (ii) as Messianic Champion and Ruler of the Righteous. In each instance we shall consider (a) the scope and range of his activities, and (b) the characteristics which accrue to him by reason of the two functions respectively.

i. (a) As Judge,³ his jurisdiction embraces all creatures. The sum of judgement will be committed unto Him⁴ (lxix 27), as He sits on the throne of His glory (xlv 3; lv 4; lxii 3), whereon the Lord of Spirits will place Him (lxi 8; lxii 2) alongside of Himself⁵ (xlvii 3; li 3). On the Day of Judgement (that great day, liv 6, of tribulation and suffering, xlv 2; lv 3) the elect will stand before Him (lxii 8), and He will judge all the works of the holy in heaven, and weigh their deeds in the balance, according to the manner of the righteous judgement of the Lord of Spirits (lxi 8-9). No one shall be able to utter a lying word before Him (xlix 4). As to sinners, the word of His mouth will slay them, and all the unrighteous will be destroyed before His face (lxii 2; cf. xxxviii 1-3; xlv 2-6); so in particular the kings and mighty ones of the earth will perish and be delivered into the hands of the righteous and holy,

¹ Cf. Is. xli 8 f; xlii 1; Lk. ix 35; xxiii 35.

² Cf. Acts iii 14; vii 52; xxii 14; 1 Jn. ii 1. See further Dalman *Worte Jesu* 200.

³ The Ancient of Days himself acts as Judge, xlvii 3; so in the N. T. the rôle is attributed now to the Father, and again to the Son.

⁴ Cf. Jn. v 22, 27.

⁵ Cf. Ps. cx 1.

xxxviii 5; for their subsequent fate see lxi 8; lv 4; lxii 3; ii 5, 9; lxiii 9, 1, 8; lxii 11, 12; lxiii 10). Likewise, those who have led the world astray (presumably the 200 angels whose *amours* with the daughters of men were productive of so much mischief), will be destroyed from off the face of the earth (lxix 27); and again Azazel and all his crew will be judged by the Elect One 'in the name of the Lord of Spirits' (lv 4).

i. (b) As Judge, the Messiah possesses Righteousness, Wisdom, and Power.¹ He is the Righteous One *κατ' ἐξοχήν* (xxxviii 2; cf. liii 6 'the Righteous and Elect One'). By reason of his indwelling Righteousness God has been pleased to elect him to the position (xlvi 3; xlix 4). Wisdom, finding no habitation on earth, withdrew to heaven (xlii 1-2, see Beer *ad loc.*), the spirit of Wisdom abides in him² (xlix 3), and its secrets pour forth like water from the thought of his mouth (xlix 1, 3;³ li 3). Likewise he possesses the Spirit of Power and of Universal Dominion from generation to generation (xlix 2; lxii 6).

ii. (a) As Messianic champion he is to overcome the minions of Ungodliness and to vindicate the possession of the (new) earth to the righteous for ever. He thus corresponds in some sort to the Restorer and Deliverer of 4 Ezra, though indeed his punishment of the evildoers is here viewed less as a conquest than as a forensic act. As usual, he has to clear the ground (so to say) by removing (α) the foes of Israel, (β) the sinners, and (γ) the demoniac powers. We are not for the moment concerned with the by no means edifying details of their respective punishments. Chapter li announces (so far as words go) a general resurrection in the body⁴ and the transfiguration (*δοξάζειν*) of the righteous, before whom all the might of the heathens will melt away (lii 6) through the power of the Messiah, as one may suppose, though this is not explicitly stated. No defence will avail the godless (lii 7-8), and they will seek in vain to secure by gifts the mercy of God (liii 1-2). Satan and his companions will be dealt with by angels (liii 3), and the kings and mighty ones will be cast into (?) Gehenna, where also the host of Azazel will be tormented in different ways (liv 1-5). The latter will finally be cast into the fiery furnace (liv 6), after being judged by the Messiah in the presence of the kings and mighty ones who will dwell on the earth (lv 4). Chapter lvi describes a final attack on Jerusalem by the heathen kings and their forces. These will destroy one another,

¹ Cf. Volz *Jüd. Eschatol.* xxxv 8 pp. 231 f, where parallels are mentioned; also Ps. xlv 4-8; lxxii; Is. xi 3-5; Jer. xxiii 5-6.

² From this to the thought of an hypostatized Logos was but a small step.

³ For the meaning of 'the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in Righteousness', which is mentioned in this verse, see Gressmann *Ursprung* 359.

⁴ Beer *ad loc.* compares the Persian myth in which the Saošyānt raises the dead and rewards or punishes them according to their 'works'.

and together with the godless ones, will be finally swallowed up by Še'ol before the eyes of the righteous. According to lxii 2 the Messiah will slay all sinners with the word of his mouth, while xlviii 9-10, lxii 12 make the kings and mighty ones of the earth to be seized by an angel of punishment, when they form a spectacle for the righteous (!) as they burn and disappear for ever, xlviii 9. Whether the same persons are intended in the two cases I am not in a position to say. Indeed it is impossible to extract a consistent account from the confused narrative in these chapters. But enough has, perhaps, been said to shew that the part played by the Messiah is slight, as compared with the active functions assigned to him in the Psalms of Solomon, the Sibyllines, and 4 Ezra.

The fate of the righteous may be briefly outlined here. Sin and wrongdoing are banished from the face of the earth (xlix 2); heaven and earth are transformed (xlv 4-5), to become the fitting abode of the righteous elect (xxxix 5; xli 2). There they will live days without end, the righteous in the light of the sun, and the elect in that of eternal life. They will seek the light, and find righteousness in the Lord of Spirits, and enjoy eternal peace (lviii 3-4; cf. xxxviii 4; lviii 3).

ii. (b) As Champion of and Ruler of the Righteous, the Messiah has already been revealed to them (lxii 7—so Charles, but I do not see how the statement is to be explained, unless as referring to the members of the pre-existent community); he is their support and will keep them from stumbling (xlviii 4), the Light of the nations (= τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου), and the Hope of those who are oppressed (*ibid.*). He is the Avenger of the righteous (xlviii 7). As we have already noted, after the *παρουσία*, the righteous and elect will dwell in everlasting joy on the new earth¹ (li 5), and the community of the righteous will endure in unhindered prosperity (liii 6; lxii 8). Their faces will shine with joy (li 5), they will be clothed with Life and Glory (lxii 15-16), and Light (xxxix 7), and become even as the angels of heaven (li 4), and will live in closest communion with the Elect One (lxii 14), in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (*ibid.* xxxix 7).

We have here a great and noteworthy advance on the earlier conceptions of the Messiah, and an approximation to the ethical and spiritual Christology of the Gospels. Such an approximation is also found in the stress here laid on the pre-existence of the Messiah.² On this point the Similitudes go far beyond any of the books hitherto discussed. The

¹ Cf. Mt. v 5. I mention only the most striking of the N. T. parallels. The reader will find a pretty complete list in Beer's notes.

² Bousset *Die Jüdische Apokalypik* p. 59 (cited by Cheyne *Bible Problems* p. 235) seems to me to go too far. Surely there are other essential elements in the Christian conception of the suffering Messiah, which find no place here.

language of xlvi 3 is striking: 'Before the sun and the signs (i. e. of the Zodiac) were created, and before the stars of heaven were made, his (the Messiah's) name was named by the Lord of Spirits.'¹ In popular belief, name and personality are, of course, identical²; but the personal pre-existence of the Messiah is further explicitly stated: God has elected and hidden him 'before the foundation of the world' (xlvi 6; cf. lxii 7), 'his glory endureth from eternity to eternity and his power from generation to generation' (xlix 2). His dwelling is under the wings of the Lord of Spirits (xxxix 7). Most clearly xli 1: 'I beheld there the Head of Days (רֹאשׁ הַיָּמִים Dan. vii 13), and his head was white as wool; and with him another whose countenance was as that of a man (the apocalyptic *hōbar'ēnāš*) and his face full of graciousness, even as that of a holy angel.' Here he is represented as abiding with God.³ We note that the Messiah is portrayed as dwelling in the midst of a pre-existent community of the elect, as in 4 Ezra vi 26; vii 28; xiv 9. Thus in c. xxxix Enoch is caught up by a whirlwind to the end of the heavens,⁴ and there beholds the mansions of the righteous and the habitations of the saints (3), wherein they dwell with the Elect One (6) under the wings of the Lord of Spirits, (7) from eternity to eternity (5). Heaven is, of course, spatially conceived, so that 'the end of the heavens' must mean the place furthest from earth where the Ancient of Days sits enthroned.⁵ Such passages are important as throwing light on the conception of the hidden Messiah, which we find in lxii 67: 'the man' was hidden from the beginning, and the Most High has reserved him . . . and revealed him to the elect, and he rules over all hidden things. In lx 11 the angel shews Enoch 'all things hidden, the first

¹ According to Weber the original idea was 'dass es Gottes Wille von Ewigkeit her war, den Messias zu schaffen und in die Welt zu senden, wie auch die mit ihm als präexistent genannten Väter, das Volk Israel und das Heiligtum, nicht wirklich, sondern in Gottes ewigem Heilsrathe vorhanden waren' (*Jüd. Theol.* 355). The thought of a real pre-existence is late. Dalman rightly observes: 'Die Präexistenzaussagen der Bilderreden Henochs, des vierten Esrabuchs, und von Pesikta Rabbati setzen übrigens auch keine menschliche Geburt des Messias voraus' (*Worte Jesu* 107). But when he goes on to state that 'von einer der Geburt als Mensch vorangehenden dem Messias eigentümlichen Präexistenz das Judentum nie etwas gewusst habe' (*ibid.*) he certainly runs counter to the facts, as will be shewn before we have done. See further Volz *Jüd. Eschatol.* 216-218.

² See *B. R. J.* 302 n. 1, 404; Cheyne *B. P.* 229 ff.

³ The real pre-existence of the Messiah in the Similitudes is denied by Billerbeck (*Zeitschrift Nathanael* xix 97 ff; xxi 89 ff), on what appear to me insufficient grounds. Couard (*Anschanungen* pp. 207 f) criticizes this position, but his interpretation of the עֶבֶר הַיָּמִים is open to serious question.

⁴ Cf. 2 Cor. xii 2 ff. The Persian origin of the whole conception has been established by Bousset (*Arch. f. rel. Wiss.* 1901, 155 ff).

⁵ Interesting details are given by Weber, *Jüd. Theol.* 162 ff.

and the last, in heaven high above, and in the deep under the earth, at the ends of the heavens, and at the (?) foundations thereof'.¹ Of these secret repositories only the 'end of the heavens' can, however, be the abode of the Messiah, since there alone, as we have seen, is God, under whose wings he abides till the time of his manifestation arrives. There are the seats of the righteous, of the patriarchs, and of the elect of former days (lxx 4). There, too, is the garden of life, i. e. paradise. The Messiah is thus the paradisaical king, the first created of all things; we may call him with 'Paul' *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* (Col. i 15).² Or, bringing together the scattered details, we find that the Messiah appears in the apocalyptic literature as a concrete individual figure which cannot be explained as a mere literary creation of the author in whose writings it emerges, but shews every indication of having a long tradition behind it. We find 'the man' invested with divine attributes, represented as dwelling eternally in Paradise, and destined to be revealed at the close of the present era, to deliver the righteous and to judge the whole of created beings. He is to found a new order of things, or rather to 'restore' them to their original perfect condition. Furthermore, his supernatural characteristics and powers place him in a wholly different category from that of the humble scion of the house of David who formed the object of the popular aspirations of Israel. If we style him the Messiah, it is with the full consciousness that in his case the title bears a new and enlarged meaning. The popular Messiah is earthly, and born of human parents; 'the man' is divine and has pre-existed from all eternity. Moreover, the fact that the two conceptions continued for a time to flourish side by side points to the existence of two distinct currents in Jewish thought: we cannot regard the transcendent Messiah as a mere development of earlier Messianic ideas.³ Any other conclusion would imply the deification of an originally human (i. e. humanly conceived) figure. Now there are plenty of instances in which an original god has been 'honourably degraded' to heroic or even to human rank⁴; but not one single case of the reverse process is discoverable in Israel or elsewhere. Couard indeed argues⁵ that the development

¹ Text uncertain.

² See, however, Dalman *Worte Jesu* 245-248; Weber *Jüd. Theol.* 354 ff.

³ The transcendent Messiah is, of course, never represented as a descendant of David. The words *qui orietur ex semine David*, which are found in the Syrian version of 4 Ezra xii 32, seem to be a Christian interpolation.

⁴ This is the case, e.g., with Lycurgus. For instances less remote from the present investigation, see the second volume of Winckler's *Geschichte Israels*, which work, though needing to be used with caution, is rich in suggestion and supplies ample materials for forming a sound judgement. Cf. Ed. Meyer *Israeliten* 278 ff.

⁵ *Anschaunngen* 212. Similarly Schürer: *Die jüdischen Anschauungen bleiben überall eigenartige und erklären sich von der Basis der alttestamentlichen Anschauungen*

is explicable in terms of the universalistic tendencies in later Judaism. We have already seen how these may account for the displacement of the Messiah ben David in the apocalyptic writers; but this reasoning breaks down when applied to the particular form which the results of the new developement assumed. The student who weighs the arguments already advanced will, I hope, conclude that the being resembling a man is not a mere invention of the author of Daniel, but rather an already existing tradition at most revived by him and adapted as well as might be to his particular purpose. The further fact (on which Couard relies), that the pre-existence of the Messiah is implied in Mich. vii f and elsewhere serves only to confirm the existence in Israel of the tradition of a coming God-King, and by no means to establish its intra-Israelitish origin. I have already sought to shew that the idea of a divine world-ruler could not conceivably arise in Israel itself, and I will proceed to verify this hypothesis by a more searching examination of the entire tradition.

aus als Umbildung oder Ergänzungen dieser (Geschichte ii⁴ 587). But this notion will have to go. As Prof. Drews observes (in a letter to the present writer), 'Handelt es sich doch vor allem darum, das Vorurteil der "Einsichtigkeit" der jüdisch-christlichen Vorstellungswelt zu zerstören und den Blick dafür frei zu machen, dass auch diese Welt nur Moment und Glied eines grösseren Zusammenhanges von mythischen Ideen darstellt. Unsere Theologen sitzen ja noch immer eingepfercht in ihren jüdischen Mauern und meinen schon genug getan zu haben, wenn sie zeigen, dass ein bestimmter Gedanke sich innerhalb der letzteren nicht nachweisen lässt.' As to the idea of Pre-existence cf. Harnack *Dogmengeschichte* i³ 755-764.

W. V. HAGUE.