

**Studies  
in the  
Hebrew Bible  
and Early  
Rabbinic Judaism**

by  
**Rabbi George Wolf**

מחקרי מקרא ויהדות רבנית קדומה

מאת

הרב גדליהו וואלף

New York, 1994

© COPYRIGHT 1994 BY GEORGE WOLF  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED ON ACID FREE PAPER

Printed in the U. S. A. by:  
**Moriah Offset Co.**  
115 Empire Blvd. Brooklyn, N.Y. 11225 (718) 693-3800

II

DEDICATED TO

MY MOTHER

BS  
1136  
W64  
1994

REGINA WOLF

רבקה וואלף

Born in Kupczyńce, Galicia, Poland, November 9, 1889  
(שבת ט"ו חשוון תר"ן), and lived in New York till March  
5, 1976 (יום ג אדר ב תשל"ו).

MY FATHER

HERMAN WOLF

עבי בן גדליהו וואלף

Born in Chmieliska, Galicia, Poland, October 17, 1886  
(יום א י"ח תשרי תרמ"ז), lived in Podhajce, Galicia, Poland,  
& followed in his father's occupation, came to New  
York and lived to May 21, 1966 (יום שבת ב סיון תשכ"ו).

MY MATERNAL GRANDFATHER

BERISCH CZACZKES

דוב בער טשאטשקיס שו"ב

Born in Kupczyńce, Galicia, Poland, in 1872, and lived  
in New York till February 23, 1942 (ו אדר תש"ב).

MY MATERNAL GRANDMOTHER

HINDA (GOTTWORT) CZACZKES

חיה הינדא

טשאטשקיס בת יהושע העשיל גוטוורט

Born in Pomorzany, Galicia, Poland, in 1872, and lived  
in New York till August 1, 1930.

MY PATERNAL GRANDFATHER

GEDALIA WOLF

גדליהו וואלף

He was a whisky distiller (gorzelnik) who died in  
Podhajce, Galicia, after World War I.

MY PATERNAL GRANDMOTHER

HENDEL (BOLTUCH) WOLF

הנדל (בולטוך) וואלף

She lived in Podhajce, Galicia, until July 17, 1939  
(יום ב א אב תרצ"ט).

X2737400

## MY PATERNAL UNCLE

DR. JAKOB WOLF

יעקב וואלף

My father's brother was a judge for the Austro-Hungarian Empire and later practiced law in Lezajsk, Poland, after World War I. He visited his mother Hendel who lived in Podhajce, and was killed by the Germans in 1943.

מצבת אבי

מצבת סבתי

HERMAN WOLF

נ

פ

פ"נ איש תם וישר  
ה"ה ר' צבי  
בן גדליהו וואלף ז"ל  
נולד יום א י"ח תשרי שנת תרמ"ז  
ונפ' ב סיון תשכ"ו  
ת נ צ ב ה  
OCT. 17, 1886  
MAY 21, 1966

חבל על אבדן רעתי המפוארה  
י בכו עינינו על אמנו היקרה  
הן בעצם היום נחשכה האורה  
האם היקרה ישרים ארחותיה  
י דיס שלחה לאביון ולנפש מרה  
נ הו נשאו מיודעים ומכירים  
ד ברי תחלה ושבה אמרו עליה  
אשת חיל לבעלה ואם רחמניה  
אמנו

חיה הינדא בת

ר' יהושע העשיל

אשת ר' דוב בעריש שו"ב  
טשאטשקיס

נפ' ז ימים לחודש מנחם אב תר"ץ  
ת נ צ ב ה

מצבת אמי

REGINA WOLF

פ"נ אשת חיל זריזה בעזרה  
ה"ה מרת רבקה בת ר'  
בעריש טשאטשקיס ז"ל  
נול' ט"ו חשוון תר"ן  
ונפ' ג אדר ב תשל"ו  
ת נ צ ב ה  
NOV. 9, 1889  
MAR. 5, 1976

## PREFACE

At first glance, this appears to be a slender volume, but upon closer examination, one will discover that it contains, in its compact style and space, more concrete interpretations than in volumes many times its size. In this work, I offer my original lexicographical and historical studies, to recover the primary meaning of some of the unexplained and difficult vocabulary of the Hebrew Bible, which I began in my first book, *SOME LEXICOGRAPHICAL COMMENTS ON THE HEBREW BIBLE*, New York, 1990, and in my second book, *LEXICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL AND RABBINIC PASSOVER*, New York, 1991, which were received favorably by scholars. As in my previous books, verse numbers are cited according to the Masoretic Hebrew text of the Bible.

Today's Hebrew Bible, is a remnant of the great Hebrew literature that existed in ancient times. Along with the loss of this literature, came the disappearance of the majority of its vocabulary and classical literary forms, including many original connotations for the surviving words recorded in the text of the Hebrew Bible. In time, many passages and words in the Biblical text became misunderstood and have remained so for centuries.

The same thing happened to early Rabbinic literature. The original connotations of many Mishnaic Hebrew words, and the origin and reasons for customs practiced in Early Rabbinic Judaism, have been forgotten in the course of time, and are now misunderstood.

Many scholars do not recognize the great impact that Early Christianity had on Early Rabbinic Judaism. Early Christianity played a role in the development and formation of the liturgy for the Passover night, the Haggadah. Attention has been given to this aspect in my interpretations of some Passover customs in Early Rabbinic Judaism.

My son, David Wolf, discussed the entire manuscript with me, proofread it, offered his constructive criticism and encouragement, and compiled the bibliography and indexes. My wife, Fay Wolf, and my daughter, Mrs. Sylvia Jacobs, listened attentively to my interpretations and expressed their opinions too.

בראשונה, עלי לשבח ולהודות להורי היקרים, אבי ר' צבי וואלף, ואמי מרת רבקה וואלף, שחנכוני והדריכוני בדרכי תורה ומצוות, וגם מסרו לי חנוך עברי ודתי שלם, שאפשר את כל מלאכתי הקדושה הזאת. שנית, עלי להודות לד"ר נתן קלוץ, מורי בתנ"ך בבית המדרש למורים של ישיבה אוניברסיטה בנויורק, שנטע בלבי אהבת ספר הספרים, ואת למודו המדעי.

הרב גדליהו וואלף יום ג ז טבת תשנ"ד

NEW YORK December 21, 1993 RABBI GEORGE WOLF

ביום הולדתי

## VI

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| DEDICATION.....   | II-III |
| PREFACE.....  | IV-V   |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS.....  | VI-VII |
| THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE AS THE TREE OF<br>DEATH IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS..... | 1-14   |
| קיע.....  | 15-16  |
| שם.....   | 17-20  |
| THE TOWER OF BABEL: Genesis 11:1-9..                                      | 21-24  |
| על.....   | 25-27  |
| שק לשק.....   | 28-29  |
| לקף.....  | 30     |
| שקרי שקר.....   | 31-33  |
| שקר.....  | 34-36  |
| זרא.....  | 37-38  |
| זראון.....  | 39     |
| ראש.....  | 40-42  |
| לברך      ברכה.....   | 43-45  |
| WHO WAS OSNAPPAR OF THE BIBLE?.....                                       | 46-48  |
| קריה.....   | 48-51  |
| חג.....   | 52-53  |
| עער.....  | 54-57  |
| נחתיים.....   | 58     |
| נחת.....  | 59-60  |
| נחת.....  | 61     |
| נחת.....  | 62-63  |
| שפט.....  | 64     |
| תפארת      גיא.....   | 65-68  |

VII

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| עפלה   | 69-72   |
| גגג  | 73      |
| גג   | 74-5    |
| גפ   | 76-77   |
| עלע  | 78-79   |
| TRANSLATING THE BIBLICAL HEBREW  |         |
| INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE  | 80-84   |
| HASMONAEAN ( חשמל )  | 85-94   |
| THE SAMOVAR OR BOILER AT THE PASCHAL MEAL                                | 95-98   |
| WHAT WAS THE ORIGINAL ORDER AND NUMBER OF QUESTIONS IN THE PASCHAL MEAL? | 99-120  |
| THE ROASTED LAMB IN THE PASCHAL MEAL IN THE YEARS AFTER 70 CE.           | 121-149 |
| THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CUPS OF WINE IN THE PASCHAL MEAL.                 | 150-159 |
| WAS THE LAST SUPPER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT A PASCHAL MEAL?                 | 160-171 |
| SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.   | 172-178 |
| INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES.  | 179-180 |
| GLOSSARY & INDEX OF MY NEW INTERPRETATIONS.                              | 181-183 |



THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE AS THE TREE OF DEATH  
IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS

Genesis 2:9 ועץ החיים בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע  
Genesis 2:17 ומעץ הדעת טוב ורע לא תאכל ממנו כי  
ביום אכלך ממנו מות תמות.

During the last 2,000 years, many interpretations have been given to the story about Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, or Paradise, and the two special trees located there. Modern attempts have not succeeded in solving fully the many problems inherent in this story.

The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad and the Tree of Life, appear in this narrative. In the middle of this story, however, only one tree, the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, was mentioned.

Some scholars thought that the single tree in the middle of the story, the Tree of Knowledge, was a later addition. Other researchers have held that this narrative originally contained one tree, the Tree of Knowledge, and that the Tree of Life was added later. Still others believe that originally the story mentioned both trees and that the Tree of Life was was not a late accretion to the narrative. Modern scholars have not been able to explain this story by eliminating one of the trees or

by dividing it into two different sources.

The word תַּעֲזָב is the problem and the interpretation of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad (עֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע), is the item that has drawn the attention of scholars through the ages. The Biblical narrative focuses its main attention upon the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad. The uncertainty comes from the fact that the Hebrew text does not define anywhere what is meant by עֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע.

Upon this Biblical Garden of Eden narrative in the Book of Genesis, Paul built one of the fundamental tenets of Christianity, the doctrine of Original Sin and the Fall of Man.

Pagan cultures had the concept of an inherent primordial evil and a myth of the envy and vengeance of the gods. Stories about the Fall of Man were current in Babylonia and Assyria. Paul borrowed these concepts from Hellenistic thought which were not accepted by Rabbinic Judaism. In the NEW TESTAMENT, Paul said: "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men..." (Romans 5:12). "Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men" (Romans 5:18).

According to Paul, Adam's sin of disobedience brought evil and death into the world, after

he was expelled from the Garden of Eden and was forbidden to eat from the Tree of Life, thus placing all mankind under sin and death.

Christianity taught that, after Adam's transgression, all men were inherently evil, and they could be redeemed only after Jesus came as the Christ. To save mankind from its sinful condition, another man, a new Adam, had to be sacrificed, who would redeem it; "so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men" (Romans 5:18), and "so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous" (Romans 5:19).

According to Paul, man could escape the consequences of Original Sin through redemption by the Second Adam, Jesus, who gave up his life in the crucifixion. He thus emphasizes the interdependence between sin and sacrificial expiation. "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Corinthians 15:21). Thus, without faith in Jesus as the redemptive savior, men would live and die in their Original Sin.

Rabbinic Judaism rejected the doctrine of Original Sin and maintained that the only road to salvation was through ethical deeds and stressed Original Virtue, the beneficent hereditary influence of righteous ancestors upon

their descendants.

While man tended to corruption, he was not basically a corrupt creature. By carrying out God's commandments, man could overcome the evil impulse and develop his impulse for good. By paying attention to the mitzvot, God's ethical prescriptions, man would be protected from sin. Man's Garden of Eden, or Paradise, was not only in the past, but can also be in the future, when man helps to establish the Kingdom of God on earth.

Since the Garden of Eden narrative does not mention the word sin or evil, it means that this story does not tell us about the origin of sin or evil, as some scholars believe. After eating from the Tree of Knowledge, Adam and Eve were embarrassed because of their nakedness. Before eating from this tree, they did not feel this way because they didn't know any better; they didn't have, at that time, the necessary knowledge. The nakedness of Adam and Eve was not a sin or something evil, it was a matter of propriety in society. Clothing is a necessary item for human living in this world.

Adam and Eve did not rebel against God and they made no effort to oppose the divine judgment or the absolute sovereign will of God.

Man is a free moral agent who must suffer the consequences of his actions. Since man ate from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, he has the wisdom to choose freely between the good and the bad in life.

A popular interpretation of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad is that its fruit introduced to the first humans the knowledge of sexual relations. Scholars advocating this interpretation hold that it was benevolence that impelled God to withhold from man the awareness of sex which brings pain and hardship in the raising of children. For this reason God forbade man to eat from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, so that he wouldn't learn of the existence of sexual consciousness. After man ate from this tree, he received partial and secondary immortality through the procreation of children.

There are many objections to this sexual interpretation. Sexual activity was not explicitly mentioned in the Paradise narrative. Nakedness does not necessarily imply a lack of sexual knowledge. God's command to Adam not to eat from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, came before woman was created. Man and woman were created as sexually mature beings. To "know good and bad" may also have legal and social connotations. The Bible couldn't have

attributed sexuality to God. Human procreation is not the counterpart of divine creativity.

Some scholars explained "good and bad" as a merism, a figure of speech explaining totality by two extremes. This means a cognizance of the opposites. According to this interpretation, the Tree of Knowledge gave man access to everything, to all good and bad things, to universal or divine knowledge, omniscience, a godlike power which is a characteristic of the deity.

Objections to this interpretation are that there is no place in the Bible where antithesis meant "everything" and that man never gained universal knowledge, making this an unfounded solution. When God created man, he bestowed upon him abundant knowledge contained in speech. Even before the creation of woman, God brought the beasts before man, who was a creature with knowledge, so that he could give them names. We therefore cannot say that man got cognition in general only when he ate the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad.

Another view of the knowledge of "good and bad" is that it represents mature intelligence and understanding, which are absent in children, that distinguishes the grownup from the child.

Scholars proposing this interpretation hold that before Adam and Eve ate from the tree they were, at that time, immature like children. God wanted man to be happy and continue his harmonious existence, free from worries, in the Garden of Eden, but man was not satisfied with his obedient dependency on God, he wanted more.

Adam was like a child who disobeys his father and disregards his admonitions. He then eats from the forbidden fruit to become independent from his father, God. But he wanted also to become like God in mature intelligence. Critics, however, argue that Adam's ability to name the animals shows that he had more than child-like intelligence.

According to some scholars, "good and "bad" means the moral sense of right and wrong. Eating from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad provided man with moral discrimination, or the ability to make ethical decisions between good and bad, making him capable of committing sin. Critics of this theory hold that it is inconceivable that God would prevent man from acquiring a sense of moral judgment.

Another explanation advocated by some scholars, is that the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad was a means to secular knowledge, cul-

ture and reason. A criticism of this theory is that Adam's action did not cause any increase in worldly knowledge.

Whether the forbidden fruit of this Tree of Knowledge made possible the attainment of human maturity, moral and social responsibility, the acquisition of certain human faculties and self-determination, no explanation is ever given why God should deny mankind of any of these responsibilities or how these qualities are godlike.

The Biblical writer of the Garden of Eden narrative refashioned Babylonian literary material from the Middle Bronze Age or utilized Canaanite literary sources to create his masterpiece. Among the Tel Amarna Tablets of the 14th century BCE and in the library of the Assyrian King Ashurbanipal, was discovered the tale of Adapa, which contains parallels to our Biblical story.

The god Ea created a being named Adapa, and granted him divine wisdom, but did not give him the gift of eternal life. Adapa became a priest and sage, a leader among mankind, in the city of Eridu. When Adapa was summoned before the chief sky god Anu, Ea warned him not to eat or drink the bread and water of death that were to be served to him there.



Anu desired to offer Adapa the bread and water of life to supplement his divine wisdom. But Adapa refused to partake of the food offered him, according to Ea's advice.

Adapa had the choice of gaining immortality but he didn't take it. The gift of life was held out to Adapa, but he refused the offer. Wisdom and immortality combined constituted equality with the deity. In the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh, the hero lost his immortality because the serpent stole the life-giving plant.

In Egypt, the Tree of Life is depicted as a tall sycamore from which the gods obtained immortality by eating its fruit. The Tree of Knowledge is mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, but is not found in Ancient Near Eastern literature.

We know from the context of the Bible that the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, was a Tree of Death, "for on the day you eat of it, you shall be destined to die" (Genesis 2:17).

(לא תאכל ממנו כי ביום אכלך ממנו מות חמדת)

I believe that the Bible does have a Tree of Death, which is parallel to the Tree of Life. The Tree of Death does appear in the literature of Ugarit.

I believe that the word יְעַת which normally means "knowledge", may be related to the

Egyptian DUAT and TUAIT.

DUAT= land of the dead, underworld.

TUAIT=death

הַדְּעָת עֵץ = THE TREE OF DEATH

The Babylonian tale of Adapa emphasizes how man lost his immortality.

The Biblical Garden of Eden story emphasizes too how man lost his immortality.

"God created man in his own image,  
in the image of God he created him".

(Genesis 1:27)

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ.

When man was placed in the Garden of Eden, God commanded him, "from every tree of the garden you may eat" (Genesis 2:16),

(מִכָּל עֵץ הַגֵּן אָכַל תֹּאכַל)

"except from the GOOD AND BAD TREE OF DEATH",

(וּמֵעֵץ הַדְּעָת טוֹב וָרָע)

"for on the day you eat of it, you shall be destined to die" (Genesis 2:17).

(כִּי בַיּוֹם אָכַלְךָ מִמֶּנָּה מוֹת תָּמוּת)

Adam was permitted to eat from all the trees of the garden including the Tree of Life. It was only the fruit of the Tree of Death that he was not permitted to eat. God intended to give man immortality.

We may assume that Adam did eat from the Tree of Life, or the Tree of Immortality, and

acquired eternal life or immortality. Why did God have to tell Adam that he would eventually die if he ate from the Tree of Death? If he were mortal, it wouldn't have made any difference. Since he was mortal, man would have died eventually anyway. This means that, at that time, man was immortal because he had eaten from the Tree of Immortality.

Along came the cunning serpent and asked the woman whether God said that she couldn't eat from any tree in the garden (Genesis 3:1).

(וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל הָאִשָּׁה אֵף כִּי אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל עֵץ הַגָּן)

But the woman informed the serpent that God permitted one to eat from the fruit of the trees in the garden (Genesis 3:2),

(וַתֹּאמֶר הָאִשָּׁה אֶל הַנָּחַשׁ מִפְּרֵי הַגָּן נֹאכָל)

except from the fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden, the Tree of Death.

She added that it was not permissible even to touch it because one would die (Genesis 3:3)

(וּמִפְּרֵי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא תִגְעוּ בּוֹ פֶּן תָּמוּתוּ).

The serpent lied to the woman, duped her, and told her that she would not die if she ate from the fruit of the tree because this was not a Tree of Death, but a Tree of Knowledge (Genesis 3:4) (וַיֹּאמֶר הַנָּחַשׁ אֶל הָאִשָּׁה לֹא מוֹת תָּמוּתוּ).

The serpent said that after eating of the fruit of this tree, her and Adam's eyes would be opened, and they would become like God knowing good and bad (Genesis 3:5).

(כִּי יֵדַע אֱלֹהִים כִּי בַיּוֹם אֲכַלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקָחוּ  
עֵינֵיכֶם וְהִייתֶם כְּאֱלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי טוֹב וָרָע )

The divine attributes of God are immortality and the knowledge of good and bad. God did not want man to have both of these divine attributes, and for that reason he tried to withhold from him the knowledge of good and bad, especially when man had already obtained immortality.

The *עץ הדעת טוב ורע*, the Good and Bad Tree of Death, was good because it imparted knowledge, but it was bad because it also brought death.

The word *דַעַת* means "knowledge", but when referring to the tree, it also means "death".

God told Adam that the *עץ הדעת* was a Tree of Death, but withheld from him that it was also a Tree of Knowledge because he didn't want man to know also good and bad, for he wanted man to have immortality. The serpent, however, told Eve that this tree was a Tree of Knowledge and not a Tree of Death because it wanted man to lose his immortality.

When the woman saw that this tree was good for food, a delight to the eyes, and attractive for acquiring wisdom, she took from the tree's fruit and ate, and also gave some to her husband Adam to eat. Then their eyes were opened and they became knowledgeable (Genesis 3:6).

(וּתְרָא הָאֵשָׁה כִּי טוֹב הָעֵץ לְמַאֲכָל וְכִי תְאוּבָה הוּא  
לְעֵינַיִם וְנִחְמַד הָעֵץ לְהִשְׁכִּיל וְתִקַּח מִפְרִיו וְתֹאכַל  
וְתַתֵּן גַּם לְאִישָׁה עִמָּה וּלְאָכַל)

After eating from the Tree of Death, Adam lost his immortality and became mortal, subject to death. God wanted man to have immortality, for he did not warn him not to eat from the Tree of Life. Thus, after eating from the Tree of Death, man became like God, knowing good and bad, but lost his immortality (Genesis 3:22).

(וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים הֵן הָאָדָם הָיָה כְּאָדָם מִמְּנוּ לֹדַעַת  
טוֹב וְרָע )

Immortality rested on continual nourishment from the Tree of Life. God prevented Adam from extending his hand to take fruit from the Tree of Life in order to regain his immortality (Genesis 3:22).

(וְעַתָּה פֶּן יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וְלָקַח גַּם מֵעֵץ הַחַיִּים וְאָכַל  
וְחָי לְעֹלָם )

Hence, God drove Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:23-24).

(וישלחו יהוה אלהים מגן עדן.)

(ויגרש את האדם.)

When man was driven out of the Garden of Eden and cut off from the source of the fruit from the Tree of Immortality, he lost his immortality.

Thus, man acquired the divine attribute of wisdom or knowledge of good and bad which gave him the ability to differentiate between the good and the bad. At the same time, man lost his other divine attribute, immortality, after disobeying God's command.

עץ החיים = Tree of Life, Tree of Immortality.

עץ הדעת = Tree of Death, Tree of Mortality.

The main theme of the Garden of Eden narrative is man's loss of immortality because of his quest for additional divine knowledge, which became only a temporary gain.



I believe that the root  $\text{קע} = \text{קע} = \text{קע}$  (Job 7:5) =  
 $\text{בקע}$  = to separate, divide, cleave.

$\text{קִיקִיעַ} = \text{בְּקִיעַ} =$  a fissure, cleft, breach,  
 division, separation, partition.

$= \text{יהי רקיע בתוך המים}$

Let there be a partition in the water.

$\text{קִיקִיעַ}$  is parallel to  
 $\text{מבדיל בין מים למים}$ .

$= \text{ויעש אלהים את הרקיע}$

And God made the partition.

$= \text{ויקרא אלהים לרקיע שמים}$

And God called the partition sky.

Genesis 1:20  $\text{ועוף יעופף על הארץ}$   
 $\text{על פני רקיע השמים}$ .

And birds will fly above the earth  
 under the sky partition.



## שׁם

In the Hebrew Bible, God is known by a four-letter personal Divine Name YHWH (יהוה), the Tetragrammaton, which is not pronounced by Jews the way it is written because of its holiness. In Talmudic literature, this Divine Name was substituted by the term HaShem (הַשֵּׁם = the Name), or Shem (שֵׁם). Judaism prevented the profanation of the Tetragrammaton by encouraging the use of the substituted form HaShem. Thus, in Jewish tradition, HaShem is synonymous with "God".

I believe that the word שֵׁם connoting "God", was used earlier than the post-Biblical period, and was already prevalent in the Biblical period.

Here are some examples of its use in the Bible.

Leviticus 24:11      ויקב בן האשה הישראלית את הַשֵּׁם .

And the Israelite woman's son blasphemed the Lord.

Leviticus 24:16      ונקב שֵׁם יהוה מות ימנת .

And he who blasphemes God YHWH shall be put to death.

Genesis 12:8      ויבן שֵׁם מזבח ליהוה ויקרא בשֵׁם יהוה .

And there he built an altar to YHWH, then prayed to God YHWH.

Genesis 4:26      אז הפחל לקרא בשֵׁם יהוה .

At that time (man) began to pray to God YHWH.

Genesis 16:13      ותקרא שֵׁם יהוה הדבר אליה .

So she prayed to God YHWH who spoke to her,

Deuteronomy 32:3      כי שֵׁם יהוה אקרא .

For I will pray to God YHWH.

Deuteronomy 28:58      לִירָאָה אֶת הַשֵּׁם הַנִּכְבָּד וְהַנּוֹרָא הַזֶּה  
אֶת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ .

That you may fear this glorious and awful God,  
YHWH your God.

Psalms 18:7      בָּצַר לִי אֶקְרָא יְהוָה וְאֶל אֱלֹהֵי אֲשׁוּעַ .  
In my distress I prayed to YHWH, and cried to my  
God.

Isaiah 55:13      וְהָיָה לִיהוָה לְשֵׁם לְאֹת עֹלָם .  
And it will become for God YHWH an eternal sign.

Psalms 72:19      וּבְרוּךְ הוּא לְשֵׁם כְּבוֹדוֹ לְעֹלָם .  
And blessed is God, his glory is eternal.

Psalms 113:2      יְהִי לְשֵׁם יְהוָה מְבֹרָךְ מֵעַתָּה וְעַד עֹלָם .  
Blessed be God YHWH from now forever.

1 Kings 5:17      אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ אֵת דְּוִד אָבִי כִּי לֹא יָכַל לְבַנוֹת  
בַּיִת לְשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו ...

You know that my father David couldn't build a  
temple for God YHWH his God.

1 Kings 5:19      וְהִנְנִי אֹמֵר לְבַנוֹת בַּיִת לְשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהָי ...  
And I intend surely to build a temple for God YHWH,  
my God...

1 Kings 6:1      וַיִּבֶן הַבַּיִת לִיהוָה  
And he built the temple for YHWH.

1 Kings 6:2      וְהַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר בָּנָה הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה לִיהוָה  
And the temple that King Solomon built for YHWH.

1 Kings 8:17      וַיְהִי עִם לִבִּי דָוִד אָבִי לְבַנוֹת בַּיִת לְשֵׁם יְהוָה  
אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל .

It was my father David's intention to build a  
temple for God YHWH, the God of Israel.

1 Kings 8:20      ואבנה הבית לשם יהוה אלהי ישראל.  
And I have built the temple for God YHWH, the God of Israel.

1 Kings 8:13      בנה בניתי בית זבול לך מכוון לשבתך עולמים  
I built for you a princely temple, a place for you to live in forever.

Solomon built for God YHWH a temple in Jerusalem in which He was to live forever.

Isaiah 18:7      אל מקום שם יהוה צבאות הר ציון.  
To the sanctuary of the God of Hosts YHWH, at Mount Zion.

We can see from all these citations that שם = God, and does not have the ordinary connotation of "name".

Solomon didn't build the Temple in Jerusalem for the name of God, but for God YHWH.

The following Ugaritic quotation will show that the word Shem (שם) = God.

ʿttrt . šm . bʿl

(Gordon, C.H. UGARITIC TEXTBOOK. Rome, 1967. Text 127:56)

ʿTTRT. ŠM . BʿL = עֲשֶׁתְרֵת שֵׁם צֶעֱל .

This has been interpreted to mean:

- 1) Ashtoreth name of Baal 2) Ashtoreth heavens of Baal. Ashtoreth was a consort of Baal, the Canaanite storm and fertility god. She was the giver of life or death, and was also associated with Eshmun, the Phoenician god of healing. In 1 Kings 11:5, Ashtoreth is mentioned as the goddess of the Phoenician Sidonians ( עֲשֶׁתְרֵת אֱלֹהֵי צִדוֹנִים ) .

In Carthage, Ashtoreth was called the "face of Baal" (עשתרת פן בעל) . Baal was a trinity, one god composed of three gods. Ashtoreth was the female emanation or part of the masculine god Baal, in association with the holy spirit, the god Eshmun.

Thus, עֲשֶׁתְרֶת שֵׁם בַּעַל = Ashtoreth of the god Baal. This shows that in Ugaritic the word שֵׁם = God. It has the same meaning in the Hebrew Bible.

THE TOWER OF BABEL  
GENESIS 11:1-9

Scholars have claimed that the Biblical writer, who portrayed the building of the tower of Babel in Babylonia, thought that it symbolized man's early rebellion or arrogant defiance of the will of God. Others held that this story represented the desire of mankind to raise itself to the dwelling place of God, or man's attempt to stretch out his hand to God for help.

In Babylonia, the ziqqurat became the means by which man and God could establish direct contact. This was a man-made holy mountain created from bricks; a giant step-ladder, or stepped-tower, with a temple at its summit, and another at its base. At Ur, Uruk and Nippur, the ziqqurats were ascended by means of a temple staircase. In Babylonia, the ziqqurats were termed temples, with different names, that included both earth and heaven.

According to the Biblical text, mankind, at that time, had one language and few words, or one vocabulary, when some people traveled eastward, found a plain in Babylonia, and settled there. The land lacked stone, so, for construction purposes, they molded bricks and hardened them with fire, and employed bitumen as mortar.

According to Genesis 11:4, they decided to build a tower, whose top reached the sky,

וַיֹּאמְרוּ הִבֵּה נִבְנֶה לְנוֹ עֵיִר וַיְמַגְדֵּל וַיִּרְאֶשׁוּ בְשָׂמַיִם.

Commentators have assumed that the word עֵיִר in this

verse, refers to a city, claiming that the builders wanted to build a city, the city of Babylon. According to Genesis 10:10, however, the city of Babylon is represented as already built.

I do not believe that this story deals with the building of the city of Babylon at all, but treats only of the construction of the tower.

I think that עִיר וּמְגִדָּל is a hendiadys (= "one by means of two" ). This is a figure of speech in which a single concept is expressed by two words, nouns, where one defines the other, connected with a conjunction "and".

From ZAQRU (Akkadian)= to be high, we get ZIQQURAT=tower.

From גָּדַל (Hebrew)= to be high, we get מְגִדָּל=tower.  
ZIQQURAT= מְגִדָּל = tower.

The ziqqurats were towers with temples, at the top and bottom, whose purpose was to facilitate communication between earth and heaven.

I believe that עִיר = a tower.

Isaiah 1:8 עִיר נִצְרָה = a tower of watch=a watchtower.

עִיר וּמְגִדָּל = a tower

Genesis 11:5 וַיֵּרַד יְהוָה לִרְאוֹת אֶת הָעִיר וְאֶת הַמְּגִדָּל אֲשֶׁר בְּנִי בְנֵי הָאָדָם.

YHWH came down to look at the tower that the earthlings were building.

Genesis 11:8 וַיִּפֶּעַ יְהוָה אֹתָם מִשָּׁם עַל פְּנֵי כָל הָאָרֶץ  
וַיִּחְדְּלֵי לְבַנּוֹת הָעִיר.

And YHWH dispersed them from there over all the earth and they stopped building the TOWER.

Genesis 11:9

על כן קרא שמה בבל

Therefore, its name was called Babel.

Babel is the name of the tower, and not the city of Babylon.

The name Babel ( בבל ) stems from:

- 1) אֵלֵי בַבֶּל = Gate of God or
- 2) בֵּל בַּבֶּל = Gate of Bel

The tower was "the ladder", and the temple it supported on its summit, was "the gate". With this giant step-ladder, man was able to ascend to the temple, the gate, leading to heaven where the gods lived and revealed themselves to man.

At Beth-El, Jacob dreamed of a ladder ( סֻלָּם ), a tower, whose top reached to heaven, and upon which was a temple, a Gate of Heaven.

Genesis 28:12

והנה סֻלָּם מַעַב ארצה וראשו מגיע השמימה...

Genesis 28:17

אין זה כי אם בַּיִת אֱלֹהִים וזה שֶׁעַר הַשָּׁמַיִם

This is no other than the TEMPLE OF GOD and this is the GATE OF HEAVEN.

(Genesis 11:9) BABEL(=GATE OF GOD)= GATE OF HEAVEN

(Genesis 28:17).

Thus, the Gate of God (Babel) in Genesis 11:9, refers to the temple on the tower, and not to the city of Babylon.

The crucial statement in the whole tower story is in verse four, where the people who

were building this tower stated: **נַעֲשֶׂה לָנוּ אֱלֹהִים**. This has been interpreted as: "let us make a name for ourselves". I don't think that this story tells us that God dispersed the people on earth because they tried to reach Him in order to worship Him.

Man's desire was to bring his deity down to earth. In the ziqqurat, the deity, using the stairways of the tower, was to descend to the temple at the base of the tower, and there make himself known to man.

**נַעֲשֶׂה לָנוּ אֱלֹהִים** = let us set up a god for ourselves.

**אֱלֹהִים** = God

Man set up an idol to worship.

This tower building story informs us about the genesis of idolatry in the world. When man set up a god for himself and began idol worship, God dispersed him over the entire earth. In short, the aim of this story is to show that God disapproves of idol worship. The Tower of Babel story is an anti-pagan polemic.



על

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Genesis 41:33 | וַיִּשְׁיָחֶהוּ <u>עַל</u> אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם.   |
| Genesis 41:41 | וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה אֶל יוֹסֵף<br>רְאֵה נָתַתִּי אֹתְךָ <u>עַל</u> כָּל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. |
| Genesis 41:43 | וַנִּתְּחַן אֹתוֹ <u>עַל</u> כָּל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם.                                      |
| Genesis 41:40 | אַתָּה תְּהִי <u>עַל</u> בְּיַתִּי.   |

From Genesis 41 we learned that as a result of Joseph's successful interpretation of Pharaoh's dreams, he was elevated to a position of leadership and made a ruler of Egypt.

Scholars have assumed that in these verses the Hebrew word עַל is a preposition with the usual connotation of "on", "upon" and "over". I believe that the word עַל is a noun from the root עלה (in Arabic)= to be high, and that עַל = chief. In Aramaic, עֲלִי and עֲלִיָּא = the most high.

These verses should be translated thus:

.וַיִּשְׁיָחֶהוּ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. = And appoint him chief of the land of Egypt.

:וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה אֶל יוֹסֵף: = And Pharaoh said to Joseph:

.רְאֵה נָתַתִּי אֹתְךָ עַל כָּל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. = See, I have appointed you chief of the whole land of Egypt.

.וַנִּתְּחַן אֹתוֹ עַל כָּל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. = Then he appointed him chief of the whole land of Egypt.

.אַתָּה תְּהִי עַל בְּיַתִּי. = You shall become chief of my palace (=government).

Pharaoh= Pr<sup>6</sup>O (Egyptian)= Great House. It was originally applied to the royal palace, and later to the

government and monarch.

In succeeding chapters of Genesis, the term for "chief" is שְׁלִיט and מוֹשֵׁל.

Genesis 42:6                      וַיֹּסֵף הוּא הַשְּׁלִיט עַל הָאָרֶץ =  
Now Joseph was the ruler, the chief of the land.

Genesis 45:8                      מוֹשֵׁל בְּכָל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם =  
A ruler of the whole land of Egypt.

Other verses where עַל = chief, follow:

Genesis 43:19                      וַיִּגְשׁוּ אֶל הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר עַל בֵּית יוֹסֵף =  
And they approached the man who was chief of Joseph's  
palace.

Genesis 44:4                      וַיֹּסֵף אָמַר לְאִשְׁרֵי עַל בְּיַחַז =  
And Joseph said to the man who was chief of his palace.

Genesis 44:1                      וַיְצַו אֶת אִשְׁרֵי עַל בְּיַחַז =  
And he commanded the man who was chief of his palace.

2 Kings 10:5                      וְאִשְׁרֵי עַל הַבַּיִת וְאִשְׁרֵי עַל הָעִיר =  
The man who was chief of the palace and the man who  
was chief of the city.

King Solomon of Israel reorganized his empire by dividing his kingdom into 12 new administrative districts, binding it to the central government in the city of Jerusalem. Every district was ruled by a district governor commanding a garrison of troops to help him collect revenues in kind for Solomon's palace and for his huge building programs.

1 Kings 4:7                      וּלְשִׁלְמֹה שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר נְצַבִּים עַל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל =  
And Solomon had 12 district governors as chiefs of all  
Israel.

Scholars have interpreted נְצַב as "officer",

"overseer", "prefect", but he was a district governor commanding a military garrison (נְצִיב) .

וְכִלְכְּלוּ אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֶת בֵּיתוֹ = who provided food for the king and his palace.

חֹדֶשׁ בְּשָׁנָה יְהִיָּה עַל אֶחָד לְכָל־כֵּל . = each one had to provide food for one month in the year.

Some of Solomon's ministers of state (שְׂרָפִים) were:

1 Kings 4:4                    יִבְנִיָּהוּ בֶן יֵהוִיָדָע עַל הַצָּבָא . =  
Benaiah Ben Jehoiada was chief of the army.

1 Kings 4:5                    וְעֹזַרְיָה בֶן נָתָן עַל הַנְּצִיבִים . =  
Azariah Ben Nathan was chief of the district governors.

1 Kings 4:6                    וְאַחִישָׁר עַל הַבַּיִת וְאַדֹנִירָם בֶּן עֲבֹדָא עַל הַמָּס      וְאַחִישָׁר  
Ahishar was chief of the palace, and Adoniram Ben Abda was chief of the corvée.

An equivalent of the noun עַל (=chief) = גֹּבַהּ.

2 Kings 25:8                    גֹּבַהּ טַבָּחִים = chief of the guard.

Jonah 1:6                    גֹּבַהּ הַחַוָּנָל = chief of the sailors (captain)

Esther 1:8                    גֹּבַהּ בַּיִת = chief of the palace.

גֹּבַהּ הַבַּיִת = גֹּבַהּ בַּיִת = chief of the palace.

לִשְׂקָה ?

Genesis 41:40 אַתָּה תִּהְיֶה עַל גִּיְתֵי  
וְעַל פִּיֶדֶת לִשְׂקָה כָּל עַמִּי  
רַק חֲכִסָּא אֶגְדֹּל מִמֶּד.

What does the word לִשְׂקָה mean? Commentators have said that this is a difficult word whose meaning is very uncertain and no explanation is quite satisfactory. They have interpreted it to mean: "be ruled", "be led", "be administered by", "be directed", "shall dart", "shall conduct themselves", "shall obey", "shall order themselves", "shall be obedient", "shall yield", "shall equip themselves", "are to submit", "will depend on", "dispose themselves", "shall arrange themselves", "pay homage", and "be fed".

Scholars have not been able to agree on the root of the word לִשְׂקָה. Some thought that it was derived from the root נִשְׂקָה, while others believed its root was שִׂוָּק or שִׂקָּה.

We know that the assimilation of the ל is not an uncommon phenomenon in the Semitic languages. I believe that the root of the word לִשְׂקָה is לִשְׂקָה, in the same way as לִקָּה is derived from the root לִקָּה.

The root לִשְׂקָה is not listed in Hebrew dictionaries, but in Arabic, لَشَقَّ = to adhere, to cling, and in Coptic, SOLK = to adhere. Therefore, the Hebrew root לִשְׂקָה = to adhere, to cling.

Joseph was appointed as chief of Pharaoh's government, next in rank to the Pharaoh himself.

These Biblical verses should be translated thus:

אתה תהיה על גייתי

You shall become chief of my government

ועל פיד יִשְׁק כל עמי

then all my people will adhere to your command,

רק הכסא אגדל ממך

only I The Throne will be greater than you.

The word כִּסֵּא has been interpreted to mean: "in the kingly throne", "my royal throne", "by the throne", "with respect to the throne" and "on the throne".

These interpretations do not convey what Pharaoh was telling Joseph. He told Joseph that he is the throne, and as the throne, he is greater than Joseph. He was not greater by, in, on, or with respect to the throne, but as Pharaoh The Throne himself. Pharaoh said that "I am The Throne".

## לקף

דעו אפוֹ כי אֱלוֹהַ עֲנֹתַנִּי וּמָצַדוֹ עָלַי הִקְיָהּ. Job 19:6

What does the word הִקְיָהּ mean? It has been given the following interpretations: "drawn", "closed", "hem in", "enclosed", "raised", "encircled", "thrown up", and "spread".

Job in chapter nineteen replied to Bildad's question in 8:3, "Does God pervert justice?" (הֲאֵל יַעֲנֶה מִשְׁפָּט?), and to Elihu's statement in 34:12, "Yes, surely, God will not do wickedly, nor will the Almighty pervert justice" (אִם אִמְנַם אֵל לֹא יִרְשִׁיעַ וְשָׂדֵי לֹא יַעֲנֶה מִשְׁפָּט).

In 18:8, Bildad asserted that the wicked man is caught in a net by his own feet (כִּי שָׁלַח בְּרֶשֶׁת בְּרַגְלָיו). Despite the declarations of his friends, Job declared to them that God had wronged him.

Scholars have assumed that הִקְיָהּ is derived from the root נִקַּף = to encircle, to enclose. I believe that it is a Hiphil derived from the root לִקַּף, which is not found in the Hebrew dictionaries. The assimilation of the letter lamed is found in Canaanite dialects and in other Semitic languages.

לִקַּף (Arabic) = to catch, seize, rob.

דעו אַפּוֹ כִּי אֱלוֹהַ עֲנֹתַנִּי = Know then that God has wronged me

וּמָצַדוֹ עָלַי הִקְיָהּ = and caught me in His net.

Another example of the root לִקַּף is found in Psalms 17:9

מִפְּנֵי רָשָׁעִים זֶה שֹׁדְדֵנִי = From the wicked who plunder me

אֵיבֵי בְנֵי אִשְׁתִּי הִקְיָהּ עָלַי = my personal enemies who ROB me.

דְּבַרְיִי שְׁקֵר

Exodus 5:9      תִּכְבַּד הַעֲבֹדָה עַל הָאֲנָשִׁים וְנִעְשֶׂה בָּהּ  
וְאֵל אֵי שְׁעָרֵי בְּדַבְרֵי שְׁקֵר .

We are told in this chapter of Exodus that Moses and Aaron asked the Egyptian Pharaoh for his consent to let the people of Israel go and permit them to take a three-day journey into the desert to celebrate a sacrificial festival to YHWH, the God of Israel.

Pharaoh thought that offering phony sacrifices to a God that was unknown to him, was an unreasonable excuse for taking time off from work. How could he give a three-day vacation from work to so many slaves to celebrate a fictitious religious festival to an unknown God?

Pharaoh considered the Israelite workers lazy and ordered his construction supervisors not to supply their workers with any straw for manufacturing bricks, and, at the same time, to maintain the existing quota of brick production. Instead of reducing their work, he increased it. Pharaoh aimed to keep the Israelites so busy that they wouldn't have any time to think about celebrating new religious holidays.

אֵלֶּיךָ יָשׁוּבֵי has been interpreted as: "they may labor in it"; "let them attend to that"; "so that they keep working"; "let them fulfill them"; "let them keep at it"; and "that they may labor therein".

אֵלֶּיךָ = to be busy

אֵלֶּיךָ יָשׁוּבֵי = then they will be busy with it.

לֹא תִשָּׁעַר? has been interpreted as: "pay no regard"; "pay no attention"; "take no notice"; and "not dally around with".

שָׁעַר = to be occupied

לֹא תִשָּׁעַר? = not be occupied

שְׁקָרָהּ יִשְׁקָרָהּ has been interpreted as: "vain words"; "lying speeches"; "lying words"; "pack of lies"; "vain discourses"; "deceitful promises"; "glib speeches"; "vain conversations"; and "vain matters".

The noun שְׁקָרָהּ does not have the usual connotation here.

I think that the root שָׁעַר = to offer, to sacrifice.

שְׁקָרָהּ = an offering, a sacrifice.

The noun שְׁקָרָהּ has this connotation in the following Biblical and Mishnaic sources:

Exodus 12:24                      וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת הַזֶּבֶךְ הַזֶּה לְךָ וּלְבָנֶיךָ עַד עוֹלָם.

And you shall observe this OFFERING as an ordinance for you and your children forever.

Leviticus 23:27                      יוֹם יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ

The daily OFFERING in its time.

Numbers 18:7                      לְכָל זֶבֶךְ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

For every OFFERING on the altar.

In the Mishna, it has the same connotation.

כָּל שֶׁלֹא אָמַר שְׁלוֹשָׁה זֶבֶכִּים אֵלּוּ בִפְסַח לֹא יֵצֵא יָדָיו חֻבְתּוֹ.

(Mishnacodex Kaufmann A50, Jerusalem, 1968. Tractate Pesahim, 10:5)

Whoever did not lift up high these three OFFERINGS in the Paschal meal, has not fulfilled his obligation.



For more details about this word, please see my book LEXICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL AND RABBINIC PASSOVER. New York, 1991. pp. 8, 98, 119-120.

My translation of this verse is:

תִּכְבֹּד הָעֲבוֹדָה עַל הָאֲנָשִׁים

Make the work heavy on the men

וְיַעֲשׂוּ בָהּ

Then they will be busy with it

וְאֵל יִשְׁעוּ בַדְּבָרֵי שֶׁקֶר

And they shall not be occupied with fake sacrifices.

## שֶׁקֶר

שֶׁקֶר has been translated as: deception, fraud, falsehood, lie, and disappointment.

Jeremiah 14:14                      שֶׁקֶר הַנְּבִיאִים נְבִיאִים בְּשִׁמִּי .

It has been translated: "These are but false promises that they utter in my name"; "The prophets say false words in my name"; "The prophets prophesy falsely in my name"; "The prophets are prophesying lies in my name"; and "It is a lie that the prophets utter in my name".

My translation is: The prophets prophesy fakery in my name.

Jeremiah 14:14                      חֲזוֹן שֶׁקֶר ... הֵמָּה מְתַנְּבְּאִים לָכֵם .

It has been translated: "They prophesy to you a false vision"; "They prophesy to you a lying vision"; "They are prophesying to you a deceitful vision"; "They say to you a false vision"; "Delusive visions...that is what they prophesy to you"; and "The prophets offer them false visions".

My translation is: They prophesy a fake vision to you.

Jeremiah 27:10                      כִּי שֶׁקֶר הֵם נְבִיאִים לָכֵם .

It has been translated: "For they prophesy a lie to you"; "They are prophesying falsely to you"; "They prophesy lies to you"; "For they say false words to you"; and "Whither will they bring you, these lying prophecies".

My translation is: For they prophesy fakery to you.

Jeremiah 29:23

וַיְדַבְּרוּ דְבָרֵי כְזָבִיבִים בְּשֵׁמי שְׂקֵר .

It has been translated: "They have spoken in my name lying words"; "In my name they have spoken lies"; "They prophesied in my name, and what they prophesied was false"; "Speaking in my name false words"; "they have delivered as prophets a word in my name"; and "They have spoken false words in my name".

My translation is: And they gossiped fake prophecies  
in my name.

This translation is corroborated by Jeremiah 23:27,

בְּתַלְמוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר יִסְפְּרוּ אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ

that the fake prophets told their prophetic dreams one to another. Verse 30 told us how these phony prophets used to steal their prophecies one from another

מִגִּבְרֵי כְזָבִיבִים אִישׁ מֵאֵת רֵעֵהוּ .

Isaiah 9:14

נְבִיא מִזֹּרֵה שְׂקֵר הוּא הַזֹּנֵב .

It has been translated: "The prophet that teaches lies, he is the tail"; "The prophet who gives false instruction is the tail"; "The prophets who teach lies are the tail"; "The prophet teaching falsehood is the tail"; "The prophet with lying vision is the tail"; "the prophets with false oracles are the tail"; and "The prophet that gives lying assurances is the tail".

My translation is: The prophet teaching fakery  
is the tail

Jeremiah 23:32

הֲנִי עַל נְבָאֵי תַלְמוֹת שְׂקֵר .

It has been translated: "Behold I'm against those

who prophesy lying dreams"; "I am going to deal with those who prophesy lying dreams"; "Behold I am against them that prophesy false dreams"; "I am against the prophets who dream lies"; and "Their made up dreams are flippant lies".

My translation is: I'm here concerning those who prophesy fake dreams.

This translation is corroborated by Jeremiah 23:23, which stated that God is not only at hand, but also far off.

Zechariah 13:3                      כִּי שָׁקַר וְנִבְרָתָהּ בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

It has been translated: "Because you have told lies in the Lord's name"; "For thou speakest lies in the name of the Lord"; "Because you have spoken a lie in the name of the Lord"; "For you have lied in the name of the Lord"; and "For you have spoken falsely in the name of the Lord".

My translation is: For you spoke fakery in the name of YHWH.

1 Kings 22:23                      נָחַן יְהוָה רוּחַ שָׁקַר בְּפִי כָל נְבִיאָיִךְ .

It has been translated: "So the Lord has put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these prophets of yours"; "The Lord has permitted a spirit of deception to speak through all these prophets of yours"; and "The Lord has put a lying spirit in the mouths of all these prophets of yours.

My translation is: YHWH put an air of fakery in the utterances of all your prophets.

אָרֵר

Numbers 11:18

...ואכלתם בשר כי בכיתם באדני יהוה לאמר מי יאכלנו בשר...ונתן יהוה  
לכם בשר ואכלתם.

Numbers 11:20 ...עד חודש ימים עד אשר יצא מאפכם והיה לכם לארֵר

The Israelites yearned for the free fish, the cucumbers, the melons, the leeks, the onions, and the garlic, which they used to eat in Egypt (Numbers 11:5). They complained about their constant diet of manna and demanded to eat meat. A west wind brought down many migrating quail, which were gathered and spread out on the camp ground to be cured in the sun. The Israelites devoured this meat voraciously, but many of them died while eating. Moses had warned them that they would have enough meat for a whole month until it would come out of their nostrils. Eating decomposed meat caused severe vomiting, exiting through the mouth and even the nostrils.

What does the word אָרֵר mean? It has been explained to mean: "loathsome"; "loathsome thing"; "loathing"; "loathsomeness"; "hateful"; "alien"; "repugnance"; "nausea"; and "cholera".

Scholars have assumed that the word אָרֵר stems from the root אָרָר = to be loathsome. It would be more logical to say that אָרֵר stems from the root אָרָר = אָרָר = אָרָר = to vomit.

אָרֵר = And it will become as vomit to you.

In the Samaritan Pentateuch, Numbers 11:20, אָרֵר is spelled אָרָר.

In the Apocrypha, in BEN SIRA 37:30, this word is written  $\text{קָרַח}$ , but in 39:27, it is written  $\text{קָרַח}$ .

כי ברוב תענוג יקנך חולי  
והמרבה יגיע אל  $\text{קָרַח}$ .

For overeating brings sickness,  
and gluttony leads to vomit.

דְרָאוֹן  
 דְרָאוֹן

Isaiah 66:24 ויצאו וראו בפגרי האנשים הפטעים בני  
 ... והיו דְרָאוֹן לכל בשר.

Daniel 12:2 ורבים מיִשְׁנֵי אדמת עפר יקיצו....  
 לחַרְפוֹת לְדְרָאוֹן עולם.

What does דְרָאוֹן mean? It has been interpreted by scholars to mean: "abhorrence", "aversion", "horror", "loathsome", "disgust", "contempt", "shame", and "a spectacle".

The root of דְרָאוֹן is דָּרַן = to vomit.

The noun דְרָאוֹן = דָּרַן = vomit.

Both verses, in Isaiah and Daniel, deal with the dead. In Isaiah, it is פְּגְרֵי אַנְשֵׁים, while in the Book of Daniel, it is יִשְׁנֵי אֲדָמַת עֶפֶר.

The dead bodies of those who rebelled against God, will be perceived and considered by mankind as things to be thrust away, cast forth, or disgorged, as vomit.

והיו דְרָאוֹן לכל בשר

And they will be vomit to all mankind.

לַחַרְפוֹת לְדְרָאוֹן עולם

To taunts of eternal vomit.

Judges 5:30

. קַחַם רַחֲמַתִּים לְאִשׁ גִּבּוֹר .

Aferer the Israelite army of 10,000 men, commanded by Barak the son of Abinoam, defeated the Canaanite army and 900 chariots of King Jabin of Hazor and his general Sisera, Barak and Deborah, the prophetess, sang a victory song. This song concluded with a portrayal of Sisera's anxious mother peering out of a window, asking herself why her son's chariot was so late in returning from the battlefield. She answered herself saying that his army was busy dividing the spoils of embroidered dyed garments and girls.

This verse has been interpreted to mean:

"a wench or two wenches apiece"; "a damsel or two for each man"; "one or two girls for each man"; "to every man a damsel or two"; "a maiden or two for every man"; "a girl or two for each man"; "a maid or two for each warrior"; "a wench to each man, two wenches"; "every man a mule and great booty"; and "will he show compassion to the head of a man".

In the literature of all nations there are many designations for the male organ, the penis, or phallus. Euphemisms, paraphrases and intimations are employed so as to avoid obscene terms. In the Hebrew Bible, the following words are used:

קֶשֶׁט (Genesis 17:11; Exodus 28:42; Leviticus 15:2)

לִגְיָן (Isaiah 6:2; 7:20)

קֶשֶׁט (Isaiah 57:8)



I believe that the word לְאִשׁ in Judges 5:30 is another example of a euphemism for "phallus". The word שְׂאֵל = phallus. קָחַם (rḥm)(Ugaritic) = a girl.

= קָחַם רַחֲמַתִּים לְרֵאֶשׁ גִּבּוֹר

For a soldier's phallus, a girl or two.

This interpretation is corroborated by the verse in 2 Samuel 3:8

וַיִּחַר לֵאבֹנֵר מְאֹד עַל דְּבַרֵי אִישׁ בִּשְׁתִּי  
וַיֹּאמֶר הֲרֵאֶשׁ כְּלָב אֲנֹכִי אֲשֶׁר לִיהוּדָה?

King Saul had a concubine, Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah. A king's concubines were considered to be royal property which was to be kept within the royal household. It was a treasonous act for anyone to acquire such a concubine, for it was tantamount to aspiring to kingship. Ish-Bosheth, son of King Saul, accused Abner of having sexual relations with his father's concubine.

(2 Samuel 3:7) מְדוּעַ פָּאֲתָה אֶל פִּילֹגֶשׁ אֲנִי

Abner was angry over the words of Ish-Bosheth,  
and said הֲרֵאֶשׁ פֶּלֶב אֲנֹכִי אֲשֶׁר לִיהוּדָה?

This has been interpreted as:

"Am I a dog's head of Judah?"

"Am I a baboon in the pay of Judah?"

"Am I the mere head of a cur?"

"Am I a dog's head that belongeth to Judah?"

"Am I a dog's head to lick the palm of Judah?"

"Am I a dog's head, which against Judah?"

"Am I a dog's head against Judah?"

"Am I the leader of vicious men in Judah?"

"Am I a dog's head from Judah?"

"Am I a dog's head on Judah's side?"

Others interpreted פֶּלֶבּ לְאִשׁ as "dog-headed" or "dog-faced baboon".

Some say that its interpretation is unknown and its signification is uncertain.

I believe that in this verse too that the word לְאִשׁ = phallus.

פֶּלֶבּ = a male prostitute.

פֶּלֶבּ in Deuteronomy 23:19 has the same connotation.

Ish-Bosheth accused Abner of being a male prostitute because he had sexual relations with Saul's concubine.

הֲרֵאשׁ פֶּלֶבּ אֲנֹכִי אֲשֶׁר לִקְהוּדָה?

Am I the the phallus of a Judean male prostitute?

לְבַרְךָ      בְּרִכָּה  
 :                    :

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Genesis 33:11  | קח נא את בְּרִכָּתִי                                    |
| Joshua 15:19   | תנה לי בְּרִכָּה  |
| Judges 1:15    | חבה לי בְּרִכָּה  |
| 1 Samuel 25:27 | הבְּרִכָּה הזאת אשר הביא שְׁפַחְתְּךָ .                 |
| 1 Samuel 30:26 | הנה לכם בְּרִכָּה משלל אי־בי יהוה .                     |
| 2 Kings 5:15   | קח נא בְּרִכָּה מאת עבדך .                              |
| Joel 2:14      | והשאיר אחריו בְּרִכָּה מנחה ונסך ליהוה<br>:<br>אלהיכם . |

In all of these verses, the noun בְּרִכָּה = gifts.

In the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah's reign, Sennacherib King of Assyria, invaded the kingdom of Judah, in 701 BCE, attacked and captured 46 fortified cities and countless small villages. Sennacherib sent his field marshal ( מַרְתָּן ), chief officer ( לִבְ סָרִיס ) and field commander ( גִּבְשֶׁשֶׁת ), with a large army from Lachish to King Hezekiah at Jerusalem and stopped at the aqueduct of the Upper Pool. They called for the king, but Eliakim son of Hilkiah the palace administrator, Shebna the secretary, and Joah son of Asaph the recorder, went out to them. The Assyrian field commander spoke in Hebrew to the people on the wall and advised them not to listen to King Hezekiah, but to surrender to the king of Assyria.

2 Kings 18:31 & Isaiah 36:16 אל תשמעו אל חזקיהו כי

כֹּה אמר מלך אשור עֲשׂוּ אִתִּי בְּרִכָּה ויצא אֵלַי .

What does עֲשׂוּ אִתִּי בְּרִכָּה mean? Translators and

commentators have interpreted it to mean: "make ye with me a blessing", "make ye peace with me", "make your peace with me", "if ye wish to be blessed", "do me a favor", "make an agreement with me", "make an agreement with me by a present", "send me a gift", "join in my good fortune", and "make your agreement of mercy with me".

The noun *ברכה* does not have the connotation "gifts" here, but something else. I believe that, in this case, *ברכה* = homage.

*עשו אתי ברכה וצאו אלי*

Do HOMAGE to me, and surrender to me.

This is corroborated by the fact that in Late Egyptian (1350-650 BCE), Brkw ( *ברכה* ) = 1) gifts 2) homage.

2 Samuel 8:10 *וישלח תעי את יורם בנו אל המלך דוד  
לשאל לו לשלום ולברכו  
על אשר נלחם בהודועור ויפיהו  
כי איש מלחמות תעי היה הודועור  
ובידו היו כלי כסף וכלי זהב וכלי נחשת.*

*לשאל לו לשלום ולברכו* has been interpreted as: "to greet him and to congratulate him".

*ברך* (Late Egyptian) = to kneel in homage

*לברכו* = to kneel in homage to him

*שלום* = an alliance

When King Toi of Hamath heard that David had defeated the entire army of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, he sent his son Yoram to

King David TO ASK HIM FOR AN ALLIANCE ( לְשׂאֵל לוֹ ) and to kneel to him in homage ( וּלְבַרְכוֹ ) because he had fought against Hadadezer and defeated him; for Hadadezer had waged war with Toi. And he had in his possession silver, gold and bronze articles.

1 Chronicles 18:10            לְשׂאֵל לוֹ לְשׂוֹמֵם וּלְבַרְכוֹ  
 To ask him for an alliance and to kneel  
 to him in homage.

Of course, after kneeling in homage, the gifts that Yoram or Hadoram brought with him, were given to David as proof of his homage.

2 SAMUEL 14:22

וַיִּפֹּל יוֹאָב אֶל פְּנֵי אֲרֻצָּה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וַיִּבְרַךְ אֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ.  
 And Joab fell on the ground with his face,  
 prostrated himself, then KNEELED IN  
 HOMAGE BEFORE THE KING.

○ For other examples of my interpretation of the word שְׂוֹמֵם = an alliance, please see my book: SOME LEXICOGRAPHICAL COMMENTS ON THE HEBREW BIBLE, by Rabbi George Wolf. New York, 1990, pp. 147-8, 156.



deportations of people from rebellious vassal states to another region and replacing them with similar exiles from other vicinities of his empire. His policy of deportations was continued by his successors.

Tiglath-Pileser III invaded the kingdom of Israel twice, once during the reign of Menahem (747-737BCE) (2 Kings 15: 19), and again during the reign of Pekah (735-732 BCE) (2 Kings 15:29; 1 Chronicles 5:26). In his campaign of 733 BCE, Tiglath-Pileser III conquered Galilee and Gilead and deported most of the upper classes to Assyria.

2 Kings 15:19      בא פֿוֹל מלך אשור על דארץ ויתן מִנְחָם לִפְּוֹל  
אלף כבר כסף...

2 Kings 15:29      בימי פֿקח מלך ישראל בא תגלת פֿלאסר מלך  
אשור ויקח... ואת הַגִּלְעָד ואת הַגְּלִיָּלָה כל ארץ נפתלי ויגלם אשורה.

1 Chronicles 5:26      ויער אלהי ישראל את רוח פּוֹל מלך אשור ואת  
רוח תִּלְגַּת פֿלֶנְסֶר מלך אשור וַיִּגְלֵם לראובני ולגדי ולחצי שבט  
מנשה ויביאם לחלח וחבור וזרא ונזר גוזן...

From  $\text{וַיִּגְלֵם}$  = "and he deported them", which is a singular, and not a plural, we see that  $\text{פּוֹל} = \text{פֿלֶנְסֶר} = \text{תִּלְגַּת פֿלֶנְסֶר}$ .  
 $\text{תִּלְגַּת פֿלֶנְסֶר}$ .

In short, Osnappar is Tiglath-Pileser III, the father of mass deportations, who was renowned and remembered as such in the Persian period, in the Book of Ezra, written around 400 BCE. He couldn't be Shalmaneser V, the conqueror of Samaria in 722 BCE, since he died shortly and didn't have the opportunity to make mass deportations from Israel, the northern kingdom. He isn't King Sargon II, who did make large deportations from Israel,

but his name wouldn't lead to Osnappar. He wasn't Ashurbanipal (668-612 BCE) because we did not hear of any great deportations in his reign due to rebellions. More variations of the name of Tiglath-Pileser III exist in the Bible than any other Assyrian king.

Ezra 4:10

קריה  
ד:

וּשְׂאֵר אַמִּיָּא דִּי הַגְּלִי אַסְנַפֵּר רַבָּא וְיִקִּירָא  
וְחֻתְבֵי הֵמוּ בְקִרְיָהּ דִּי שְׂמֵרִיךְ וּשְׂאֵר עֵבֶר נִהְרָה .

King Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria (744-727 BCE), absorbed the small vassal kingdoms of Syria and Palestine and converted them into provinces of the Assyrian Empire. He deported their wealthy, professional and industrial classes to other regions of his empire, replacing them with similar deportees from those regions.

In his successful campaign of 733 BCE, against the kingdom of Israel, he annexed Galilee, the coastal region and Gilead, and organized them into 3 Assyrian provinces: 1) Dor (the Sharon Plain till the Philistine border) 2) Gilead (the kingdom of Israel's territory in Transjordan) 3) Megiddo (the northern plains and Galilee).

Isaiah 8:23 alludes to Tiglath-Pileser's campaign and the three Assyrian provinces he established.



- 1) דַּר הַיָּם = the way by the sea = Dor province.
- 2) עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן = the land beyond the Jordan = Gilead province.
- 3) גַּלִּיל הַגּוֹיִם = Galilee of the nations = Megiddo province.

The kingdom of Israel, which now comprised only Mount Ephraim, continued to exist as an Assyrian vassal state until King Shalmaneser V of Assyria (726-722 BCE) invaded the country, and after a siege of three years, 724-722 BCE, conquered Samaria. Sargon II (721-705 BCE), converted Israel into an Assyrian province called SAMERINA, exiling the upper classes to cities in Media and northern Mesopotamia, and replacing them with deportees from Babylon and Syria. From 721 BCE, when the land of Israel was renamed, its people were not called Israelites anymore, but Samaritans.

2 Kings 17:5 וַיַּעַל מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ וַיַּעַל שְׁמֶרֶן וַיִּצַר עֲלֶיהָ שְׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים .

2 Kings 17:6 בַּשָּׁנָה הַחֲשִׁיעִית לַחֹשֶׁעַ לְכַד מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר אֶת שְׁמֶרֶן וַיִּגְלֶה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה וַיֵּשֶׁב אוֹתָם בַּחֲלָח וּבַחֲבוּר נָהָר גּוֹזָן וְעָרֵי מְדִי .

2 Kings 18:10 וַיִּלְכְּדוּ מִקְצֵה שְׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים בַּשָּׁנָה . . . . חֲשֵׁעַ לַחֹשֶׁעַ מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִלְכְּדָה שְׁמֶרֶן .

2 Kings 18:11 וַיִּגְלֶה מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה וַיִּנְחַם בַּחֲלָח וּבַחֲבוּר נָהָר גּוֹזָן וְעָרֵי מְדִי .

2 Kings 17:24 וַיָּבֵא מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר מִצְבָּל וּמְכוּתָה וּמְעוּא וּמַחֲמַת וּמִסְפְּרוּיִם וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּעָרֵי שְׁמֶרֶן תַּחַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּרְשׁוּ אֶת שְׁמֶרֶן וַיֵּשְׁבוּ בְּעָרֶיהָ .

These Assyrian provinces existed almost unchanged for hundreds of years and were eventually incorporated into the Babylonian and then the Persian Empire.

What does the word  $\text{קִרְיָה}$  in Ezra 4:10 in the phrase  $\text{בְּקִרְיָהּ דִּי שְׁמֶרְיָן}$  mean? The old translations of the Bible, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta, translated it as "cities". This means that  $\text{שְׁמֶרְיָן}$  is the name of the country. They did so because they believed that all the foreign deportees could not have been settled only in one city. Since  $\text{קִרְיָה}$  appeared in the text as a singular, some modern interpreters rendered  $\text{קִרְיָה}$  as "city". This means that  $\text{שְׁמֶרְיָן}$  is the name of the city.

I believe that the noun  $\text{קִרְיָה}$  does not have the usual connotation of "city", but, in this case, means "PROVINCE".

The word  $\text{קִרְיָה}$  is similar to  $\text{מְדִינָה}$  and  $\text{אֶרֶץ}$ .  
 $\text{אֶרֶץ}$  = land, country. It also connotes, in Biblical Hebrew and Phoenician, "city".

2 Chronicles 32:4  $\text{וַיִּסְתְּמוּ אֶת כָּל הַמַּעֲיִנוֹת וְאֶת הַנַּחַל}$

=  $\text{הַשּׁוֹטֵף בְּחוּךְ הָאֶרֶץ}$

And they stopped up all the springs and the canal that flowed into the CITY (of Jerusalem). The Septuagint rendered

$\text{בְּחוּךְ הָאֶרֶץ}$  as:  $\text{διὰ τῆς πόλεως}$  (=through the city).

Psalms 74:20  $\text{הִבֵּט לְבַרְיֹתַי כִּי מִלְאוּ מַחְשְׁכֵי אֶרֶץ נְאוֹת חַמָּס}$ .

Look at the Temple, for the CITY's dark places are full of seats of crime.

$\text{מְדִינָה}$  (Aramaic) = city, region, PROVINCE.

$\text{מְדִינָה}$  (Hebrew) = large town, district, PROVINCE, country.

קָרָה = town, city. I think it also means "province".  
 Therefore, קָרָה = קָרָה = קָרָה = city, PROVINCE.

עַבְרַתְּךָ (= Across the River) = a term from the Assyrian Empire, eber nāri, whose Aramaic form in the Persian Empire, was the official title of the Fifth Satrapy, or the region west of the Euphrates River, which included all the provinces in Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine.

The province of Samaria was part of the Fifth Satrapy of the Persian Empire.

Tiglath-Pileser III or Osnappar, as he was called in the Persian period, was the father of the policy of mass deportations of peoples in his Assyrian Empire. For that reason he was given credit, in the Persian period, for the later deportations of Sargon II, who created the province of Samaria, and continued the policy of Tiglath-Pileser III.

The correct translation of Ezra 4:10 should be:

וְהוֹתֵב הֵמוּ בְּקָרָה קִי שְׁמֵרָה וְשָׂא עַבְרַתְּךָ נְהַרָה

And settled them in the PROVINCE OF SAMARIA  
 and the rest of (the Satrapy) ABAR NAHARA.

Isaiah 29:1

הִזִּי אֲרִיאֵל אֲרִיאֵל קִרְיַת חֲנָה דָּוִד  
 סִפְּנֵי שָׁנָה עַל שָׁנָה חֲגֵי־שָׁנָה נִקְפְּפֵי.

In this chapter Isaiah told how God would make the City of God, Jerusalem, a besieged city, with a multitude of nations fighting against her.

Isaiah 29:7

...הַמּוֹךְ כָּל גּוֹיִים הַצֹּבְאִים עַל אֲרִיאֵל.

Isaiah 29:3

וַחֲנִיתִי כְּדָוָר עָלֶיךָ וְצַרְתִּי עֲלֶיךָ.

What does נִקְפְּפֵי mean? This has been given many interpretations:

"Let the feasts run their round".

"Let the pilgrim-feasts run their round".

"Let your cycle of festivals go on".

"Let festivals come in their cycles".

"The solemnities are at an end".

"Let them keep festivals".

"Gather ye fruits".

"Let the feasts come round".

"Let the feasts revolve".

"Let the cycle of feasts continue".

"Let the feasts go or come around".

"Let them kill the sacrifices".

אֲרִיאֵל = City of God = Jerusalem יְרֵדֵי־שָׁלִים

In Sumerian, the city of Ur is URĪ.UNU (G) or URŪ.UNU (G). In Akkadian, ālu = city.

In the Tel El Amarna letters of the 14th century BCE, uru ili = city of God.

Masoretic  $\text{לִּאֲלֹהִים}$  = Dead Sea Scrolls  $\text{לִּאֲלֹהִים}$  =  
city of God.

=  $\text{לִּאֲלֹהִים לִּאֲלֹהִים}$

Woe City of God, City of God

=  $\text{קָרַח קָרַח קָרַח}$

The city David settled.

The word  $\text{קָרַח}$  is a kal, imperative, masculine, plural, which stems from the root  $\text{קָרַח}$  = to add.

$\text{קָרַח קָרַח קָרַח}$  = Add a year to a year = In 2 years.

I believe that the word  $\text{קָרַח}$ , which is a kal, imperfect, third person, masculine, plural, stems from the root  $\text{קָרַח}$  = to strike (= to attack).

$\text{קָרַח}$  is a noun, plural, from the root  $\text{קָרַח}$ .

From the root  $\text{קָרַח}$  = to surround, to besiege, to attack, we derive the noun  $\text{קָרַח}$  = besieger, enemy.

I believe that from the root  $\text{קָרַח}$  = to surround, go in a circle, we derive the noun  $\text{קָרַח}$  = a besieger.

=  $\text{קָרַח קָרַח קָרַח}$

Besiegers will strike (= attack).

This means that the prophet Isaiah informed the people of Jerusalem that in two years time, the city will be attacked by foreign besiegers.

## עער

Isaiah 15:5  $\text{לִבִּי לְמוֹאָב יִזְעַק בְּרִיחָהּ עַד צַעַר עֵגְלַת שְׁלִישִׁיָּהּ}$   
 כִּי מַעְלָה הַלְּוִיחִית בְּבִכֵי יַעֲלֶה בּוֹ  
 כִּי דֶרֶךְ חֲזוֹנִים זַעֲקַת שֹׁבֵר יַעֲעֶר וְ.

Jeremiah 48:5  $\text{כִּי מַעְלָה הַלְּוִיחִית בְּבִכֵי יַעֲלֶה בְּכִי}$   
 כִּי בַמִּזְרֹךְ חֲזוֹנִים צָרִי צַעֲקַת שֹׁבֵר שְׁמַע וְ.

Isaiah chapter 15 and Jeremiah chapter 48, contain elegies on the destruction of the kingdom of Moab and its cities, Ar, Dibon, Nebo, Medeba, and others, by an invading army. When Moab was attacked, its refugees crossed the fords of the Arnon River, and fled to the kingdom of Israel for asylum. Isaiah counseled the Israelites to hide these fugitives and not betray them. He said that they should allow them to dwell in the kingdom of Israel and protect them from the invading spoilers (Isaiah 16:2-4). Isaiah sympathized with these war refugees from Moab, when he said:  $\text{לִבִּי לְמוֹאָב יִזְעַק}$ , my heart cries out for Moab.

The Moabite refugees ran as far as the city of Zoar, the uttermost fortress of Moab, near the southern tip of the Dead Sea.

$\text{בְּרִיחָהּ עַד צַעַר עֵגְלַת שְׁלִישִׁיָּהּ =}$

Eglath Shelishiyah, her fugitives are as far as Zoar.

$\text{כִּי מַעְלָה הַלְּוִיחִית בְּבִכֵי יַעֲלֶה בּוֹ} =$  For the ascent to Luhith, he goes up on it weeping.

What does  $\text{זַעֲקַת שֹׁבֵר יַעֲעֶר וְ}$  mean? It has been interpreted as:

"They raise a cry of destruction";  
 "There are cries of Disaster";  
 "They lament their destruction";  
 "They raise a cry of anguish";  
 "She cries Destruction";  
 "They shall lift up a cry of destruction";  
 "They utter heart rending cries"; and  
 "They raise the cry of destruction".

Scholars have claimed that  $\text{עָרָה}$  stems from the root  $\text{עוּר}$  and is an error for :  $\text{עוֹרָה}$  ,  $\text{עָרָה}$  or  $\text{עָרָה}$  because the  $\text{ו}$  was softened to  $\text{ו}$ .

$\text{עוּר}$  = to shout, to make a loud noise.

$\text{עוּר}$  = to shout, to make a loud noise, to cry out with a loud voice.

#### $\text{עוּרָה}$

I believe that  $\text{עָרָה}$  is derived from the root  $\text{עוּרָה} = \text{עוּרָה} = \text{עוּרָה}$  = to shout, to cry out with a loud voice.

$\text{עָרָה}$  is a pual, imperfect, third person, masculine, plural.

The prophet Isaiah mentioned that the armed men of Moab cry aloud and that the Moabite cities, Heshbon and Elealeh, cry out , and their voice is heard as far as Yahaz (15:14). He also said that a cry has gone around the land of Moab and the wailing reached Eglaim and Beer-elim (15:8).

$\text{כִּי דָרַךְ הַלְּנָיִם}$  = For on the road to Horonaim

$\text{זָעַקְתָּ שִׁבְרָה עָרָה}$  = They shout a cry of destruction.

The prophet Jeremiah sympathized too with the people of Moab : על מואב איליל ולמואב כלה אזעק (48:31). He also spoke of the destruction of Moab and the cries emanating from her cities, Heshbon, Horonaim and Elealeh (48:34).

קול צעקה מחלְנִים שׁוֹ וּשְׁבַר גְדוֹל (48:3)

נִשְׁבְּרָה מוֹאָב הִשְׁמִיעַ צַעֲקָה צַעֲרִיָּה (48:4)

What does צַעֲקַת שְׁבַר שְׁמִיעוֹ mean?

It has been interpreted as:

"They have heard the cry of destruction";

"Cries of destruction are heard";

"Anguished cries over the destruction are heard";

"A distressing cry of anguish is heard";

"They shall raise a cry of tribulation and of destruction";

"The enemies have heard a howling of destruction";

"Cries of distress are heard"; and

"One can hear the cry of confusion".

The word צַעֲקָה is omitted by the Septuagint, Targum Jonathan and most translations.

Scholars ascribe the word צַעֲקָה to the root צַעַק .

I believe that the word צַעֲקָה stems from the root צַעַק , just as צַעַק comes for the root צַעַק .



$\text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$   
 $\text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$

It seems that roots meaning "to break", "to split", or "to bore", also have the connotation "to sound", "to make a loud noise", "to cry out", or "to call".

$\text{לָצַע}$  = to break, to make a loud noise.

$\text{לָצַע}$  = to bore, to cry aloud, to cry out with a loud voice.

$\text{לָצַע}$  = to split, to sound

$\text{לָצַע}$  = to cut, to call

$\text{לָצַע}$  = a call       $\text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$  = calls

$\text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$  = calls of

$\text{לָצַע}$  = to sound       $\text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$  is a kal perfect, third person, masculine plural, in a pause.

It is well known that in the Hebrew Bible, the kal and the hifil are used many times interchangeably. This means that the meaning of a verb in the hifil can also appear in a kal form and vice versa.

Thus  $\text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע} = \text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$  = they sounded

$= \text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע} ; \text{לָצַע}$

They sounded calls of an outcry of misfortune.

נְחֹתִים

2 Kings 6:9 וַיִּשְׁלַח אֵיִשׁ חֹאֲלָהִים אֶל מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר  
 חֲשׂוֹמֵי מַעְבְּרַת הַמַּקּוֹם הַזֶּה  
 כִּי שָׁם אֲרָם נְחֹתִים.

When the king of the Arameans was warring against the kingdom of Israel, Elisha, the prophet of Israel, reported to his king, the movements of the enemy's troops.

What does *נְחֹתִים אֲרָם כִּי שָׁם* mean? This phrase has been interpreted by scholars in many ways.

"For the Syrians are governing down there".

"For the Arameans are encamped there".

"For the Arameans are going down that way".

"Because the Arameans are going down there".

"For the Arameans are lying in wait".

"For the Syrians are there in ambush".

"For the Syrians are hidden there".

"For there the Arameans are in ambush".

"For the Arameans attack there".

"For there Arameans are hidden".

The word *נְחֹתִים* stems from the root *נַחַת*, and is a kal, present tense, masculine, plural. I believe that the connotation of *נַחַת* (Late Egyptian, *nḥt*)= "strong", "mighty", "powerful", should be applied here.

The prophet Elisha warned the king of Israel that the Arameans assembled many troops in a particular place and were powerful there. This meant that the king should beware and not pass through that place, but avoid it. *כִּי שָׁם אֲרָם נְחֹתִים* = For there the Arameans are powerful.

## נחת

Isaiah 30:15      כי כה אמר אדני יהוה קדוש ישראל  
    בָּשׁוּבָה וְנַחַת תִּשְׁעֶיךָ  
    בַּחֲשֵׁקט וּבְנִטְחָה תַחִיָּה גְבוּרַתְכֶם..

In this chapter, the prophet Isaiah condemns the imperial policy of the kingdom of Judah which sent ambassadors to Egypt to conclude an alliance with her against Assyria. He said that they should trust in God rather than deceive themselves by expecting Egypt, which never kept its promises, to protect them. Egypt is compared to a broken and overhanging part of a high wall which will be destroyed. In the same way, the kingdom of Judah will be broken up into sherds and scattered.

What does *בָּשׁוּבָה וְנַחַת תִּשְׁעֶיךָ* mean? It has been explained as follows:

"Come back, keep peace, and you will be safe".

"In returning and rest you shall be saved".

"In repentance and rest is your salvation".

"You shall triumph by stillness and quiet".

"When you will repent and rest you will be saved".

"If you return and be quiet, you shall be saved".

"When thou shalt turn and mourn, then thou shalt be saved".

"In ease and rest shall you be saved".

"Through turning and rest you would be helped".

In Post-Biblical Hebrew, the noun תשובה=repentance. I believe that the Biblical equivalent of this term is שובה. שובה = תשובה = repentance.

According to the commentators, the noun נחת= peace, rest, stillness, quiet and mourning.

I believe that the connotation of נחת (Late Egyptian, nht)= "prayer", should be applied here.

In the days of Isaiah, the 8th century BCE, organized prayer services may have been sufficiently well established. Repentance meant a return to God by striving after righteousness.

= בשובה ונחת תושעו

You shall be saved by repentance and prayer.

נחשת has been interpreted as: "in quietness"; "in stillness"; "calm"; and "silence".

I believe that נחשת = calmness.

נחמה has been interpreted as: "staying quiet"; "confidence"; "hope"; "trust"; and "assurance".

I believe that נחמה = trust.

= בנחשת ונחמה תהיה גבורתכם

Your strength shall be in calmness and trust.

Isaiah emphasized faith in God in time of distress. A return to God, repentance, leads to trust in God and a refusal to depend on human help. Repentance, prayer, and faith in God, leads to trust and calmness. The message of Isaiah was that faith and trust in God will sustain the kingdom of Judah during the crisis of the Assyrian threat and that no human security from Egypt was necessary.

נַחַת

Isaiah 30:30 וְנַחַת זְרוּעוֹ יִרְאֶה .

The prophet Isaiah told how Assyria will be beaten down by God and the kingdom of Judah will be saved without the help of Egypt.

What does וְנַחַת זְרוּעוֹ יִרְאֶה mean? It has been translated as:

"And show his arm sweeping down".

"And will make them see his arm coming down".

"And display the sweep of his arm".

"And shall show the striking of his arm".

"And shall show the terror of his arm".

"And the wrath of his arm to make a display".

"And shall show the descending blow of his arm".

"And causes the lowering of His arm to be seen".

"And shall shew the lighting down of his arm".

"And the bringing down of his arm shall be seen".

In the Bible, YHWH's arm is characterized as a symbol of strength.

Isaiah 51:9 יְהוָה עוֹ זְרוּעֵי יְהוָה = Put on strength, arm of YHWH .

Isaiah 62:8 יְהוָה נִשְׁבַּע בְּיָמֵינוּ וּבְזְרוּעֵי עֲזוֹ = YHWH has sworn by his right hand and by the strength of his arm.

Psalms 89:14 לְךָ זְרוּעַ עִם גְּבוּרָה = You have an arm with strength.

I believe that the noun נַחַת stems from the root נחַת (Late Egyptian, nḥt) = strength.

וְנַחַת זְרוּעוֹ יִרְאֶה

And the strength of his arm will be seen.

נַחַת

Proverbs 29:9

אִישׁ חָכֵם נִשְׁפָּט אֶת אִישׁ אָוִיל  
וְגִלְגֹּל וְשִׁחֻק וְאִיר נַחַת.

What is the connotation of the word נַחַת? The translators are divided concerning the subject in the second line. Some take the wise man as the subject of וְגִלְגֹּל וְשִׁחֻק, while others assign the fool as the subject.

The following are interpretations of this verse:

"If a wise man has an argument with a fool, the fool only rages and laughs, and there is no quiet".

"If a wise man goes to law with a fool, he will meet abuse or derision, but get no remedy".

"If a wise man goes to court with a fool, the fool rages and scoffs, and there is no peace".

"When a wise man enters into litigation with a fool, there is ranting and ridicule, but no satisfaction".

"A wise man contends with a fool, and when he is angry, he laughs and does not scoff".

"If a wise man contend with a fool, whether he is angry or laugh, he shall find no rest".

"A wise man shall judge nations, but a worthless man being angry, laughs and fears not".

"Let a wise man argue with a fool, be he angry or good-humored, he will not gain his end".

"If a wise man contends with a foolish man, whether he rage or laugh, there is no rest".

"If a wise man hath a controversy with a foolish man, whether he be angry or laugh, there will be no rest".

"When a wise man goes to law with a fool (the fool only) rages and laughs immoderately".

"A wise man has a lawsuit with a fool, and he is excited and laughs and there is no quiet (or, rest)".

"If a wise man has to contend with a fool, he (the fool) rages and laughs, and has no rest".

"If a wise man conrends with a foolish man, whether he rage or laugh, there is no rest".

"If the wise, when he disputes with a fool, becomes angry, or jests, he will have no rest".

"If a wise man goes to law with a foolish man, he may be angry or laughing, but there will be no rest".

The translators have interpreted the word נחת to mean: "quiet", "remedy", "peace", "satisfaction" and "rest". Others have interpreted it as a verb to mean: "gain an end" and "fears".

I believe that the noun נחת (Late Egyptian, nht) = victory.

איש חכם נשפט את איש ליל =

When a wise man litigates with a foolish man,

קשף? זגף? = whether angry or laughing,

נחת? איל? = then there is no victory.

This proverb advises the wise man to avoid having disputes with a good-humored or angry fool because the wise man will not win.

## שֹׁפֵט

Ruth 1:1

... וַיְהִי בַיָּמֵי שֹׁפֵט הַשּׁוֹפְטִים ...

What does **שֹׁפֵט הַשּׁוֹפְטִים** mean? Translators have rendered it thus:

"When the judges ruled".

"When the chieftains ruled".

"When the heroes governed".

"When the judges were in power".

"When the judges judged".

"The judging of the judges".

Scholars have maintained that the word **שֹׁפֵט** in our verse in Ruth is an infinitive construct. They claimed that the grammatical construction of this phrase is unusual because it contains a masculine plural noun (**שׁוֹפְטִים**), preceded by an infinitive construct (**שֹׁפֵט**) which depends on the word following it.

I believe that the word **שֹׁפֵט** is a noun, in the same form as: **צִחֹק** (Genesis 21:6), **צָרוֹר** (Genesis 42:35), **רָחוֹב** (Genesis 19:2), and **צָכוֹר** (Genesis 35:23).

The noun **שֹׁפֵט** (= judgment) is also found in 2 Chronicles 20:9.

In the book of Ruth, the noun **שֹׁפֵט** = rule.

My translation of **וַיְהִי בַיָּמֵי שֹׁפֵט הַשּׁוֹפְטִים** is:

And it happened in the days of the rule of the rulers.



תפארת

גיא

Isaiah 28:1      הוֹי עֵטְרוֹת גְּאוֹת שְׁפָרֵי אַפְנֵימַי  
 וְצִיץ נֹזֵבֵל צְבִי תִפְאֲרוֹתַי  
 אֲשֶׁר עַל רֹאשׁ גֵּיא שְׁמַנִּים הַלְיוּמֵי יַיִן .

The prophet Micah rebuked the rulers of the northern kingdom, Israel, and the leaders of Judah for abhorring justice and perverting all equity (Micah 3:9). He said that if a man were to utter lies and say that he wished to preach about wine and strong drink, he would be made the preacher for the people (Micah 2:11).

(לוֹ אִישׁ הֵלֵךְ רוּחַ וּשְׁקֵר כּוֹב אֶטֶף לֶךְ לַיַּיִן וּלְשֹׁכֵר וְהָיָה מִטִּיף  
 הַעַם הַזֶּה)

Isaiah too, rebuked the rulers of Judah and compared them to the Ephraimites, those drunken leaders of the Israelite northern kingdom, who were enslaved by wine. They did this because they wanted to drown their anxieties in wine so they wouldn't have to think about the coming Assyrian invasion and destruction of Samaria.

Isaiah depicted the Israelites conducting a drinking party, a drunken orgy, with the participants wearing garlands and perfumes on their heads, which, the prophet said, will be trampled, during the Assyrian invasion, under

the feet of the Assyrian troops.

In this chapter, Isaiah warned the leaders of Judah and its priests and prophets, that they will share the same fate if they continue their carousing and attempt to involve Judah in a war with Assyria. Isaiah stated that it is not they, but God who is the source of justice and protection for his people.

At banquets in ancient Egypt and the Middle East, each guest was crowned with a garland of scented flowers placed around the head. The flowers in this garland were regularly in full bloom and bright with color.

In Egypt, blue-flowered lotus or water-lily was held to be sacred on account of its soft delicate perfume. One of the oldest plants known to man, the red rose, was in great demand throughout the East. The Greeks too wreathed the heads of their guests with roses. The rose has the ability to retain its fragrance when dried, and its perfume was known to increase as the petals dried.

The Persian kings wore crowns of myrrh. At Athenian banquets, all kinds of perfumes were used. The Greeks also believed that the use of perfumes enabled them to drink more wine without feeling any ill effects.

$\text{תִּגְּאָגַת עֵטְרָת}$  has been interpreted as:  
 "crown of pride"; "proud crown"; "haughty  
 crown"; and "proud garland".

$\text{עֵטְרָת}$  = crown, garland, wreath.

The garland of flowers circled the head like  
 a crown.

The root  $\text{תִּגְּאָג}$  = to be high. I believe that  
 the noun  $\text{תִּגְּאָגַת}$  = high-towering.

Therefore,  $\text{תִּגְּאָגַת עֵטְרָת}$  = high-towering garland.

$\text{עֵטְרָת}$  = a flower.  $\text{נֹבֵל}$  = a sprig (Akkadian,  
 niblu = sprig).  $\text{עֵטְרָת נֹבֵל}$  = a flowery sprig.

$\text{יְפֵאֲרוֹתָיו צְבִי}$  has been interpreted as:

"of its glorious beauty"; "his glorious beauty";  
 "whose glorious beauty"; "so lovely in their  
 beauty"; "of majestic beauty"; "of the strength  
 of his glory"; "the glory of his joy"; "of his  
 glorious ornament"; and "of its splendid  
 ornament".

$\text{פְּאָרָה}$  = A head-dress consisting of a sort of  
 crown or garland.

I believe that the noun  $\text{תִּפְאָרֶת}$  =  $\text{עֵטְרָת}$  = crown,  
 garland, wreath.

$\text{צְבִי}$  = beauty.  $\text{יְפֵאֲרוֹתָיו צְבִי}$  = his beautiful wreath.

What is  $\text{אֲגִי אֶשְׁמְנִים}$ ? This has been defined  
 as: "rich valley"; "revellers"; "fertile val-  
 ley"; "lush valley"; "fat valley"; "fertile  
 mountain"; "luxuriant valley"; and "bloated  
 with rich food".

Ancient Egyptian banquet scenes show cones made of metal or wood upon the heads of guests. These cones contained fragrant oils or ointments which melted in the heat of the sun and covered the head and shoulders of revellers with a perfumed grease which seeped into the skin. Men too used perfumes at banquets and festivals. Putting perfume on the head of guests was mentioned in the Bible.

שֶׁמֶן = perfume, ointment, scented oil.

Psalms 23:5 רָאֲשִׁי לְרִאֲשֵׁי בְשֶׁמֶן בְּשֶׁנֶה בְּשֶׁמֶן = You anoint my head with perfume.

Psalms 133:2 כְּשֶׁמֶן הַטּוֹב עַל הַרְאֵשׁ יֵרֵד עַל הַזָּקָן.

As fine perfume on the head running down on the beard.

Amos 6:6 וּרְאִשֵׁי שֶׁמָנִים יִמְשְׁחוּ. And they will anoint with top quality scented oils.

I believe that the noun גַּיָּא is related to the Late Egyptian GAY = גַּי = jar, flask.

Therefore, גַּיָּא = גַּי = jar, flask, cone.

גַּיָּא שֶׁמָנִים = a cone of scented oils or perfume.

THIS VERSE SHOULD BE TRANSLATED:

הוֹי עֵטְרַת גַּיָּא שְׁפָרִי אֶפְרַיִם

Woe to the Ephraimite drunkards' high-towering garlands,

= וְצִיץ נֹבֵל צְבִי תִפְאַרְתּוֹ

and flowery sprigs, their beautiful wreaths,

= אֲשֶׁר עַל רִאֲשֵׁי גַיָּא שֶׁמָנִים הֵלְוִי זֵיֶן

where cones of scented oils are on the heads of those intoxicated by wine.

## עפלה

Habakkuk 2:4      חנה עפלה לא ישקה נפשו בו  
 וצדיק באמונתו יחיה.

This is part of a divine revelation about the fate of Israel and its oppressors, the Chaldeans. In response to the prophet's question concerning injustice in the world, God informed him that the Chaldean oppressors' successes will not continue.

Some interpreters apply the whole verse to the Jewish people. They say that the first part deals with those who rejected the vision of the prophet, while the second part treats of those who accepted it. According to them, both parts thus form a marked antithesis. Another interpretation of this verse is that the former hemstitch applies to the insolence of the Chaldeans and their voracious lust for conquest, while the latter hemstitch applies to the Jewish people.

Many authorities hold that the first member of this couplet is corrupt past safe reconstruction.

The following illustrates how scholars have rendered this verse in their translations.

"Lo, his spirit within him is puffed up, not upright, but the righteous man is rewarded with life for his fidelity".

"Behold, he whose soul is not upright in him shall fail, but the righteous shall live by his faith".

"The reckless will be unsure of himself, while the righteous man will live by being faithful".

"see, he is puffed up, his desires are not upright, but the righteous will live by his faith".

"Behold, he that is unbelieving, his soul shall not be right in himself; but the just shall live in his faith".

"For his soul does not delight in iniquity, but the righteous shall live by faith".

"If he should draw back, my soul has no pleasure in him, but the just shall live by my faith".

"Behold, his soul is puffed out, it is not upright in him, but the just shall live by his faith".

"The upright (shall rest) his soul in me, and the righteous shall live in my faithfulness".

"Behold, puffed up, his soul is not straight within him, but the just, through his faith will he live".

"He who is stiff-necked will have no rest in his soul".

"Behold the proud! his soul is not right within him, but the righteous shall live by his faith".

Scholars hold that the word  $\text{הַגָּבֹהַּ}$  is the third person feminine singular of Pual, or it is a noun which means "pride", "presumption", "elation", and "mental inflation".

Because the Hebrew letter פ interchanges with the letter ק, I believe that that the root עפל = עקל = to twist, to bend, to bend out of shape, to pervert, to be crooked.

crooked= dishonest. a crook= a dishonest man, a thief.

I believe that the noun עִפְלָהּ = "crookedness", and is an abstract feminine noun with a concrete meaning. Thus, this abstract noun עִפְלָהּ = a crooked man, a dishonest man, a crook.

Another example of an abstract noun with a concrete meaning is:

Isaiah 3:25 = מִתִּיר בַּחֶרֶב יִפְלוּ וְגִבּוֹרֵי תַחַךְ בַּמִּלְחָמָה

Your men will fall by the sword, and your warriors in the battle.

The abstract feminine noun גִּבּוֹרָהּ = "warrior", a concrete meaning.

The root יָשַׁב = to be straight, to be upright, to be normal.

Who is the crook or the thief? It is the king of the Chaldeans who is the dishonest man because of his insatiable lust to conquer land that does not belong to him.

Israel is compared to an honest man who lives with his trust in God.

Part 4a portrays the thief, the crooked or dishonest man.

Part 4b portrays the honest man.

חנה עפלה לא לִשְׂרָה נפשוּ בוּ =

Behold the crook whose mind is not normal

וּצְדִיק בְּאֵמוּנָתוֹ חָיָה =

But the honest man lives with his trust.

In the NEW TESTAMENT, Paul reinterpreted the second part of this phrase for his theological doctrine of justification by faith in order to abolish the observance of the Mosaic law in Christianity, by replacing works with faith.

In Galatians 3:11 it is:

Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law; for "He who through faith is righteous shall live".

In Romans 1:17 it is:

For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written "He who through faith is righteous shall live".



## גִּזְיִי

Psalms 71:6 . עָלִיד נִסְמַכְתִּי מִבֶּטֶן מִמַּעַי אִמִּי אַתָּה גִּזְיִי בְךָ תִּקְלַחֲתִי תָמִיד .

Scholars hold that the word גִּזְיִי is an unsolved puzzle. The phrase מִמַּעַי אִמִּי אַתָּה גִּזְיִי has been explained as:

"Thou art he who took me out of my mother's bowels";  
 "From my mother's bosom you have been my sustainer";  
 "In the womb of my mother, you were my support";  
 "Thou art he who took me from my mother's womb";  
 "You have brought me forth from my mother's womb";  
 "you have been my portion from my mother's womb";  
 "Thou art my hope since I was in my mother's body";  
 "Thou has set me apart from my mother's womb";  
 "From the moment I left my mother's womb you have been my prop".

The word גִּזְיִי stems from the root גזז = to flee, to escape, hasten away. The root עזז = to flee, hasten away, seek refuge, seek protection.

זזז = עזז = to seek refuge, to seek protection.

גִּזְיִי = a protector. God is a protector.

Psalms 71:1 בְּךָ יְהוָה חֲסִיתִי = In you YHWH I sought protection.

Psalms 91:9 כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה מוֹסֵי = For you YHWH are my protector.

Psalms 46:2 אֱלֹהִים לֵנוּ מוֹסֵה = God is our protector.

חזז = to seek protection. I believe that the Septuagint had the correct interpretation. It translated גִּזְיִי as "my protector". This verse should be translated thus:

עָלִיד נִסְמַכְתִּי מִבֶּטֶן = I relied on you from birth,  
 מִמַּעַי אִמִּי אַתָּה גִּזְיִי = You are my protector from my mother's belly  
 . בְּךָ תִּקְלַחֲתִי תָמִיד = I always praise you.

## גֹּדֵי

Psalms 22:10 . כִּי אַתָּה גֹּדֵי מִבְּטֹן מִבְּטֵי חַי עַל שְׁדָי אִמִּי .

Scholars have declared that the etymology of גֹּדֵי is uncertain. This verse has been translated by scholars as:

"But thou art he that took me out of the womb: thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts";

"You drew me from the womb, made me secure at my mother's breast";

"Yet thou art he who took me from the womb, thou didst keep me safe upon my mother's breasts";

"Upon thee was I cast at birth, from my mother's womb thou hast been my God";

"From birth I was cast upon you; from my mother's womb you have been my God";

"Yet you drew me out of the womb, you entrusted me to my mother's breasts";

"For thou art he that drew me out of the womb; my hope from my mother's breasts";

"For thou art my trust since I came out of the womb, and my hope since I was upon my mother's breasts";

"For thou art he that hast drawn me out of the womb; my hope from the breasts of my mother";

"For thou art He that wrested me from the womb; Thou gavest me my mother's breast";

"Yet thou hast been my prop from my birth, thou hast imbued me with hope from the days when I lay an infant at my mother's breast";

"Yes thou art He that took me out of the womb that inspired me with trust at my mother's breasts".

The  $\lambda$  interchanges with the  $\kappa$ .

The noun  $\underline{\text{פִּז}}$  = "power", stems from the root  $\text{פזז}$  = to be strong, to be powerful.

I think that the root  $\text{פזז}$  =  $\text{פזז}$  = to be powerful.

I believe that the noun  $\underline{\text{פִּז}}$  = powerhouse.

Powerhouse= One having or wielding great power.

I think that  $\underline{\text{פִּז}}$  = "powerhouse", is found in the following verse, Genesis 49:3.

Commentators have divided this verse this way in their translations:

|          |          |        |          |            |         |         |        |
|----------|----------|--------|----------|------------|---------|---------|--------|
| רֵאוּבֵן | בְּכֹרִי | אַתָּה | כִּחֲמִי | וְרֵאשִׁית | אֶזְנִי | יִתְרִי | שְׂאֵת |
|          |          |        |          |            |         | ↓       |        |
|          |          |        |          |            |         | יִתְרִי |        |

I believe that it should be divided the following way:

|          |          |        |        |         |            |         |
|----------|----------|--------|--------|---------|------------|---------|
| רֵאוּבֵן | בְּכֹרִי | אַתָּה | שְׂאֵת | יִתְרִי | וְרֵאשִׁית | אֶזְנִי |
|          |          |        |        |         |            |         |
|          |          |        |        |         |            | ↓       |
|          |          |        |        |         |            | יִתְרִי |

Instead of translating it: "Reuben, you are my first born, my might", it should be translated: "Reuben, my first born, you are my powerhouse".

$\text{יִתְרִי אַתָּה פִּז}$  = you are my powerhouse.

From the root  $\text{פזז}$  is derived the noun  $\underline{\text{פִּז}}$  =  $\underline{\text{פִּז}}$  = powerhouse.

$\text{מִבְּטֵן אִמִּי אַתָּה גִּחִי מִבְּטֵן}$  = For you are my powerhouse from my birth.

$\text{עַל שְׁדֵי אִמִּי מִבְּטֵיחִי}$  = My protector at my mother's breasts.  
 $\underline{\text{מִבְּטֵיחִי}}$  = a protector

Psalms 48:14

שִׁיחֵי לְבַכָּם לְחִילָה

פְּסָגוֹ אֶרְמֹנוֹתֶיהָ

למען תִּסְפְּרוּ לְדוֹר אַחֲרוֹן.

This chapter deals with the beauty and security of Mount Zion, one of the hills upon which the city of Jerusalem was built.

What does the hapax legomenon פְּסָגוֹ mean? Scholars have stated that this word has no satisfactory interpretation and that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain.

The root פסג has been explained as: "to scan", "to discriminate", "walk through", "be high", "pass between", "look at", "mark off", "fix the limits of", "raise up", "traverse", "to go to and fro between", and "to furnish with pinnacles and turrets".

פְּסָגוֹ אֶרְמֹנוֹתֶיהָ has been interpreted as:

"walk through her palaces"

"consider her palaces"

"survey her fortresses"

"go through her citadels"

"pass her palaces in review"

"go through its citadels"

"raise aloft her palaces"

"survey her palaces"

"distribute her houses"

"examine her citadels"

"observe her palaces"

"march through her palaces"

"the depth of her bulwarks"

"view her citadels"

"distinguish her citadels".

Some have proposed to emend the text to read: פסעו or פקדו.

Some verbs connoting "to cut" also mean "to think".

גלא = to cut, to think.

יָצַר = thought      יָצַר = to shape, to think.

פסק (Akkadian pasaku = to cut),  
to decide.

קָטַט = to cut, to decide

I think that the root פסק = פסק = to cut, to think.

The Psalmist speaks of remembering Zion and Jerusalem.

Psalms 137:1      על נהרות בבל שם ישבנו גם בכינוּ בְּזִכְרֵנָהּ אֶת צִיּוֹן .

Psalms 137:6      תִּדְבַק לְשׁוֹנֵי לֶחְזֵי אִם לֹא אֶזְכְּרֶנָּה ... אֶת יְרוּשָׁלַם .

= שִׁיתֵּי לְבַבְכֶם לְחֵילָהּ

Remember its wall

= פִּסְגֵּי אֶרְמֹנוֹתֶיהָ

Think of its citadels

= לַמַּעַן תִּסְפְּרֵהּ לְדוֹר אַחֲרָיו .

That you may tell it to a next generation.



That its brood may be gorged with blood, and where the slain are, there the vulture is.

This verse is also found in Matthew 24:28 and Luke 17:37: Wherever the body is, there the eagles will be gathered together.

What does the hapax legomenon עלע? mean, and what is its root? This text has been explained as a scribal error, and in the absence of cognates, emendations have been proposed. Grammarians thought it should read:

לוע? , עלע? , לע? and לע?

They say that its root is לוע, לע or עול which is also related to Arabic לע = to lick, lap up.

I believe that the root is עלע = עלק = לע = לק = to lick, lap up. The letter ע interchanges with the letter ק.

The eagle builds his nest high on a peak of a mountain and, with his sharp vision, he is able to spot food in the depth below. The young eat flesh and lap blood.

(Aramaic) תא = (Hebrew) אשר = place

= אפלה עלע דם

And his nestlings lick blood

= באשר תללים שם הוא.

And in a place of dead bodies,  
he is there.

## TRANSLATING THE BIBLICAL HEBREW INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE

In Biblical Hebrew, and in other Northwest Semitic languages, Phoenician and Ugaritic, the infinitive absolute is used in place of a finite verb. It is used adverbially together with a finite form of its own verb, to add emphasis to the previous verb. The infinitive absolute after its verb, strengthens the idea of continuity of action. The use of the verb  $\text{הלך}$  to go, followed by its infinitive absolute, expresses the idea of continuance of action. The infinitive absolute can follow or precede the finite verb of the same root or different root. We see a great variation in translating the Biblical Hebrew infinitive absolute when comparing the various English translations of texts in which it appears in the Hebrew Bible. I believe that it can be rendered in good literal English in a uniform manner. Here are my translations to illustrate my point.

Joshua 6:13  $\text{וְהִמָּאֵסָה הֵלֵךְ אַחֲרַי אֲרוֹן יְהוָה הֵלֹךְ וְתִקְוֶעַ בְּשׁוֹפְרוֹת}$

This has been translated: "blowing with the trumpets"; "and blew their horns"; and "blowing the trumpets continually".

My translation is: And the rearguard continually marched behind the ark of YHWH, and blew the trumpets.

Judges 14:9  $\text{וַיֵּלֶךְ הֵלֹךְ וְאָכַל}$

This has been translated: "and ate it as he went along"; "and he ate as he walked"; "eating as he went";



"and went on his way eating"; and "and went on eating".

My translation is: And he continually went and ate.

Isaiah 19:22      וְנִגְזַף יְהוָה אֶת מִצְרַיִם נִגְזַף וְרָפָא .

This has been translated: "And the Lord shall smite Egypt, he shall smite and heal"; "smiting and healing"; "healing as he strikes"; "he will first afflict and then heal"; and "He will strike them and heal them".

My translation is: And YHWH will continually smite and heal Egypt.

Jeremiah 12:17      וְנִתְשָׁתִי אֶת הַגּוֹי הַזֶּה וְנִאֲבַד .

This has been translated: "I will utterly pluck it up and destroy it"; "I will uproot that people, uproot and destroy them"; "I will tear out that nation, tear it out and destroy it"; and "I will completely uproot and destroy it".

My translation is: I will continually smash and destroy that nation.

1 Kings 20:37      וַיִּכּוּהוּ הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה וַיַּפְצֵעַ .

It has been translated: "And the man struck him, smiting and wounding him"; "He struck and wounded him"; and "So the man struck him and wounded him".

My translation is: And the man continually struck and wounded him.

Isaiah 3:16      הָלֹךְ וְטַפּוֹף תִּלְכְּנָה .

It has been translated: "tripping along with mincing steps"; "and with mincing gait"; "mincing along as they go"; "moving with mincing gait"; "walking with their mincing steps"; and "walking and mincing as they go".

My translation is: continually walk and mince.

Psalms 126:6

הַלְלוּךָ יְיָ וְיִבְכְּהוּ .

It has been translated: "Though he goes along weeping"; "a man may go out weeping"; "He that goes forth weeping"; and "He who goes out weeping".

My translation is: He who continually goes and weeps.

2 Samuel 5:10

וַיִּגְדַּל וַיִּבְרַח וַיִּגְדַּל .

It has been translated: "So David grew stronger"; "David kept growing stronger"; "And David became more and more powerful"; "And David became greater and greater"; "And David went on and grew great"; "David went on waxing great"; and "David progressed and grew great".

My translation is: And David continually proceeded and became great.

2 Samuel 3:16

וַיֵּלֶךְ אִתָּהּ אִישׁ הַלְלוּךָ יְיָ וְיִבְכְּהוּ .

This has been translated: "Her husband went with her weeping after her all the way"; "Her husband walked with her, weeping as he followed her"; "Her husband went with her, weeping behind her all the way"; "Set off with her, and followed her weeping"; "Weeping as he went behind her".

My translation is: Her husband continually went with her and wept.

2 Samuel 16:13

וַיִּשְׁמְעֵי הַלְלוּךָ . . . . וַיִּקְלַל .

It has been translated: "And Shimei went... and cursed as he went"; "cursing as he went"; "insulting him as he walked"; "cursing as he went along",

My translation is: And Shimei continually went.... and cursed.

1 Samuel 6:12      . הַלְכוּ הַלֵּךְ וְגָעוּ .

It has been translated: "Lowing as they went"; and "Lowing all the way".

My translation is: They continually went and lowed.

Genesis 8:3      . וַיִּשְׁבוּ הַמַּיִם מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ הַלֵּוֹךְ וְשׁוֹב .

This has been translated: "And the water receded steadily from the earth"; "and the water always receded more and more"; "and the waters returned continually"; "and the water receded in a continuous fashion"; "and the water gradually receded from the earth"; "the waters then receded steadily from the earth"; "and the water always receded more and more"; and "and the waters receded from the earth continually".

My translation is: And the waters continually receded and receded from the earth.

Genesis 8:5      . וְהַמַּיִם הָיוּ הַלֵּוֹךְ וְחֹסֵר .

It has been translated: "And the waters continued to abate"; "and the water continued to recede"; "and the waters went on diminishing"; "and the water receded steadily"; and "and the waters decreased continually".

My translation is: And the waters continually receded and receded.

הָיָה = to fall, to recede.

חָסַר = to decrease, to recede.

Genesis 8:7      . וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת הָעֹלֵב וַיֵּצֵא וַיָּצוּא וְשׁוֹב .

This has been translated: "And it went to and fro"; "and it kept flying back and forth"; "which went this

way and that"; "it kept going forth and returning"; and "and it continued flying to and fro".

My translation is: And it continually went out and returned.

Genesis 12:9      וַיֵּסַע אַבְרָם הַלּוֹךְ וְנֹסֵעַ הַנְּגֵבָה.

This has been translated: "And Abram journeyed on, still going toward the Negeb"; "And Abram journeyed by stages towards the Negeb"; "Abram continued slowly southward to the Negeb, pausing frequently"; and "And Abram advanced always southward".

My translation is: And Abram continually journeyed and journeyed southward.

HASMONAEAN ( יְהוֹאָרִיב ): ORIGIN & MEANING

In the year 167 BCE, the priest Mattathias came upon the stage of history. He belonged to one of the most important priestly orders in Israel, the Joarib, known originally as Jehoiarib (1 Chronicles 24:7) and Joiarib (Nehemiah 11:10). He moved from Jerusalem to a town 17 miles away called Modein.

Josephus, in his JEWISH ANTIQUITIES (12.6.2), told how officers of the Seleucid King Antiochus IV Epiphanes, came to the village of Modein "to compel the Jews to carry out his ordinances, and they ordered the inhabitants to sacrifice as the king had ordered; and as MATTATHIAS WAS HELD IN ESTEEM... they invited him to be the first to sacrifice - for, they said his fellow citizens would follow him... but Mattathias refused to do so, saying that even if all the other nations obeyed the commands of Antiochus... he himself and his sons would never be persuaded to abandon their native form of worship. But when... one of the Jews came forward and... sacrificed... Mattathias in rage rushed upon him with his sons... and cut down the man himself, and also made an end of Apelles, the king's officer... together with a few of his soldiers; and after pulling down the pagan altar, he cried out, 'Whoever is zealous for our country's laws and the worship of God let him come with me!'"

Mattathias then escaped to the hills together with his five sons, Johanan, Simon, Judah, Eleazar, and

Jonathan, and organized a large army to resist the religious persecution by the Syrian Greeks and their Jewish sympathizers. This later became a national movement for independence.

What is the origin of the word "Hasmonaeen" (חַסְמוֹנִי)? Josephus, in his *JEWISH ANTIQUITIES* (12.6.1), wrote that, "At this time there was a man living in the village of Modai in Judea, named Mattathias, the son of Joannes, the son of Symeon, the son of ASAMONAIOS, a priest of the course of Joarib and a native of Jerusalem". *I MACCABEES* (2:1) gives the same genealogy, but omits the word Asamonaios. "In those days Mattathias, the son of John, son of Simon, a priest of the sons of Joarib, moved from Jerusalem and settled in Modein".

*I MACCABEES* was compiled in Hebrew in Israel during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 BCE) and revised during the decade after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in 70 CE. The Hebrew text was still available during the fourth century CE, but was subsequently lost. Its author portrayed the descendants of Mattathias as the family divinely ordained to save the Jews from the Hellenistic Syrians.

The Hebrew text of *I MACCABEES* was known to and utilized by the Tannaim, or early rabbis, and the early Church Fathers. The term "Hasmonaeen" is found in the works of Josephus and in Rabbinic literature, but is absent from the text of *I MACCABEES*.

According to Josephus, in his *JEWISH WAR* (1.1.3),

Asamonaeus was the father of Mattathias, but in his JEWISH ANTIQUITIES (12.6.1), Asamoniaios was the great-grandfather of Mattathias. In JEWISH ANTIQUITIES (20.8.11), Josephus spoke of "the sons of Asamoniaios".

In the Mishna, the rabbis called the sons of Mattathias, "Hasmonaeans" ( **בְּנֵי הַשְּׂמוֹנִי** ).

מזרחית צפונית בה גנזו **בְּנֵי הַשְּׂמוֹנִי** את אבני  
מזבח ששיקצו מלכי יון.

( משנה, הוצאת לו, Cambridge, 1883, מדרת, פרק א הלכה ו )

The Targum Yerushalmi for 1 Samuel 2:4 mentioned the dynasty of the Hasmonaeans ( **בְּיַת הַשְּׂמוֹנִיאִים** ).

על מלכות מקדון אתנביאית ואמרת: קשתת דגברי מקדונאי  
יתברון, ודבית **הַשְּׂמוֹנִיאִי** דהווי חלשין, יתעבדו להווי  
נסיין וגבורין.

Eusebius (263–339 CE), in his ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, cited Origen (3rd century CE), who wrote that there was a book outside the Hebrew canon dealing with the history of the Maccabees, whose Hebrew title was SARBETH SABANAIEL. Scholars claimed that this was the Hebrew title of I MACCABEES. Transcribed into the Hebrew alphabet, this title would be **ספר בֵּית סַרְבְּנֵי אֵל**, connoting "Book of the Dynasty of God's Resisters". This name has been interpreted two different ways. Since I MACCABEES glorified the Maccabean dynasty, this title, viewed by pro-Hasmonaeans, meant "resisters for God", but when viewed by anti-Hasmonaeans, it was a mocking title connoting "resisters against God".

Some have explained SARBETH SABANAIEL as a corruption and misunderstanding of ספר בית חשמונאים, "The Book of the House of the Hasmonaeans".

Another interpretation is that the original reading of Origen was, Sfar Beth Sarachai El, "The Book of the Dynasty of the Princes of God", which was corrupted from Sfar Beth Sarachai Israel' "The Book of the Dynasty of the Princes of Israel".

In the Hebrew chronicle, YOSSIPON, compiled in Italy in 952 CE, the descendants of Mattathias are referred to as Hasmonaeans.

ויתר דברי יהודה וגבורותיו ומלחמותיו הלא הם  
 כתובים על ספר יוסף בן גוריון ועל ספר בני  
 החשמונאים...  
 (ספר יוסיפון הוצאת דוד פלוסר, ירושלים, 1978, כרך ראשון,  
 כו, עמוד 108)

Scholars are uncertain about the origin of the word חֲשִׁמוֹנִי, and no satisfactory meaning has been offered. Josephus derived it from the name of the great-grandfather or grandfather of Mattathias. Some commentators maintain that the family of Mattathias originally came from the towns of Heshmon (Joshua 15:27), Hashmonah (Numbers 33:29-30), or Hashim (I Chronicles 8:11).

In Josephus and in Rabbinic sources, the descendants of Mattathias are called חֲשִׁמוֹנִי or בְּנֵי חֲשִׁמוֹנִי. From this arose the adjective Hasmonaeon. Hasmonaeon is incorrectly taken to be a family name.



It seems that "Hasmonaeon" is an epithet connoting "prince".

Another opinion is that this epithet is a compound word composed of the Hebrew root *משח* (to anoint) and *שמן* (oil). Accordingly, it would connote "one anointed with olive oil". I do not believe that this is a compound word. The Hasmonaeans were never anointed by anyone with oil. Why use a word for a ceremony that never took place?

The epithet Hasmonae is not mentioned in the text of I Maccabees, written during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 BCE), because, at that time, it had not yet been applied to this illustrious family. Most probably it was applied to this ruling family during the reign of his son Judas Aristobulus I (104-103 BCE), for he was the first of the Hasmonaeon rulers to take the title of king. When this happened, this epithet was then applied to the whole family going back to Mattathias.

It was easily applied to Mattathias because of his high priestly position which he occupied in his time. In 152 BCE, Jonathan was made high priest by Alexander Balas, the Syrian pretender to the throne. I Maccabees 10:20 stated: "And so we have appointed you today to be the high priest of your nation; you are to be called the king's friend (and he sent him a purple robe and a golden crown)..." 1 Maccabees 10:62 told: "The king gave orders to take off Jonathan's garments and clothe

him in purple, and they did so". And again in I Maccabees 11:58: "And he sent him gold plate and a table service, and granted him the right to drink from gold cups and dress in purple.."

In 141 BCE, at a large assembly of priests, people and elders of the land, his brother Simon was declared the high priest and ethnarch forever "until there should arise a faithful prophet" (I Maccabees 14:41). King Demetrius confirmed him in the high priesthood and made him one of the king's friends (I Maccabees 14:38). It was also decided that he should be clothed in purple and wear gold (I Maccabees 14:43), a prerogative of Hellenistic royalty. It was also forbidden to the people and priests to be clothed in purple or to put on a gold buckle (I Maccabees 14:44).

A new dynasty was thus established, with political and ecclesiastical authority. In short, Simon had the status of a king without the title. His powers were monarchic because of the purple robe and gold he wore. He did receive the title SAR AM EL, "Prince of the People of God", at the large assembly of priests and people (I Maccabees 14:28).

In 139 BCE, the Roman Senate recognized the new dynasty, and in 138 BCE, Simon was endorsed by King Antiochus VII. The history of the Hasmonaeans as a dynasty thus begins with Simon. The family ruled until 63 BCE, but was prominent in Judea until 37 BCE.

In Tannaitic literature, חַשְׁמוֹנְאִים connotes "princes".

The word **חֲשַׁמְנִים** (Psalms 68:32) is rendered by Origen as "dignataries". In medieval Hebrew literature, the princes of the Church, the Cardinals, were called **חשמינים**, so stated the Hebrew grammarian of the 15th century, Elijah Bahur.

... **הַיְהוּדִים הַלְּוֵעוּזִים קוֹרִין לַחֲמַרְדֵּינָאִלִּים חֲשַׁמְנִים** ...  
**וְאִינִי יוֹדֵעַ מֵהֵיכָן לַמְדוֹ לֹמַר כֵּן** ...

(ספר החשבני לאליהו בחור, 1601, Basle, leaf 35b-36a)

Purple in the ancient world was the insignia of power. "Purple" refers to hues ranging from red to dark purple. Purple dye was first extracted from the murex shell in Minoan Crete in 1699 BCE. In ancient Egypt, as the Nile River rose in flood, it turned green, red, yellowish, and then blue. During the dyeing process, startling changes in color took place, and the fluid from the murex shell behaved almost the same way as the Nile, turning green, yellow, and blue, before its final fixed purple. Shell purple was considered a noble and sacred color, emblematic of the power of the gods. The Phoenicians cornered the dye market and Tyrian purple became famous in the Mediterranean. In the neighborhood of Tyre, great accumulations of shells of purple producing murex have been found. As early as 1500 BCE, Nuzi texts indicate that purple dye was processed there.

Clothing was dyed in different shades of purple, the more important the wearer, the deeper the shade.

Purple garments were made for the king, queen, crown prince, and ministers of the court.

The name Canaan ( כְּנַעַן ) is derived from Akkadian KINAHHU= red-purple wool. Thus Canaan ( כְּנַעַן ) = the country exporting red-purple wool.

The name PHOENICIA is derived from the Greek phoenix = red-purple.

Blue was a variety of purple.

תְּכֵלֶת = blue-purple.

The prophet Ezekiel described Assyrian governors and commanders clothed in blue-purple for their military operations.

Ezekiel 23:6 לְבָשֵׁי תְּכֵלֶת פָּחוּ וּסְגָנִים.  
תְּכֵלֶת = porphyra (Greek), purpura (Latin) = red-purple.

When Xerxes made Mordecai a courtier, he clothed him in blue-purple and red-purple clothing.

Esther 8:15 וּמְרוֹדֵכַי יָצָא מִקִּפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ בְּלִבְיֹשֶׁת מַלְכוּת  
וּתְכֵלֶת וְחֹזֵר וְעֵטְרָת זָהָב גְּדוּלָה וְחֹזֵר בּוּץ נְאֻף תְּכֵלֶת.

And Mordecai went out from the king's presence in royal apparel of blue-purple and white and a large golden crown, and a robe of linen and red-purple.

תְּכֵלֶת (Akkadian, TAKILTU= blue-purple wool) is related to the adjective TAKLU = consistent, fast. The dye maintains a highly consistent or permanent hue.

Tekelet was very costly because it required great quantities of snails to produce even a gram of pure pigment. For this reason, tekelet was reserved for

royalty and for cultic vestments.

Purple was prescribed for the sacred vestments of Israel's priests, blue-purple, red-purple and scarlet colors.

וּמִן הַחֲכֵלֶת וְהָאֲרָגְמָן וְחֹלְעַת הַשָּׁנִי עֶשֶׂן בְּגָדֵי שָׂרָד  
לְשֵׁרֶת בְּקֹדֶשׁ.

When Judah the Maccabee defeated a Hellenistic Syrian army he seized their purple cloth.

I Maccabees 4:25 "Then Judas returned to plunder the camp, and they seized much gold and silver and CLOTH DYED BLUE AND SEA PURPLE".

In the New Testament, Roman soldiers dressed Jesus in a purple robe.

John 19:2 "And the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns, and put it on his head and arrayed him in a PURPLE ROBE."

John 19:3 "they came to him saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!"

Hellenistic monarchies retained an entourage of vassals and advisers whom they honored with distinctive purple clothing.

The high priest's garment the HOSHEN (חֹשֶׁן), also contained blue-purple (תְּכֵלֶת) and red-purple (אַרְגָּמָן).

Psalms 68:32 יֵאָחֲזוּ חֲשֻׁמְנִים מִנִּי מִצְרַיִם.

Princes shall come from Egypt.

Some commentators also interpreted the word חֲשֻׁמְנִים as "nobles", or "ambassadors", but that

wouldn't make any difference because high government officials wore purple clothing.

I believe that : the Hebrew word  $\text{לְמַשְׁחָה}$  stems from the Akkadian  $\text{ḤAŠMĀNU}$  (  $\text{חֲמָנָה}$  ) = blue. Since, in reference to wool, blue was a variety of purple,  $\text{לְמַשְׁחָה}$  = blue-purple.

The nobles and high officials were called  $\text{לְמַשְׁחָהִים}$  because they wore purple clothing.

$\text{לְמַשְׁחָהִים} = \text{לְמַשְׁחָה}$  = a wearer of purple clothing, a noble.

$\text{לְמַשְׁחָהִים}$  or  $\text{לְמַשְׁחָהִים}$  = wearing purple clothing.

The Hasmonaeans were given the right to wear purple clothing and even Mattathias, the priest, who had a top position, most probably wore purple clothing.

The Hasmonaeans were high priests, kings and high government officials, who wore purple clothing.

The Hebrew epithet for the illustrious Maccabean dynasty that wore purple clothing was  $\text{HASMONEANS}$ ,  $\text{לְמַשְׁחָהִים}$  or  $\text{לְמַשְׁחָהִים}$  .

## THE SAMOVAR OR BOILER AT THE PASCHAL MEAL

## מִיָּחַם

שתי חבורות שהינן אוכלות בבית אחד  
 אלו הופכים את פניהם הלאה ואוכלים  
 ואלו הופכים את פניהם הלאה ואוכלים  
 והמִיָּחַם באמצע.

(THE MISHNA ON WHICH THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD RESIS by W.H.Lowe.  
 Cambridge, 1883. Tractate Pesahim, VII, 13)

This is my translation and interpretation:

Two associations which were eating (their Paschal lambs) in one room,

These should turn their faces this way and eat,

And those should turn their faces that way and eat,

And the BOILER is in the middle.

In Jerusalem, during the days of the Second Temple, associations existed for important religious duties, including the celebration of Pesach and eating the Paschal lamb. Israel in the first century C.E., had many such associations. In Rome too, workers belonged to collegia or associations, which provided a hall for their members, cared for the sick, and arranged for celebrations and feasts. Among the Pharisees and the early Christian community, as well as in the other associations, participation in common meals, was an important aspect of their activities. The association gave the member a feeling of social importance and satisfied his need for direct involvement in a group larger than his own family.

In the Bible, the Paschal lamb was eaten only by the immediate family, while in Pharisaic Judaism, the

Paschal lamb was eaten also by members of an association, composed of friends or associates representing a new and larger family.

Scholars have interpreted this Mishna to mean that there was only one Paschal lamb and one waiter for both associations, assuming also that this waiter took food in his mouth at one association and ate it at another association.

I believe that this Mishna deals with two associations, each having its own Paschal lamb and its individual waiter, while eating their lambs in one room. The waiter was not permitted to eat with the association that he served food if he was not their member. He could only eat with an association of which he was a member because no member of an association may eat in two places, or with another association.

The boiler (מִיָּם), made of metal, and sometimes of clay, was placed in the middle, between the two associations eating their Paschal lambs. Scholars claim that the boiler was utilized for heating water for diluting the wine drunk at the Paschal meal.

Was the boiler used only for mixing warm water with the wine? I believe that we learn from a Mishna that the boiler was used for another purpose too.

... הָבִיאוּ לְפָנָיו מִטְּבֵּל בַּחֲזָרָה (1)

... הָבִיאוּ לְפָנָיו מִצָּה וְחֲזָרָה (2)

(משנה פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ג W. H. Lowe edition)

1) They brought before him, he dips the lettuce....

2) They brought before him unleavened bread & lettuce..



Scholars hold that "they brought before him" in verse one, refers to the table, the food, the lettuce, or the seasoning for the food. We see from the phrase in the Mishna that "he dips the lettuce" (מְטַבֵּל בַּחֲזֶרֶת), that it is the lettuce that has to be dipped.

From the Jerusalem Talmud we learn that lettuce has to be dipped twice.

חֲבֵרָא בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: צְרִיךְ לְטַבֵּל בַּחֲזֶרֶת שְׁנַי פַּעֲמִים.  
(תלמוד ירושלמי, פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ג. ויניציה, 4-1523, הוצאת דניאל  
בומברג. ניו יורק, 1944)  
(Reprint of 1944)

The collegium of scholars in the name of Rabbi Yochanan (3rd century C.E., Amora of Israel): One must dip the lettuce two times.

Why did the lettuce have to be dipped? Rabbi Papa, a Babylonian Amora of the 4th century C.E., whose view is recorded in the Babylonian Talmud, enlightens us concerning the reason for dipping the lettuce.

אמר רב פפא: שמע מינה האי חֲבֵרָא צְרִיךְ לְשַׁקְוֵיעִיה לְמַה לִּי?  
מִשּׁוּם קַפָּא.

(תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, פרק עשירי, קטו א-ב, הוצאת דניאל בומברג, ויניציה,  
1520. ירושלים, 1968)  
(Reprint of 1968)

Said Rabbi Papa: Infer from this, that one must dip this lettuce because of the worms.

This means that lettuce had to be dipped because it contained worms. What was the lettuce submerged or dipped into?

Rabbi Ammi, an Amora of Israel who flourished in the third to the beginning of the fourth centuries, whose view is cited in the Babylonian Talmud, held that lettuce contained worms and had to be dipped into hot water in

order to get rid of them.

אמר רבי אמי משום קפא, ואמר רבי אמי קפא דחסא . . . . .  
קפא דכולהו חמימי .

( תלמוד בבלי , פסחים , פרק עשירי , קטז , א )

Said Rabbi Ammi: On account of worms. And Rabbi Ammi said: The worms of lettuce (are counteracted)...the worms of all of them by hot water.

Thus, in order to make lettuce edible, it had to be dipped into hot water to remove its worms.

When the Mishna stated that "they brought before him", it meant that they brought before him hot water from a boiler ( מײַחם ).

Then the diner dipped the lettuce into the hot water to remove its worms. The Mishna didn't mention the hot water because it was such a common practice and so well-known then that it was taken for granted that people would understand what the Mishna intended.

According to Rabbi Hiyya, a Tanna of Israel of the second century C.E., one could prevent stomach illness by dipping vegetables regularly to get rid of the worms.

תני ר' חייא: הרוצה שלא יבא לידי חולי מעים יחא רגיל  
בטביל .

( תלמוד בבלי , מסכת גטין , ע , א )

We see that the boiler was used not only for hot water for mixing with wine, but also for dipping the vegetables in order to make them edible by eliminating the worms that inhabit these vegetables.

## WHAT WAS THE ORIGINAL ORDER AND NUMBER OF QUESTIONS IN THE PASCHAL MEAL?

During his presidency, Rabban Gamaliel II of Yavne (80-115 C.E.), aimed not only to replace the defunct centralized sacrificial cult with a non-sacrificial prayer service, but also to halt the inroads of advancing Pauline Christianity, by providing all Jews with an official and authentic interpretation of the Pesach festival's ceremonies which would offer solace and hope for the Jewish people in their relationship with God, by emphasizing his eternal covenant with them.

In the years 80-86 C.E., the Festival of Unleavened Bread was renamed the Festival of Pesach, and a Pesach liturgy or Haggadah was created for the Jewish people. By New Testament times, the Greco-Roman manner of arranging meals or banquets, was well-known to the Jews in Palestine. At a symposium, guests reclined on sloping couches around three sides of a rectangular table on a low pedestal, with the fourth side of the table open for servants to serve the foods. The servants or waiters brought in a table-top on which the meal was already arranged, and placed it on legs standing in front of the guest. Each couch had room for three persons to recline on the left elbow. A full Roman dinner party consisted of nine people with three couches (=triclinia).

In the Roman symposium, the theme for discussion at the banquet, was put in the form of a question appearing as an interrogative sentence, and many questions dealt with the subject of food. Likewise, an interrogative

sentence was included in the Pesach Haggadah, read at the Paschal meal or banquet, which introduced the theme for the questions about food to be asked.

The interrogative sentence in the Haggadah is:

מָה נִשְׁתַּנָּה הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה מִכָּל הַלַּיְלֹת?

What is different this night from all the nights?

The Haggadah is not mentioned in the Bible, for it was created in the period after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. The second extant Rabbinic source which mentions the questions asked at the Paschal meal, is the Mishna Pesahim compiled at the end of the second century C.E. In the earliest surviving manuscripts of the Mishna and the Haggadah, there are three questions that are asked during the Paschal meal, according to the order of the meal.

What was the order of the Paschal meal during Temple days? It was a single course meal, consisting of unleavened bread, bitter herbs and a roasted whole Paschal lamb.

The Paschal lamb was eaten as the last item in the main course in order to be the food that satiates, as stated in the following Mishna.

תני חגיגה הבאה עם הפסח היתה נאכלת תחילה  
כדי שיאכל הפסח לשבע.

(תלמוד ירושלמי, פסחים, פרק ששי, לג, ג. הוצאת דניאל בומברג, ויניציה,

(Reprint of N.Y., 1944 .1523-4

The order in which food was served can be derived from the following statement in the Mishna.

- (1) הָבִיאוּ לְפָנָיו מִטְבֵּל בַּחֲזֵקָתָא ...  
 (2) הָבִיאוּ לְפָנָיו מִצָּה וַחֲזֵקָתָא וַחֲרוֹסֶת ... וּבִמְקוֹשׁ מִבִּיאִין  
 לְפָנָיו גִּזְפוּ יְשֵׁל פֶּסַח .

(Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), Jerusalem, 1970.

(פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ג)

In the third quarter of the first century C.E., the Romans added to the banquet a first course consisting of appetizers, before the main course which now became the second course. This Mishna reflects the Roman custom of having appetizers as a first course. Verse one of this Mishna lists the appetizer (=the lettuce חֲזֵקָתָא) as the first course, before the main or second course of verse two. We see from verse two, that the order was originally unleavened bread, bitter herbs (lettuce), and the Paschal lamb (גִּזְפוּ שֶׁל פֶּסַח).

After the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 C.E., the order of service became: appetizers as the first course, followed by unleavened bread, bitter herbs (lettuce) and roasted lamb, as the second course.

In those days, lettuce, fruits, rice, meat, eggs, and fish, served as appetizers for the first course. It was customary to eat three appetizers. From the Tosefta, we notice that guests were not permitted to enter a banquet after the third appetizer was served.

הָבָא אַחֲרֵי שְׁלֹשׁ פְּרִפְרָאוֹת אֵין לוֹ לְשׂוּמָה לִיְכַנֵּס .

He who comes after the three appetizers has no right to enter (the banquet).

(ברכות ד, ח תוספתא על פי כתבי יד ערפורט ווינה מאת משה ש. צוקרמאנדל.)

(ירושלים, 1963)

In our Mishna, lettuce (קַיִּיִת) is the only appetizer mentioned, which was eaten in the first course, and as a bitter herb in the second course. Thus, lettuce was eaten twice. Lettuce had to be dipped into hot water before eating to remove the worms. For this reason, the question about the eating of lettuce twice, became known in the literature as the dipping question (טְבִיל)

When the questions for the Paschal meal were instituted, there were, according to the Mishna, only three questions.

Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), written in 1073, in southern Italy, mentions three questions in the following order.

1) שֶׁבִּכְל הַלַּיְלוֹת אֲנִי מְטַבֵּלֶיךָ פַּעַם אַחַת וְהַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה שְׁתֵּי פַּעֲמִים.

2) שֶׁבִּכְל הַלַּיְלוֹת אֲנִי אוֹכְלֶיךָ חֶמֶץ וּמִצָּה וְהַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה כּוֹלוּ מִצָּה.

3) שֶׁבִּכְל הַלַּיְלוֹת אֲנִי אוֹכְלֶיךָ בָּשָׂר צְלִי שְׁלוּק וּמִבְשָׁל הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה כּוֹלוּ צְלִי.  
(פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ד)

- 1) For all the nights we dip one time, but this night two times.
- 2) For all the nights we eat leavened or unleavened bread, but this night, all of it is unleavened bread.
- 3) For all the nights we eat roasted, stewed or boiled meat, this night all of it is roasted.

The order is: 1) dipping question 2) unleavened bread question 3) roasted meat question.

The Mishna Codex Kaufmann A50, written in the 10th

or 11th century, in Italy, has the same order.

1) שבכל הלילות אני מטבליים אפילו פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים.

2) שבכל הלילות אני אוכלים חמץ ומצה הלילה הזה כולו מצה.

3) שבכל הלילות אני אוכלים בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל הלילה הזה כולו עלי.

(פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ד)

The Cambridge manuscript of the Mishna, published by W.H. Lowe, in 1883, written in the 14th-15th centuries, follows the same order.

1) שבכל הלילות אני מטבליין פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים.

2) שבכל הלילות אני אוכלין חמץ ומצה הלילה הזה כולו מצה.

3) שבכל הלילות אני אוכלין בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל הלילה הזה כולו עלי.

The Jerusalem Talmud, published by Daniel Bomberg in Venice, 1523-4, lists 3 questions, which are almost identical to Mishna Codex Parma.

1) שבכל הלילות אני מטבליין פעם אחת והלילה הזה שתי פעמים.

2) שבכל הלילות אני אוכלין חמץ ומצה והלילה הזה כולו מצה.

3) שבכל הלילות אני אוכלין בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל והלילה הזה כולו עלי.

(פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ד)

The oldest extant Haggadah which is from the Cairo Geniza, the synagogue store-room in which medieval literary documents, such as worn out copies of Hebrew scrolls, volumes and works, were placed, lists three

questions, with the dipping question first.

(1) שבכל הלילות אנו מטבלין פעם אחת והלילה הזה שתי פעמים.

(2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלים חמץ ומצה הלילה הזה כלו מצה.

(3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלים בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל הלילה הזה כלו עלי.

The Mishna in the Babylonian Talmud Codex Munich 95, written in France, in 1343, lists three questions in a different order, with a slightly different wording. The questions are: unleavened bread question 2) dipping question 3) roasted meat question.

(1) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ ומצה הלילה הזה כולו מצה.

(2) שבכל הלילות אין אנו מטבלין אלא פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים.

(3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בשר ושלוק ומבושל הלילה הזה כלו עלי.

(תלמוד בבלי, מסכת פסחים, פרק עשירי)

The earliest surviving prayerbook, that of Amram Gaon of Babylonia (d.875 C.E.), lists 4 questions, first the dipping question, and then the unleavened bread question.

(1) שבכל הלילות אין אנו מטבלין אפילו פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים.

(2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ או מצה הלילה הזה כולו מצה.

(3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקות הלילה הזה מרור.

(4) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בין יושבין ובין מסובין הלילה הזה כולנו מסובין.



(סדר רב עמרם גאון הוצאת דניאל גולדשמידט. ירושלים,  
1971, עמוד קל"ג )

The prayerbook of Saadia son of Joseph, Gaon of Sura, Babylonia (882-942 C.E.), also lists four questions, with the dipping question first.

- 1) שבכל הלילות אין אנו מטבלין והלילה הזה מְטַבְּלִין .
- 2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ ומצה והלילה הזה כּלוּ מְצָה .
- 3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקוֹת והלילה הזה מְרוֹרִים .
- 4) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בין יושבין ובין מסובין והלילה הזה מְסוּבִין .

(סדר רב סעדיה גאון יוצא לאור על ידי ישראל דודזון,  
שמחה אסף, יששכר יואל. מהדורה שניה, ירושלים, 1963,  
עמוד קל"ז)

Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), in his code MISHNEH TORAH, completed in 1180 C.E., and printed in Rome, 1480, lists four questions and states that the roasted meat question is not said anymore because there is no Paschal sacrifice:

- בזמן הזה אינו אומר והלילה הזה כּוּלוּ צְלִי שאין לנו קרבן .
- 1) שבכל הלילות אין אנו מְטַבְּלִין אפילו פעם אחת והלילה הזה שתי פעמים .
- 2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ ומצה והלילה הזה כּוּלוּ מְצָה .
- 3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקוֹת והלילה הזה מְרוֹרִים .
- 4) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בין יושבין ובין מסובין והלילה הזה כּוּלְנוּ מְסוּבִין .

(משנה תורה לרבינו משה בן מימון. מהדורה מצולמת מדפוס רומי ר"מ  
(1480). ירושלים, 1955. ספר זמנים, הלכות חמץ ומצה, פרק שמיני,  
עמוד קמ"ד)

The HAGGADAH ACCORDING TO THE RITE OF YEMEN, by William H. Greenburgh, London, 1896, page 14, with Babylonian punctuation, follows the order of Maimonides, and lists 4 questions, with the dipping question first, followed by the unleavened bread question.

- 1) שבכל הלילות אין אנו מְטַבְּלִין אפילו פעם אחת והלילה הזה שתי פעמים.  
 2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין זמץ ומצה והלילה הזה כולו מְצָה.  
 3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקות והלילה הזה מְרֹךְ ים.  
 4) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בין יושבין בין מסובין והלילה הזה כולנו  
 מְסַבְּבִין.

The manuscript editions of the Mishna, the Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), the Mishna Codex Kaufmann A50, the Cambridge Mishna manuscript transcribed by W. H. Lowe, the Bomberg printed edition of the Jerusalem Talmud of Venice, 1523-4, the prayerbook of Amram Gaon, edited by Daniel Goldschmidt, the prayerbook of Saadia Gaon, edited by Israel Davidson, et al, the oldest Haggadah from the Cairo Geniza, and the Code of Moses Maimonides, the MISHNEH TORAH, printed in Rome, 1480, all list the dipping question first.

Since 1200, the order of prayers and the four questions in the Haggadah, prevailed according to Maimonides' directions, in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, North Africa, and Yemen. Maimonides followed the order of the Babylonian Amram Gaon (d.875 C.E.), who listed the dipping question first.

The Haggadah of the Chinese Jews of the city of K'ai Feng Fu of the 17-18th century, which belongs to the Babylonian-Persian group, the Haggadah of the Bene

Israel of India, the Haggadah in the Mahzor Rome, published in Bologna, 1540, the Venice Haggadah of 1716, with a Judeo-Italian translation, and the Livorno Haggadah of 1825, with a Judeo-Spanish translation, also list the dipping question first.

The First Printed Mishna of Naples, 1492, lists 4 questions in the following order:

- 1) unleavened bread
- 2) bitter herbs
- 3) dipping
- 4) roasted meat.

- 1) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ או מצה הלילה הזה כלו מצה .
  - 2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקות הלילה הזה מר ור .
  - 3) שבכל הלילות אנו מְטַפְּי לֵיךְ פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים .
  - 4) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל הלילה הזה כלו צלי .
- (משנה עם פרוש הרמב"ם. דפוס ראשון, Naples, 1492. תצלום, ירושלים, 1970, הוצאת א.מ.הברמן פסחים, פרק עשירי, משנה ד)

The Mishna in the Tractate Pesahim of the Babylonian Talmud, published by Daniel Bomberg, Venice, 1520, lists 4 questions, with the unleavened bread first and the dipping question last.

- 1) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ ומצה הלילה הזה כלו מצה .
  - 2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקות הלילה הזה מר ור .
  - 3) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל הלילה הזה כלו צלי .
  - 4) שבכל הלילות אין אנו חייבין לְטַפֵּל אפילו פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים .
- (תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, הוצאת דניאל בומברג, ויניציה, 1520, תצלום ירושלים, 1968. פרק עשירי, דף קיו, א)

The modern edition of the Mishna published by Hanok Albeck in 1952, lists 4 questions. For the first three

questions, he follows the order and wording of the Mishna Tractate Pesahim of the Babylonian Talmud, published by Daniel Bomberg in Venice, 1520. For the 4th question, the dipping question, he follows the wording of the First Printed Mishna of Naples, 1492.

According to Simḥah Ben Samuel of Vitry (d.1105 CE), located in the Maine Department of northern France, who compiled the MAḤZOR VITRY, published by S.Hurwitz from a manuscript in the British Museum, there are 4 questions in the following order: 1) unleavened bread 2) bitter herbs 3) dipping 4) reclining.

(1) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין חמץ ומצה הלילה הזה כולו מצה .

(2) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין שאר ירקות הלילה הזה מרור .

(3) שבכל הלילות אין אנו מטבילין אפילו פעם אחת הלילה הזה שתי פעמים .

(4) שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בין יושבין בין מסובין הלילה הזה כגלגול .

(מחזור ויטרי לרבנו שמחה. הוצאת שמעון הלוי הורוויץ. נירנברג, 1923, עמוד 295)

Rabbi Jacob Ben Yehuda Hazan of London, in his work עין חיים, compiled in 13th century England, follows the tradition of northern France in listing the four questions, in the same order and almost the same wording as the Maḥzor Vitry.

(עין חיים: הלכות פסקים ומנהגים מאת רבי יעקב חזן מלונדון. הוצאת ישראל ברודי. ירושלים, 1962. כרך ראשון, עמוד 322)

From the mid-14th century, the Rylands Haggadah of Catalonia, and the Sarajevo Haggadah of northern Spain, and from the mid-15th century, the Ashkenazi Haggadah of southern

Germany, all follow the same order of the four questions as in the Mahzor Vitry of northern France and the Etz Hayyim of England. This is the identical order and wording that Jews who follow the Ashkenazic rite follow today: 1) unleavened bread 2) bitter herbs 3) dipping 4) reclining.

Codex Munich 95 of the Babylonian Talmud, the Babylonian Talmud published by Bomberg in Venice, 1520, the first printed Mishna of Naples, 1492, the Code Etz Hayyim of Rabbi Jacob Ben Yehuda Hazan of London of 13th century England, the Sarajevo Haggadah, and the Rylands Haggadah of 14th century Spain, the Ashkenazi Haggadah of 15th century Germany, and the Mahzor Vitry, of eleventh century France, all list the unleavened bread question first.

Why do some versions of the questions list the dipping question first, while others list the unleavened bread question first?

Scholars claim that the Mishna of Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), Codex Kaufmann A50, W.H. Lowe's Cambridge Mishna manuscript, and the Mishna of the Munich manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud, are of the Palestinian type. The fact is that no pure Palestinian type of text exists. All of these manuscripts and early printed editions of the Mishna, such as Naples, 1492, and the Jerusalem Talmud printed by Bomberg in Venice, 1523, were edited by copyists to conform with the Babylonian type of text. What we have in these manuscripts and early printed editions, is a mixed text, composed of a

Palestinian type text "corrected" to conform with a Babylonian approved text.

Why were the Palestinian texts edited to conform with Babylonian texts? After the Arabs conquered Babylonia in 635-7 C.E., it became with the rise of the Abbasid Caliphate in 750 C.E., the center of Arabic and Jewish cultures. Many Babylonian Jews settled in Israel, bringing with them their Babylonian Talmud and its customs. These Babylonian Jewish settlers organized synagogues in Israel and succeeded in planting their laws and customs in Jerusalem and in other communities of the land. Just as the Abbasids, from their capital at Baghdad, spread their hegemony over the Arab world including Israel, so the Babylonian Geonim likewise tried to exercise their spiritual authority over the land of Israel and its religious leaders.

By the tenth century, the Babylonian Talmud was recognized in Israel, as the second authority for Jewish law and customs. In the diaspora of North Africa, Spain, Italy, and Germany, the Babylonian Talmud now became the supreme authority. The Jerusalem Talmud lost its importance, but it was still esteemed in Italy and Germany. In the eleventh century, the Franco-German Talmudists knew very little of the Jerusalem Talmud. By the end of the eleventh century, the Jerusalem Talmud was finally supplanted in Israel by the Babylonian Talmud, when the Crusaders destroyed the Jewish community there.

After the Babylonian Talmud became the supreme authority for Jewish law in Europe, existing manuscript texts containing readings according to the Jerusalem Talmud were "corrected" by many scribes, to bring them into line with readings and teachings of the Babylonian Talmud.

Already during the days of the Babylonian Geonim, when various ancient texts of the Talmud circulated, and many passages were not understood anymore, many scholars wrote comments in the margins, which scribes later interpolated into the text. Sherira Gaon (900-1001 C.E.) of Pumbeditha, Babylonia, warned that no scribe was permitted to add or subtract from the text of the Mishna, compiled by Judah the Prince in 200 C.E.

הכין חזינא דודאי שיתא סדרי משנה רבינו הקדוש  
תרצינון כי חיכי דגרסי להו הלכתא דבחר הלכתא,  
ואין לחוסיף ואין לגרוע.

(אגרת רב שרירא גאון הוצאת בנימין מנשה לויך. ירושלים, 1972, עמוד 7)

Indeed I have seen that the well-known six orders of the Mishna, were arranged for us by our holy Rabbi (Judah the Prince), so that they might be reviewed law by law, that one must not add to or subtract from.

Rabbi Gershom Ben Judah Me'or Ha-Golah (b.Metz 960-1040), put a ban with a curse on those scribes who erased the original readings in the Talmud and substituted "correct" readings into the text according to their own opinions. In spite of Gershom's ban on erasing the original reading of the text of the Talmud, this practice continued in the days of Rabbi Jacob Ben

Meir Tam (1100-1171), of northern France, who again protested against these scribal practices of substituting different readings according to the interpretations of commentators. In the introduction to his book, SEFER HA-YASHAR, Rabbi Jacob tells of these scribal activities prevalent in his day.

...מגיהי ספרים... ואע"ג דלט רבינו גרשום מאור הגולה  
 כל דמשבש תלמוד, הכי והכי תהוי, לא נמנעו מלשבש. ולא  
 די להם בגרסות הנראין לשבש, כי אם דברי האמוראין עצמו,  
 ולא יתכן לכל יראי שמים. כי גם רבינו שלמה אם הגיה  
 גרסא, בפרושיו הגיה. אבל בספרו לא הגיה. כי אם שותי  
 מימיו הגיהו על פי פירושו, אשר לא מלאו לבו לעשות  
 כן בחייו... והדין נותן אם לא ידע אדם הלכה יכתוב  
 פתרונו לפי דאות עיניו אם ירצה, אך בספרים אל ימחק...  
 ואם חס ושלום נשתבשו הספרים והגיהום לא ידענו עוד  
 אמיתת הדברים. ושרא ליה מריה לרבינו שמואל כי על אחת  
 שהגיה רבינו שלמה הגיה הוא עשרים, ולא עוד שמחק  
 הספרים... ויהיו דברי אלה קרובים לכל יראי השם לבלתי  
 ישבשו הספרים למחקם ולא לעשות לאו היך והיך לאו.  
 (ספר הישר לרבינו תם: חלק החידושים. הוצאת שמעון ש. שלזינגר. ירושלים,  
 1980. הקדמה, עמוד 9)

Correctors of holy books... although Rabbi Gershom Me'or Ha-Golah cursed all who corrupt the Talmud, thus and so it should be, they didn't refrain from corrupting. And pleasing versions were not sufficient for them, but the laws of the Amoraim to corrupt, and this is not right for all God-fearing men. For also Rabbi Solomon (Ben Isaac, 1040-1105), when he corrected a version, he corrected in his commentaries.



But he didn't make corrections in his book. But his students corrected according to his commentaries, intentions he couldn't fulfill thus in his life... And it is responsible when a person doesn't know a law, he should write his interpretation according to his opinion, if he wishes, but he should not erase from the holy books... And if, God forbid, the holy books become corrupted and he corrects them, we would not know the true laws anymore. And Master Rabbi Samuel (Ben Meir, c.1080-1158), for every correction that Rabbi Solomon corrected, he permitted himself to correct twenty, and not only that he erased the holy books... And let these words of mine be near to all God-fearers not to corrupt holy books by erasing them, and not make a no, a yes, and a yes, a no.

From all the aforementioned, we learn that the northern French rabbi Jacob Ben Meir Tam, was opposed to the practice of many scholars of his time, who "corrected" or emended supposedly corrupt readings in the text of the Talmud.

In the Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), and Mishna Codex Kaufmann A50, Tractate Pesachim, chapter 10, halakah 4, it says: *מח נשתנה הלילה הזה מכל לילי שבת? הלא לילי שבת?*

And thus the son asks... What is different this night from all the nights?

What was the first question asked at the Paschal meal? I believe that the unleavened bread question was historically the first question asked at the Paschal meal, and not the dipping question as scholars hold. Among the Romans, the discussion at the symposium took place after the main course was eaten. So too in the Paschal meal, the questions were asked after the main or second course was eaten, from the time of the late first century C.E. The main or second course was the main meal, and unleavened bread was the first item eaten in this course. The first course, composed of appetizers, was considered as an appendage to the main meal, but not part of it.

During Temple days, when there was no first course, but only a main course, the first item served was the unleavened bread. After the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E., a first course of appetizers was added before the main course. The dipping of lettuce in this first course, was not the one that satisfied the Biblical requirement of eating bitter herbs because it was only in imitation of the Roman custom of eating appetizers first. The dipping of lettuce in the second course, was the one that satisfied this Biblical injunction.

The unleavened bread was the item that was served first and, therefore, it was the first question to be asked. Dipping was originally done only in the main course, but after the addition of a first course, it was done also in this course. Therefore, lettuce as a

bitter herb, had to be dipped before eating in the first course and in the second course. This means that the dipping question was asked after the second dipping in the second course.

In Israel, lettuce was dipped all year round in the first course. In Babylonia, dipping of lettuce was not practiced at all during the year, and when it was dipped in the first course at the Paschal meal, it was seen as something unusual. Therefore, in Babylonia, the dipping question was asked first, while in Israel, the unleavened bread question was asked first. For this reason, there are two versions of the dipping question.

#### VERSION OF ISRAEL

שבכל הלילות אָנֵךְ מִטְפָּלִין פֶּעַם אַחַת הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה שְׁתֵּי פַעֲמִים.

#### VERSION OF BABYLONIA

שבכל הלילות אָיִן אָנֵךְ מִטְבְּלִין אֶפְיֵלֵךְ פֶּעַם אַחַת הַלַּיְלָה  
הַזֶּה שְׁתֵּי פַעֲמִים.

When we examine the different versions, we must say that those that listed the unleavened bread question first, followed the custom of Israel, while those that listed the dipping question first, followed the Babylonian custom.

Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), written in 1073, in southern Italy, W.H. Lowe's Cambridge manuscript of the Mishna, Bomberg's Jerusalem Talmud of Venice 1523-4, and the Cairo Geniza Haggadah, list the dipping question first, with the version of Israel. This means that they followed the Babylonian custom of listing the dipping question first, but used the wording of the version of

Israel. Mishna Codex Kaufmann A50, however, listed the dipping question first, but used the Babylonian version for this question.

שֶׁבֶכֶל הַלֵּילוֹת אֲנֹ מִטְּבִילִים אֶפִּילוּ פַעַם אַחַת . . . . .

Scholars claim that this manuscript belongs to the Palestinian type. It has been adjusted to a Babylonian type, not only because it lists the dipping question first, but also because it gives the Babylonian form for this question. The scribe made a mark before the word אֲנֹ intending to put the word אֵי before it in the margin, but he forgot.

The Mishna in the Babylonian Talmud Codex Munich 95, which was copied in France in 1343 from a manuscript of 859 C.E., lists the unleavened bread question first, and the dipping question second, with a version similar to the custom of Israel.

שֶׁבֶכֶל הַלֵּילוֹת אֵין אֲנֹ מִטְּבִילִין אֵלא פַעַם אַחַת הַלֵּילָה הַזֶּה שְׁתֵּי פַעַמִּים .

The prayerbooks of Amram Gaon and Saadia Gaon, the Rome, 1480 edition of Maimonides' MISHNEH TORAH, and the HAGGADAH ACCORDING TO THE RITE OF YEMEN, list the dipping question first, with the Babylonian version of the question.

The First printed Mishna of Naples, 1492, lists the unleavened bread question first, with the dipping question as number three, with the version of Israel.

The Bomberg edition of Venice, 1520, of the Tractate Pesahim of the Babylonian Talmud, lists the unleavened bread question first, with the dipping question in the Babylonian version.

In the Maḥzor Vitry of the eleventh century, the unleavened bread question is listed first, while the dipping question is in the Babylonian version. The Rylands Haggadah and the Sarajevo Haggadah of 14th century Spain, the Ashkenazi Haggadah of mid-15th century southern Germany, and the ETZ ḤAYYIM of Rabbi Jacob Ben Yehuda Ḥazan of 13th century England, follow the Maḥzor Vitry, with the unleavened bread question first, and the Babylonian version of the dipping question.

We see that manuscript texts of the Palestinian type were revised by scribes who adjusted them to Babylonian versions and customs.

In the middle of the eighth century C.E., the Babylonian Geonim attempted to foist their authority and their interpretations of the Talmud upon the spiritual leaders of Israel. They aimed to eliminate the Palestinian customs and make Babylonian customs supreme. By the ninth century, Jews in Israel were compelled to "correct" their Talmud to conform with the Babylonian Talmud. In the ninth century, the Babylonian Geonim abolished the roasted meat question of the Haggadah, for it does not appear anymore in the earliest surviving prayerbook of Amram Gaon (d.875 CE). The roasted meat question was replaced with a specific question on bitter herbs because, in Babylonia, they forgot that the dipping question referred to the lettuce or bitter herbs. It was forgotten because they did not eat lettuce, but other vegetables every day, and did not have to dip

even once in hot water during the year.

The Babylonian Geonim also added a fourth question, the reclining question.

שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלין בין יושבין ובין מסובין הלילה הזה  
כולנו מסויבין .

On all nights we eat either sitting or reclining, this night all of us recline.

In addition to the fourth question, they made changes in the order of the Paschal meal. Up to their time, the Paschal meal was eaten first and then the questions were asked. According to the custom in Israel, the meal was eaten before the recitation of the Haggadah because the meal was first in importance and liturgy was secondary.

בני ארץ ישראל עושין מזון עיקר שהכל טפילה למזון.  
People of the land of Israel, make the meal the principle thing, for everything is secondary to the meal.

(אוצר חלוק מנהגים בין בני ארץ ישראל ובין בני בבל, הוצאת  
בנימין מנשה לויין. ירושלים, 1942, עמוד 51)

In Israel, the meal was primary and more important than the liturgy, but in Babylonia, liturgy was primary and the meal was secondary. Therefore, the Babylonian Geonim changed the order of the meal. They ordered that the liturgy or Haggadah and its questions should be read first, and then the meal should be eaten. This change in the recitation of the Haggadah before the meal, initiated in Babylonia, has continued to our days.

The symposium or dinner banquet was, according to Greek and Roman custom, divided into two parts, in which the diners ate during the first part, and talked in the second part. The food was eaten quickly before the discussion, which was the main event of the evening. When the tables were removed, the symposiarch, the leader of the feast, led the discussion on a particular topic. So too, at the Paschal meal, the food was originally eaten first in Israel during the first century, followed by the discussion, on the Pesach festival, introduced by the questions.

In Israel, there were three questions, at first, in the following order: 1) unleavened bread 2) dipping  
3) roasted meat.

In Babylonia, there were three questions, in the following order: 1) dipping 2) unleavened bread  
3) roasted meat.

In the ninth century, the Babylonian Geonim changed the custom and ordered the liturgy and questions to be read before the meal. They abolished the roasted meat question and replaced it with a bitter herbs question.

In Israel, the order for the questions became:  
1) unleavened bread 2) bitter herbs 3) dipping.

In Babylonia, the order for the questions became:  
1) dipping 2) unleavened bread 3) bitter herbs.

During the same century, the Babylonian Geonim added a fourth question, the reclining question, to the existing three listed questions.

The four questions in Babylonia were:

- 1) dipping question
- 2) unleavened bread question
- 3) bitter herbs question
- 4) reclining question.

The four questions in Israel were:

- 1) unleavened bread question
- 2) bitter herbs question
- 3) dipping question
- 4) reclining question.

The European Ashkenazic and Sephardic rites are based on the difference between the rites of Israel and Babylonia. The Ashkenazic rite followed by the Jews of Germany, northern France, England, Poland, and Romania, stems from the rite of Israel. The Sephardic rite, followed by the Jews of Spain and Portugal, southern France, Italy, and Yemen, stems from the rite of Babylonia. This is the history of the order and development of the questions at the Paschal meal for almost 2,000 years.



## THE ROASTED LAMB IN THE PASCHAL MEAL IN THE YEARS AFTER 70 C.E.

When the Jews returned to Israel after the Babylonian Captivity, the population of Judea and Jerusalem was small. In those days, it was possible to offer the Paschal sacrifice in the evening in the courtyard of the Temple in Jerusalem. During the Maccabean period, when thousands of pilgrims from the Hellenistic world made pilgrimages to Israel to celebrate the Feast of Unleavened Bread and eat Paschal lambs, it became difficult to accommodate all the masses in the courtyard of Jerusalem's Temple.

During the reign of Queen Salome Alexandra (76-67 B.C.E.), when the Pharisees realized that many Jews, because of this great congestion in the Temple courtyard, were unable to offer any Paschal sacrifice, they adjusted the Biblical law of Paschal sacrifice to the realities of life, by sanctifying the entire city of Jerusalem. This permitted Jews to eat their Paschal lambs anywhere within the environs of Jerusalem, instead of being limited only to the Temple courtyard.

More Jews were now enabled to participate in the Paschal celebrations. By dividing the masses into groups, more people ate of the Paschal lambs, but each individual's portion of meat, became smaller. The number of sacrifices, slaughterers, and Jews entering the Temple courtyard, was thus reduced.

The Pharisees also extended the time for the slaughter of the Paschal lamb, by moving back the hours of

sacrifice for the Paschal lamb, from the evening, to the afternoon. This was done by reinterpreting the Biblical phrase  $\text{דָּבַרְתֶּם לְפָנָיו$  and  $\text{לְפָנָיו}$  to mean the time before the beginning of the festival, namely the afternoon.

According to Josephus, in his *JEWISH WAR*, "on the occasion of the feast called Passover, at which they sacrifice from the ninth to the eleventh hour, and a little fraternity, as it were, gather round each sacrifice, of not fewer than 10 persons (feasting alone not being permitted), while the companies often include as many as 20..." (Josephus, *JEWISH WAR*, with an English translation, by H.S.J. Thackeray. Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1968. Book VI, 9, 3.)

In Temple times, in the first century C.E., before the year 70, the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb took place in the Temple of Jerusalem, in the afternoon, between 3 and 5 PM. Jews slaughtered this sacrifice in groups, each of which slaughtered one Paschal lamb, with a quorum of at least ten.

The Paschal meal then consisted of a main course, of a Paschal lamb or kid, roasted whole, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, eaten in the city of Jerusalem. Gamaliel II of Yavne (40-c116 C.E.), grandson of Rabban Gamaliel I, who lived in the first half of the first century C.E., in Israel, publicized his grandfather's statement which is quoted in the Pesach Haggadah and in the Mishna, stating that the whole Paschal meal was a sacrificial meal.

רבן גמליאל היה אומר: כל שלא אָמַר שלשה דְּבָרִים אילו  
בפסח לא יצא ידי חובתו: פסח מצה ומרורים.

(Mishna Codex Parma (De Rossi 138), Jerusalem, 1970.

(משנה פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ה)

Rabban Gamaliel used to say: Whoever did not lift up high these three offerings in the Paschal meal, has not fulfilled his obligation: the Paschal lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs.

Offerings to God had to be raised or lifted up high, as a token of their presentation to God.

Even after the Paschal meal became non-sacrificial, after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, in 70 C.E., many people in Israel and in the diaspora, continued for many generations, to eat a whole roasted lamb on the eve of the Pesach festival.

Rabban Gamaliel II of Yavne, was one of those who, after 70 C.E., continued to eat whole roasted lambs at the Paschal meal.

מעשה ברבן גמליאל שאמר לטבי עבדו צא וצלי לנו את  
הפסח על האסכלה.

(משנה, הוצאת לו, פסחים, פרק שביעי, הלכה ב)

A case of Rabban Gamaliel II who said to Tobi, his servant, go out and roast for us the Paschal lamb on the grill.

When the Mishna, in the year 200 C.E., describes the Paschal meal, it lists, in the main or second course, not only the unleavened bread, lettuce, and haroset, but also the Paschal lamb.

הביאו לפניו מצה וחזרת וחרוסת... ובמקדש מביאין לפניו  
גופו של פסח. (משנה הוצאת לו, פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ג)

What does *ובמקדש מביאין לפניו גופו של פסח* mean? About 100 years before the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed, Jews were permitted to eat their Paschal lambs anywhere in Jerusalem. Therefore, the word *מִקְדָּשׁ* cannot mean "Temple". The word *מִקְדָּשׁ = עִיר הַקֹּדֶשׁ =* Jerusalem. This verse should be translated: And in Jerusalem, they bring before him the body of the Paschal lamb.

We learn from this verse in the Mishna that the roasted Paschal lamb was the last item eaten in the main course, not only in the days of the Temple, but also in the year 200 C.E. We notice that the roasted Paschal lamb was eaten then because, after this verse, the Mishna lists 3 questions, and the third question is about the eating of roasted Paschal lamb.

*שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלים בשר עלי שלוק ומבושל  
הלילה הזה פולז עלי.*

That roasted Paschal lamb was eaten after the year 70 C.E., is corroborated by another Mishna.

*מקום שנהגו לאכול עלי בלילי פסחים אוכלים,  
מקום שנהגו שלא לאכול אינן אוכלין.  
(משנה פסחים, הוצאת לו, פרק רביעי, הלכה ד)*

In a place that they are accustomed to eat roasted lamb on Pesach nights, they may eat.

In a place that they are not accustomed to eat, they may not eat.

Rabban Gamaliel of Yavne, in the late first century, permitted the preparation of roasted kids on the nights of Pesach, but the Rabbis did not permit it.

(רבן גמליאל) אף הוא אמר ג דברים לחקל ... ועושיין  
גדי מקולס בלילי פסחים, וחכמים אוטריין.  
(תלמוד ירושלמי, בצה, פרק שני, הלכה ח)

Theodosius (תְּוֹדוֹסִיּוֹס), the spiritual leader of the Roman Jewish community in the late first century C.E., instituted there the eating of whole roasted kids on Pesach nights.

אמר ר' יוסי: תְּוֹדוֹסִיּוֹס איש רומי הנהיג את בני רומי לאכול  
גְּדֵיִים מקוֹלָסִין בלילי פסחים. שלחו לו אלמלא תְּוֹדוֹסִיּוֹס  
אתה גזרנו עליך נדוי שאתה מאכיל את ישראל קדשים בחוץ.  
(תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, פרק רביעי, נג, א)

Rabbi Jose said: the Roman leader Theodosius, accustomed the Roman Jews to eat whole roasted goats on the nights of Pesach. The Rabbis sent messengers to him saying, if you were not Theodosius, we would decree a ban upon you because you make Jews eat sacred offerings outside of Jerusalem.

We see that the Rabbis were opposed to the eating of whole roasted goats because it resembled the eating of whole roasted Paschal lambs, which were permitted to be eaten only in the environs of Jerusalem.

Rabbi Tryphon, or Tarfon, as he is popularly known today, a Tanna of Israel, who flourished in the late first and early second centuries C.E., called a whole roasted goat, a gedi mequlas (גְּדֵיִם מְקוֹלָסִים).

חניא... ל' טרפון קורח גדי מקולס. חנני רבנן: איזוהו  
גדי מקולס דאסור לאכול בלילי פסח בזמן חוזה? כל שצלאן  
כולו כאחד. (תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, עד, א)

An extraneous Mishna... Rabbi Tarfon calls it a gedi mequlas. Our Rabbis taught in an extraneous Mishna: What is a gedi mequlas that it is forbidden to eat on the night of Pesach at this time? Whoever roasted it in its entirety in one piece.

Rabbi Jose the Galilean, a contemporary of Rabbi Tarfon, defined the gedi mequlas, as a kid that was roasted whole, with its head on its legs and entrails.

ל' יוסי הגלילי אומר: אי זהו גדי מקולס? כולו עלי,  
לאשו על כרעיו ועל קרבו.

(תלמוד ירושלמי, הוצאת בומברג, פסחים, פרק ז, לד, א)

What does the word mequlas (מקולס) mean? Scholars have not been able to determine the exact connotation of this word. It seems that the origin of this word is Greek, *Καλος* = praise. When praise was offered, it was accompanied by the raising or stretching out of the hand. I believe that when it is applied to the whole roasted kid, it perhaps meant the stretching out of the legs of the kid outside of the body during the roasting process.

In Israel, in the late first century or early second century C.E., there was a difference of opinion as to how the Paschal offering was to be roasted. Rabbi Meir stated that the legs and entrails were to be put inside the animal during its roasting. Rabbi Aqiba, however, declared that this method resembled cooking, and he held that the legs and entrails should be hung outside the body during the roasting of the paschal offering.

כיצד צולין את הפסח? שפוד שלקימון תתבו מתוך פיו עד  
 בית נקובתו, ונזחן את כרעיו ואת בני מעיו לתוכו,  
 דברי ר' מאיר. ר' עקיבה אומר: כמין בישול הוא זה,  
 אלא תולך חוצה לו.

(משנה, הוצאת Kaufmann A 50, פסחים, פרק ז, הלכה א)

How is the Paschal offering roasted? One thrusts a spit of pomegranate wood from inside its mouth to its anus, and places its legs and its entrails inside it, this is the view of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Akiba says: this is a kind of boiling, rather they hang them outside it (the body).

Aḥai (680-752 C.E.), a Babylonian scholar of the Geonic period, in his work SHE'ILTOT (Responsa), written in Aramaic, and containing lectures on very old Talmudic subject matter that antedates the redaction of the Talmud, offers a definition of gedi mequlas.

תנו רבנן אי זהו גדי מקולס? כל שצלאו כולו כאחד.  
 נחתך ממנו אבר או נשלק ממנו אבר אין זה גדי מקולס.  
 (שאלתות דרב אחאי גאון. דפוס ויניציה, 1546, תצלום ירושלים, 1971,

סימן פ, דף לג, א)

Our Rabbis taught: What is a gedi mequlas? Whoever roasted it in its entirety in one piece. If a limb was cut from it, or a limb from it was stewed, it is not a whole roasted kid.

This means that a whole roasted kid had to be roasted in one piece, without any limbs removed, and with its

legs on the outside of the body.

According to the Tosephta, Jews in Israel, in the latter part of the second century C.E., were still eating whole roasted Paschal offerings in the evening of the Pesach. The word for Paschal offering is still פֶּסַח .

בחנות של פוי בלוד והיה ר' פנחס בן יאיר יושב...  
אמר... מזכרים קטים בבטילקאות שלהן וטובלין ואוכלין  
את פסחיהן לערב.

Tosephta based on the (תוספתא, מסכת אהלות, פרק יח, הלכה יח.  
Erfurt and Vienna Codices, by M. S. Zuckermann, Jerusalem, 1963 )

In the shop of Pazi in Lydda, Rabbi Pinehas Ben Yair, used to sit... he said... (Jews) sell wheat in their (non-Jewish) exchanges, then bathe and eat their PASCHAL OFFERINGS in the evening.

The Rabbis were opposed to the eating of whole roasted Paschal lambs or goats by Jews on the night of Pesach because, since the Temple was destroyed, Jews were not permitted to eat sacred offerings outside of Jerusalem. The Christian Church also objected to Jews eating whole roasted Paschal lambs or goats for the following reasons: 1) Sacrifices could only be made in Jerusalem. 2) Since the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed, all offerings should have ceased. 3) The Paschal lamb to be roasted was arranged on the spit like a cross. 4) This sacrifice was a type of Christ. 5) The roasted lamb was a figure of the suffering of Jesus on the cross.



Justin Martyr, born in Schechem, Israel, about 100 C.E., in his book *DIALOGUE WITH TRYPHO*, composed between 155 and 161 C.E., summarized the Christian objections to the Jewish continuation to eat whole roasted Paschal lambs on Pesach night.

40.1 The mystery therefore of the sheep, which God has bidden you sacrifice as the Passover, was a type of Christ....

40.2 God does not allow the sheep of the Passover to be sacrificed at any other place than that in which His name has been called, knowing that there would come a time after Christ had suffered, when even the place of Jerusalem would be handed over to your enemies, and all offerings should completely cease to be.

40.3 And that sheep which was commanded to be roasted whole was a figure of the suffering of the cross, by which Christ was to suffer. For when the sheep is being roasted it is roasted arranged in fashion like the fashion of the cross, for one spit is pierced straight from the lower parts to the head, and one again at the back, to which also the paws of the sheep are fastened.

46.2 (Trypho replied) No, for we are aware, as you said, that it is not possible to slay a passover-sheep elsewhere than in Jerusalem.

(Justin Martyr. *THE DIALOGUE WITH TRYPHO*, translated

by A. Lukyn Williams. London, 1930. pp.79, 80, 90 )

According to the Pauline interpretation of Christianity, Jesus was the final Paschal lamb, therefore no more Paschal lambs were needed to be sacrificed and eaten. Those Rabbis who objected to Jews eating whole roasted Paschal lambs, believed that since the Temple was destroyed in 70 C.E., no more lambs could be sacrificed and eaten. If they couldn't be sacrificed in the Temple, they certainly could not be permitted to be eaten outside of Jerusalem. Other Rabbis, however, believed that whole roasted Paschal lambs may be eaten outside of Jerusalem. In the late first century C.E., Rabban Gamaliel II of Yavne, Israel, and in Rome, they ate whole roasted Paschal lambs.

אמר רבי יוֹסֵה, תְּזוּזוּס אִישׁ רוֹמִי הִנְהִיג אֶת בְּנֵי רוֹמִי לִיקַח  
 טְלָאִים בְּלֵילֵי פֶסַחִים וְעוֹשִׂין אוֹתָן מִקְּוִלְסִין . . . שְׁקוֹרִין  
 אוֹתָן פְּסָחִין .

(חוספתא ע"פ כתב יד ווינה, הוצאת שאול ליברמן, ניו יורק, 1962.)

יוֹסֵה טוֹב, פֶּרֶק ב', 15, עמוד 291 )

Rabbi Jose said: the Roman leader Theodosius, accustomed the Roman Jews to take lambs on the nights of Pesach, and prepare them roasted whole.... for they call them Paschal sacrifices.

In order to counter the Pauline Christian interpretation of the Pesach festival, Gamaliel II of Yavne, attempted to preserve the traditional Jewish celebration and interpretation of this holiday. He changed the name of this festival from the Festival of Unleavened Bread, to the Festival of Pesach, to show that God was still

continuing His covenant with the Jewish People and that they were still under His protection. Gamaliel II authorized the creation of a new Pesach liturgy or Haggadah. He continued the Paschal meal in the same manner as before the time of the Temple's destruction. This meant the continuation of eating whole roasted lambs to show that they were still needed in order to fulfill the requirements for celebrating this festival, even though the Temple did not exist anymore. To show that the whole roasted lamb was still an offering to God or sacrifice, he stipulated that it should be raised up high during the meal.

רבן גמליאל היה אומר: כל שלא אמר שלשה דברים אלו בפסח, לא יצא ידי חובתו: פסח, מצה ומרורים.

(תלמוד ירושלמי, תצלוס הוצאת בומברג, 1523-4, ניו יורק, 1944.)

(פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ה')

Scholars and commentators have assumed that after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, the Paschal meal became a non-sacrificial one. This is incorrect. We must notice that the word דברים in Rabban Gamaliel's statement does not have the usual connotation. In this instance, דברים = offering, sacrifice. Thus, Rabban Gamaliel II, by instructing Jews to raise high ( אמר ) the Paschal lamb, unleavened bread and bitter herbs as offerings to God, is telling us that it is a sacrificial meal, continuing the tradition of Temple days. The Paschal meal was sacrificial, but the new Paschal liturgy was non-sacrificial. We must not confuse them.

I believe that there was another reason for continuing

to eat whole roasted Paschal lambs after the year 70 CE. Justin Martyr, who lived in the 2nd century, gives us a clue. He said to Trypho: "The MYSTERY therefore of the sheep, which God has bidden you sacrifice as the Pass-over..." In Rabbinic literature, the Paschal sacrifice is also called a mystery which was given only to Israel.

When referring to Exodus 12:43-44, concerning the Paschal offering that was not to be eaten by any stranger before he was circumcised, the Midrash stated that this sacrifice was a mystery reserved only for the Jews,

אמר להם הקדוש ברוך הוא: אִמָּה אַחֲרַת אֵל יִתְעַרְבוּ בּוֹ וְאֵל  
יָדְעוּ מִסֵּתֵיךָ אֵלָּא אַתֶּם לַעֲצַמְכֶם.

מדרש שמות רבה, מפורש בידי משה אריה מירקין, חל אביב, 1972.

פרשה יט, ו, עמוד 226

The Holy One, Blessed Be He, said to them: A foreign nation should not meddle in it, and not know its mysteries, only you yourselves.

Another Midrash also stated that circumcision was a mystery revealed only to Abraham.

ואיזה סודו של הקב"ה? זה מילה. שלא גילה הקב"ה  
מִסְתֵיךָ של מילה אלא לאברהם.

(מדרש תנחומא, הוצאת שלמה בובר, וילנה, 1885. כרך ב, לך לד, ע' 79)

And what is the secret of the Holy One, Blessed Be He?

It is circumcision. For the Holy One, Blessed Be He, did not reveal the mystery of circumcision but to Abraham.

מִסְתֵיךָ = μυστήριον = mystery

Thus, according to Justin Martyr and the Rabbis, the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb was a mystery. Circumcision was a mystery too. The Pauline Gospel was also presented

as a mystery. "... to make known the mystery of the gospel" (Ephesians 6:19). "...to speak the mystery of Christ.." (Colossians 4:3). "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery" (I Corinthians 2:7).

During the Hellenistic period, a great propaganda literature for Judaism was created. A large number of converts were obtained in Israel and the Diaspora, during the Second Temple period, from the widespread missionary movement. Jewish missionary endeavors were geared to individuals rather than masses. The NEW TESTAMENT mentioned this. "Woe to you teachers of the law and Pharisees... you travel over land and sea to win a single convert..." (Matthew 23:15).

In the Roman period, Jews were actively and successfully engaged in seeking converts to Judaism. Since the time of the Roman emperor Augustus (BCE 27-14 CE), the Roman Jewish community accepted a substantial number of converts as members. Converts to Judaism were welcomed not only in Italy, but also in Israel and Babylonia. Even after the defeat of Israel in the war with Rome, many noble converts joined Judaism during the reign of the Roman emperor Domitian (81-96 CE).

In the first century CE, a convert to Judaism had to undergo the mystery of circumcision, and baptism or ritual immersion, in order to be permitted to partake of the mystery of the Paschal sacrifice.

גַּר שְׁנַתְּגִייר עֵרֵב פִּסְחִים, בֵּית שְׁמִי אֹמְרִים טוֹבֵל וְאוֹכֵל  
פִּסְחוֹ לְעֵרֵב ... (מִשְׁנָה, הוֹצֵאת לֵוִי, פִּסְחִים, פֶּרֶק שְׁמִינִי, הִלְכוֹת ח)

A proselyte who converted on the eve of Pesach, the school of Shammai says, he is BAPTIZED, then eats his PASCHAL SACRIFICE in the evening..

Jose Ben Ḥalafta, a Tanna of Israel, who flourished in the second century CE, also held that a convert to Judaism, had to undergo circumcision and baptism. The same view was expressed in the third century CE by two Amoraim of Israel, Rabbi Ḥiyya Bar Abba and Rabbi Johanan Bar Nappaḥa. From the same text we learned that a convert's circumcision and baptism took place in the daytime, with a court of three presiding over the exercises.

א"ר חייא בר אבא א"ר יוחנן לעולם אינו גר עד שימול  
 ויטבול ... דאמר רבי יוסי תרתי בעינן ... ש"מ גר  
 צריך שלשה ... וש"מ איך מטפילין גר בלילה.  
 (תלמוד בבלי, יבמות, פרק רביעי, מו, ב)

Rabbi Ḥiyya Bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Johanan:

In all circumstances, he is not a convert until he is circumcised and BAPTIZED ... for Rabbi Jose said, we need both... learn from this, a convert needs (a court of) three... and learn from this, we do not BAPTIZE a convert at night.

Rabbi Eleazar Ben Pedat, an Amora of Israel, of the third century CE, declared that the Jews were scattered in the world in order to make converts.

דאמר רבי אלעזר: לא הגלה הקדוש ברוך הוא את ישראל  
 לבין האומות אלא כדי שיתוספו עליהם גוים.  
 (תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, פז, ב)

And Rabbi Eleazar said: The Holy One, Blessed Be He, exiled the Jews among the nations in order that converts would join them.

The Rabbis of the Talmudic period were well disposed to proselytes joining Judaism. The continuation of Jews eating whole roasted Paschal lambs after 70 CE, which were sacrificial, in Israel and in the Diaspora, is related to the search of Jewish religious leaders to thwart the missionary propaganda of Pauline Christianity and its attempt to expropriate the Jewish festival of Pesach, and to compete with Christianity in gaining new converts for Judaism.

In order to be a recognized convert to Judaism, the proselyte had to be circumcised and baptized. Then he was permitted to participate in the Paschal meal and eat from the whole roasted Paschal lamb, which was sacrificial. The Paschal lamb was thus a means to refute Pauline Christian theology which claimed that since Jesus was the Paschal sacrifice, no more whole roasted Paschal sacrifices were needed.

When Jews and converts to Judaism, ate these Paschal sacrifices or lambs, they demonstrated their opposition to Pauline Christian propaganda. Therefore, all the scholars who claimed that after the year 70 CE, only non-sacrificial Paschal meals were eaten, have not recognized the sacrificial character of these meals.

In the fourth century, the Babylonian Amora Raba, was one of those rabbis who held that unleavened bread and bitter herbs should be lifted up high during the Paschal meal in order to fulfill the requirements for

celebrating the Pesach festival. Roasted lamb, however, should not be lifted up high because it would be considered as a sacrifice, and holy sacrifices are not to be eaten outside of Jerusalem.

אמר רבא: מצה צריך להגביה  
 ומרֹךְ צריך להגביה  
 בשר אין צריך להגביה  
 ולא עוד אלא שנראה כאִוְכַל קדשים בחוץ.  
 (תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, קטז, ב)

Raba said: He must lift up high the unleavened bread  
 and he must lift up high the bitter herb  
 he must not lift up high the meat  
 moreover, it would appear as though he ate holy  
 sacrifices outside (of Jerusalem).

It appears that whole roasted Paschal lambs were still eaten in spite of the opposition of some rabbis. From the fourth century, the Christian emperors of Rome, prohibited Jews from proselytizing, and conversion to Judaism now became a crime. As a result of the growing Rabbinic opposition, coupled with the constant Christian opposition, and the decline in the number of proselytes entering Judaism, the consumption of whole roasted Paschal lambs decreased.

In the oldest known Haggadah which is from the Cairo Geniza, the roasted meat question still appears, but in the 9th century, the Babylonian Geonim eliminated the roasted meat question from the Paschal liturgy. Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), in his code MISHNEH TORAH, completed in 1180, stated that we do not say the roasted



meat question anymore because we have no sacrifices.

בזמן הזה אינו אומר "והלילה הזה כולו עלי" שאין לנו קרבן. (משנה תורה לרבינו משה בן מימון. מהדורה מצולמת מדפוס רומי 1480, ירושלים, 1955. ספר זמנים, הלכות חמץ ומצה: פרק שמיני, עמוד קמ"ד)

What did the Mishna mean when when it stated that, "In a place that they are accustomed to eat roasted lamb on Pesach nights, they may eat".

מקום שנהגו לאכול עלי בלילי פסחים אוכלים. (משנה, פסחים, הוצאת לו, פרק רביעי, הלכה ד)

If the Rabbis did not approve of the practice of eating whole roasted Paschal lambs outside of Jerusalem, what were they in favor of?

In the Jerusalem Talmud, a Mishna is cited to show that at the time that the body of the Paschal lamb was brought to the diners at the Paschal meal in Jerusalem, two dishes were brought to the diners outside of Jerusalem.

חני ובגבולין צריכין שני חבשילין, אחד זכר לפסח, ואחד זכר לחגיגה. (תלמוד ירושלמי, תעלום הוצאת בומברג, ניו יורק, 1944, מסכת פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ג, לו, ד)

He learns from his Mishna: And outside of Jerusalem, we need two dishes, one in memory of the Paschal lamb offering, and another in memory of the Hagiya offering.

Since both of these sacrifices were roasted, it would be logical to say that these two dishes also consisted of roasted meat in their memory. This Mishna, however, did not specify which part of the lamb was roasted for these two dishes.

In the Babylonian Talmud, there are differences of opinion concerning these two dishes. Hezekiah, an Amora of Israel of the third century, held that they could be even a fish and the egg on it. Rabbi Joseph, a Babylonian Amora of the mid-third century, thought that two kinds of meat were needed, one in memory of the Paschal lamb offering, and another in memory of the Hagiga offering. Rabina, a Babylonian Amora of the 4th to early 5th century, believed that the two dishes could even be a bone and its broth.

מאי שני תבשילין? ... חזקיה אמר: אפילו דג וביצה שעליו.  
 רב יוסף אמר: צריך שני מיני בשר, אחד זכר לפסח, ואחד  
 זכר לחגיגה. רבינא אמר: אפילו גרמא ובישולה.  
 ( תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, קיד, ב )

Through the ninth century, the Rabbis still had not made a definite decision concerning the items that were to be used in the Paschal meal in memory of the Paschal sacrifice offered in Jerusalem's Temple. Jews thus had a wide latitude in choosing what they wanted to use for these two dishes at the Paschal meal. This is demonstrated by the earliest surviving prayerbook, that of Amram Gaon of Babylonia, who flourished in the ninth century. His definition of the two dishes, is nothing more than a quotation of the views of the Rabbis mentioned in the passage from the Babylonian Talmud.

By the twelfth century, many Rabbis were in favor of the opinion of the Babylonian Rabbi Joseph of the mid-third century, that two kinds of roasted meat were

needed, one in memory of the roasted Paschal lamb offering, and another in memory of the roasted Hagiga offering.

In his code, HaMANHIG, Abraham Ben Nathan Yarḥi (1155-1215), of Lunel, in Provence, France, stated that the two dishes were two kinds of roasted meat, and that it was customary in France and Provence, to serve diners at the Paschal meal, the roasted shank of a lamb, in memory of the ancient Paschal lamb.

ולוקח את הסל שבו שני תבשילין והן שני מיני תבשיל  
בשר הצלי זכר לפסח שהיה צלי... ונהגו בצרפת ופרובינצא  
לצלוח זרוע השֶׁה...  
(המנהיג מאת אברהם ברבי נתן הירחי, הוצאת יצחק רפאל, ירושלים,  
1978, כך שני, הלכות פסח, עמודים 2-481)

In the thirteenth century, Rabbi Asher Ben Saul of Lunel, France, in his BOOK OF CUSTOMS, composed about 1210, supplies additional information on the preparation of the roasted shank in memory of the Paschal offering, but he substitutes a roasted egg in memory of the Hagiga offering.

נהגו כל ישראל לצלוח הזרוע... ואין צולין אותה  
בשפוד של ברזל אלא או בשפוד של עץ זכר לפסח או  
בגחלים, גם צולים ביצה עמו על גבי גחלים הוא זכר  
לחגיגת ארבעה עשר שנאכלת צלי.  
(ספר המנהגות לר' אשר ב"ר שאול מלונל, בתוך: ספרן של ראשונים  
מאת שמחה אסף, ירושלים, 1935, עמוד 156)

All Jews are accustomed to roast the shank... And they do not roast it with an iron spit, but either with a wooden spit, in memory of the Paschal lamb, or with coals.

They also roast an egg with it on the coals, which is in memory of the Hagiga sacrifice of the 14th (of Nisan), which was eaten roasted.

In the same century, in Egypt, David HaNagid (1224-1300), the grandson of Moses Maimonides, in his commentary on the Pesach Haggadah, stated that it is customary for Jews to use the roasted shank of cattle in memory of the Paschal lamb, and a roasted egg in memory of the Hagiga offering.

...משחרב בית המקדש בטל קרבן הפסח וקרבן חגיגה,  
 נהגו בחו"ל לקחת בשר צלוי והוא זרוע הבהמה,  
 ועושים ב' מיני מאכל זכר לפסח וזכר לחגיגה.  
 (מדרש רבי דוד הנגיד על הגדה של פסח מיוחס לרבי דוד ב"ר אברהם  
 בן הרמב"ם. ירושלים, 1981, עמוד 44)

After the Temple was destroyed, the Paschal offering and the Hagiga offering were abolished, it was customary outside of Israel, to take roasted meat, which is the shank of cattle, and they make two kinds of dishes in memory of the Paschal and Hagiga sacrifices.

וכיום ... נהגו כל ישראל בליל א' של פסח להכין  
 השלחן ... שמים עליו בשר צלוי כל שהוא ומלח וביצה  
 צלוייה... (IBID.,p.29)

And as for today... all Jews are accustomed on the first night of Pesach to prepare the table... they put on it the smallest quantity of roasted meat, salt, and a roasted egg.

In 13th century Italy, Rabbi Zedekiah, the son of Doctor Abraham, in his code SHIBOLE HaLEKET, compiled

in Rome, about 1240, stipulated that the two meatdishes may be even of one kind, one, in memory of the Paschal lamb, is to be roasted, and one, in memory of the Hagiga offering, is to be boiled.

יש שם שני מיני בשר אפילו ממין אחד כגון האחד צלי  
ואחד מבושל, אחד לזכר פסח ואחד לזכר חגיגה.  
(שבלי הלקט השלם מאת רבינו צדקיה ב"ר אברהם הרופא, הוצאת שלמה  
בובר, תצלום וילנה, 1886, ניויורק, 1959, סדר פסחים, עמוד 184)

In 14th century Spain, Rabbi David Abudarham, stated in his code, written in Seville, 1340, that the shank should be roasted on coals because the Paschal offering was originally roasted only on a spit of pomegranate wood.

צולין הזרוע על הגחלים מפני שהפסח אין צולין אותו  
אלא בשפוד של עץ רמוך.  
(אבודרהם השלם מאת דוד ב"ר יוסף ב"ר דוד אבודרהם, ירושלים,  
1959, עמוד 217)

The Kaufmann Haggadah, from 14th century Spain, records that the two dishes were: a shank of a lamb roasted on the fire, and an egg boiled in water.

וישׁים בסל שני תבשילין כגון זרוע שֶׁה צלוי באש וביצה  
מבושלת במים.

(The Kaufmann Haggadah: Facsimile Edition of Ms 422 of the Kaufmann Collection in the Oriental Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, 1957)

In 14th century Provence, southern France, Rabbi Aaron HaCohen of Lunel, stated in his code ORHOT HAYYIM, that the two dishes were: one, in memory of the Paschal

lamb, which is roasted, and another, in memory of the Hagiga sacrifice, which is boiled. He said that it is our custom to make a roast of a shank of cattle, which is not roasted on a spit, but on coals because the Paschal lamb was roasted only on a spit of pomegranate wood.

וְב' חבשילין א' צלי ואחד מבושל. הצלי זכר לפסח והמבושל  
 זכר לחגיגה. ומנהגנו לעשות צלי מזרוע בהמה... ואין  
 צולין אותו בשפוד רק על הגחלים והטעם לפי שהוא זכר  
 לפסח והפסח לא היה נצלה אלא בשפוד של רימון.  
 (ארחות חיים ל' אהרן הכהן מלונגיל, תצלום, Florence, 1750, הלכות  
 ליל הפסח, סניף יד, עט, ב)

Blood atonement was important in Biblical Judaism, but in Rabbinic Judaism after 70 CE, it was replaced by atonement through prayer, repentance and charity. In Christianity, however, immense power was still ascribed to blood, when the blood of Jesus took the place of the blood of the sacrifices, acting as an atonement for sins and as the means of communion with God.

Medieval Christian Europe believed in the notion of the curing or healing properties of blood. Jews, well before the 12th century, were held to be magicians whose magic was demonic. In observing the Pesach festival, Jews were persecuted because they were accused of practicing hideous traditions against Christians.

Among the consilia of the canonist Oldrado da Ponte of Avignon, during the years 1320-1335, there was an

accusation against the Jews of Crete, which reappeared in the middle of the 15th century. This accusation was similar to the one that Justin Martyr made against the Jews in the second century CE. The charge was that Jews slaughtered lambs for the Pesach holiday in a manner which symbolized the crucifixion. When a crucified lamb was found near the Candia ghetto in 1449, it was taken as a manifestation of Jewish contempt for Christianity.

The earliest case of the blood accusation against Jews in connection with the Pesach festival occurred in 1144, in Norwich, England. Other accusations in 12th century England, took place in Gloucester, Bury St. Edmunds, Bristol, and Winchester.

English Jewry followed the customs of northern France because it stemmed from the Franco-German area. In thirteenth century England, no roasted meat was eaten on the first two nights of Pesach.

הר"ם (הרב משה) מלונדרש אומר . . . עתה אין אנו אוכלין  
צלי.

(עץ חיים: הלכות פסקים ומנהגים מאת רבי יעקב בן יהודה חזן מלונדרש,  
ירושלים, 1962, כרך ראשון, עמוד 322)

From his saying עַתָּה = now, we may conclude that previously, the eating of roasted meat was acceptable.

In the thirteenth century, the Jews of Germany were overwhelmed by persecutions and massacres growing out of the blood libel. Rabbi Jacob Ben Asher (1269-1340), stated, in his code ARBA TURIM, that in Germany, Jews

were not accustomed to eat roasted meat on the first two nights of Pesach.

אשכנז מקום שנהגו שלא לאכול עלי הוא.  
(ארבע טורים מאת יעקב בן אשר, ניויורק, 1981, טור אורח חיים,  
הלכות פסח, סעיף תעו )

Upon examining many of the codes of laws and customs written by German rabbis, it appears that eating roasted meat on the first two nights of the Pesach festival, was prohibited among German Jews.

The German rabbi Joseph Ben Moshe, born in Höchstädt a. d. Donau, near Augsburg, compiled in 1470, the code LEKET YOSHER, a collection of the legal decisions and customs of his teacher, Rabbi Israel Isserlein (1390-1460), born in Regensburg, Germany, and died in Neustadt, Austria. Rabbi Joseph recorded that his teacher held that the two dishes, one, in memory of the Paschal lamb, and the other, in memory of the Hagiga offering, had to be a kind of meat, but he was not particular whether they were roasted or boiled, for thus his teachers were accustomed to do.

ודוקא מין בשר מביאים זכר לפסח ולחגיגה דהרבה גאונים  
פסקו כרב יוסף דמצריך מין בשר. אמנם פר"י (פרש דב  
ישראל) שאין קפידא אם הם צלויים או מבושלים, וכך נהגו  
דבותי ...

(לקט יושר לר' יוסף ב"ר משה, כולל מנהגים פסקי הלכות וחשובות של  
דבו הגאון בעל תרומת הדשן. הוצאת יעקב פריימאן, ברלין, 1903, כרך  
ראשון, עמוד 90 )

Rabbi Isserlein was a German Jew, by birth and education, who was a spiritual leader in Austria. When he



said that his teachers were accustomed to eat either roasted or boiled meat, it means that in Germany, roasted meat was originally permitted.

A contemporary of Isserlein, was Rabbi Isaac Tirnau (born between 1380 and 1385), who recorded the customs of the Jews of Austria, Hungary and Moravia, in his BOOK OF CUSTOMS. He stated that in Austria, it was customary to eat roasted meat on the first two nights of the Pesach festival.

וְנִהְיֶה לִי לֶאֱכֹל עָלַי בְּמִדֵּי נִתְיָנוּ .

(ספר המנהגים לרבינו אייזיק טירנא, הוצאת שלמה י. שפיצר,

ירושלים, 1979, עמוד 53)

In Germany and Central Europe, the Black Death of 1348, brought many political, economic, social, cultural, and religious changes. In its aftermath, many Jewish communities in the Holy Roman Empire were destroyed. About fifty per cent of Germany's Jewish population died in the Black Death. The ghetto had its beginning during the second half of the 14th century.

Since many of the knowledgeable scholars in Germany perished in the Black Death, or were killed afterwards in the pogroms, their replacements now became salaried officials, who were not that acquainted with the Jewish laws and customs as their predecessors had been. Because of their lack of knowledge, these new spiritual leaders adopted more stringent religious practices. Each community and its rabbi adopted the practice that they favored. Thus, many new codes of Jewish law came into being. Customs and practices that were current at

the beginning of the 14th century were changed or suspended and became unknown in the 15th and 16th centuries.

Since the 13th century, the custom has been to use one meat dish, in memory of the Paschal sacrifice, and an egg, in memory of the Hagiga sacrifice.

Joseph Caro (1488-1575), the Spanish rabbi who migrated to Safed, Israel, stated in his code, SHULHAN ARUK, that "it was customary for the meat to be a shank, roasted on coals, and the egg to be cooked". Moses Isserles (c1525-1572), one of the leading scholars of Polish Jewry, held that the egg had to be roasted, for this was the custom in his city Cracow.

ושני תבשילין אחד זכר לפסח ואחד זכר לחגיגה ונהגו  
 בבשר וביצה. והבשר נהגו שיהיה זרוע ונהגו שהבשר יהיה  
 עלי על הגחלים והביצה תהיה מבושלת. רמ"א: צלוייה, וכך  
 נוהגין בעירנו.

(שלחן ערוך: אורח חיים, ניוירק, 1976, הלכות פסח, סימן תעג, טע"ף ד)

Rabbi Solomon Luria (1510-1573), the great Polish decisor, stated in his RESPONSA, that, "one should take the two dishes, namely the shank and the egg, and eat them, but be careful that none should be roasted, for it is prohibited to eat even a roasted egg on the night of Pesach... It is the Ashkenazic custom to roast the shank and the egg because they do not eat them, but preserve them for the second night of Pesach. I think that it is a strange custom and against the custom of the Talmud... And in my opinion, this custom became widespread because they hold that one needs especially

a shank, and its omission invalidates the act. And because of this, they preserve the shank for the second night of Pesach and do not eat (it on the first night). And therefore they roast it so that they shouldn't eat it".

שיקח שני התבשילין דהיינו הזרוע והביצה ויאכלם, ויזחר  
שלא יהיה שום אחד צלוי, דהא אפילו ביצה צלוייה אסור  
לאכול באותה לילה... מנהג אשכנז שצולין הזרוע והביצה  
היינו לפי שאין אוכלין אותה ומשמרים אות' לליל שנייה.  
מנהג זר הוא בעיני והוא נגד מנהג התלמוד... ולפי דעתי  
נתפשט המנהג לפי שסוברים שצריך דוקא זרוע וזולתו מעכב.  
ומשום הכי שומרים הזרוע לליל שניה ואינם אוכלין. ומשום  
הכי צולין אותה כדי שלא יאכלוהו.

(שאלות ותשובות מהדש"ל, תצלום למברג, 1859, ניו יורק, 1958, תשובה פח)

From this responsum, we observed that, in the 16th century, Rabbi Solomon Luria held that the shank, in memory of the Paschal lamb offering, should be boiled, and the egg, in memory of the Hagiga sacrifice, should likewise be boiled. He also believed that one must not necessarily use a shank to fulfill the requirement of remembering the ancient Paschal sacrifice.

Rabbi Abraham Danzig (1748-1820), who was born in Danzig and died in Wilno, wrote in his popular code of Jewish law, HAYYE ADAM, that "one must be careful not to intend to roast the shank for the Pesach... and even calf meat or fowl meat... but roasted fish and eggs are permissible".

צריך לזחר שלא יאמר לצלות זרוע לפסח... ואפילו  
בשר עגל או עוף... אבל דגים וביצים צלויים מותר.

(חיי אדם מאת אברום דאנציג, ירושלים, תש"ד, עמוד 449)

According to Rabbi Danzig, one may boil a shank, in memory of the Paschal lamb sacrifice, but not roast it. Even meat from a calf or fowl, may not be roasted, while fish and eggs are permitted to be roasted.

The Hungarian rabbi, Solomon Ganzfried (1804-1886), stated in his popular law code, KITZUR SHULHAN ARUK, that "we are accustomed to eat eggs... we do not eat roasted meat on both nights of Pesach, even of fowl, and if one boils and roasts it afterwards in a pot, we do not eat it".

נוהגים לאכול ביצים... אין אוכלין בשר צלי בשתי הלילות,  
אפילו של עוף, ואפילו בשלוהו ואחר כך צלאוהו בקדירה,  
אין אוכלין.

(קצור שלחן ערוך מאת שלמה גאנצפריד, הוצאת רב דוד פעלדמאן,

Manchester, 1951, סדר ליל פסח, טעיף ח)

In the 18th century, in Lithuania, Poland and Germany, Jews used a neck of fowl as the shank, in remembrance of the Paschal offering.

The use of fowl meat was already mentioned in the code of Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Joel HaLevi (1140-1235), of Western Germany, who opposed the use of roasted fowl meat on the first two nights of Pesach, in memory of the ancient Paschal sacrifice.

וראיחי בני אדם שאוכלים בשר עוף צלי בלילי  
פסח.

(ספר ראבי"ה לרבינו אליעזר ברבי יואל הלוי, הוצאת אבי גדור

אפטוביצר, ניו יורק, 1983, כך שני, טעיף תצח, עמוד 121)

In the East, Yemenite Jews use, for the two dishes, two pieces of meat, one roasted and one boiled, but they are not particular about taking only shank meat.

...שני נתחי בשר (אין מקפידים לקחת דוקא בשר זרוע) אחד עלי ואחד מבושל.

(הליכות תימן: חיי היהודים בצנעא ובנחיה מאת יוסף קאפח, מהדורה שניה, ירושלים, 1963, עמוד 19)

In most Ashkenazic Jewish communities today, a roasted piece of chicken neck or wing or little shank bone is placed on the plate, not to eat, but to look at, in memory of the Paschal lamb offering.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR CUPS OF WINE IN THE PASCHAL MEAL

The obligation to thank God for his bounty at the conclusion of a meal, was based, according to the Rabbis, on the verse in Deuteronomy 8:10

וּאֲכַלְתָּ וּשְׂבַעְתָּ וּבֵרַכְתָּ אֶת ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ.

When you eat and drink, then bless the Lord your God.

A parallel to our verse in Deuteronomy is:

Joel 2:26

וְאֲכַלְתֶּם אֲכֹל וּשְׂבֹעַ  
וְהִלַּחְתֶּם אֶת שֵׁם ה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם.

When eating and drinking

then praise the name of the Lord your God.

Thus, after eating and drinking, one should bless the Lord.

Greek princes and chieftains in the days of Homer (c800-700 BCE), made sacrifices, and feasted on broiled meat, bread, and drank mellow wine copiously the whole day long till sundown. Meat was eaten only when sacrifices were made. It was usually eaten with bread and washed down with wine.

King Ashurbanipal of Assyria (668-627 BCE), celebrated his victory over Te-Umman, with a feast, in which Ishtar, the goddess of wine and love, bade him to eat food, drink strong wine, make music, and exalt her divinity.

The Bible mentioned too that grace was recited also before the meal. Guests would not eat of a sacrifice before the prophet Samuel blessed it.

1 Samuel 9:13

כִּי תִמְצֵאֵנּוּ אֹתוֹ בְּטֶרֶם יַעֲלֶה הַבֶּמְחָה לֵאכֹל  
 כִּי לֹא יֵאכֹל הָעָם עַד בֹּאֵי  
 כִּי הוּא יְבָרֵךְ הַזֶּבֶח  
 אַחֲרָי כֵן יֵאכְלוּ הַקָּרְבָּנִים .

For you will reach him before he goes up to the shrine to eat  
 For the people will not eat until he comes  
 Because he blesses the sacrifice  
 Afterwards the guests eat.

In the pseudepigraphic work, the LETTER OF ARISTEAS, written in the second half of the second century BCE, in the Hellenistic period, recorded that during the reign of King Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-246 BCE), when Jewish elders were invited to a royal banquet, an old priest named Eleazar said grace before the meal.

line 182 ...the lord high steward, Dorotheus,...  
 was the special officer appointed to look  
 after the Jews...in the matter of drinking,  
 eating, and reclining... in accordance  
 with their own customs...

line 183 ...which were in use among his Jewish guests.

line 184 ... Eleazar, the oldest of the Jewish priests  
 ...rose up and made a remarkable prayer.

line 185 ...and then they turned to the enjoyment  
 of the banquet which had been prepared.

(LETTER OF ARISTEAS in THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE  
 OLD TESTAMENT, edited by R.H.Charles. Oxford, 1976. V.2, lines  
 182-185)

Rabbi Yohanan Bar Nappaha, a Tanna of third century CE Israel, is quoted in the Babylonian Talmud, saying that the men of the Great Synagogue instituted for the Jews, benedictions, prayers, Kiddush, and Habdalah.

אמר רבי יוחנן: אנשי פְּנִיטָה הגדולה תקנו להם לישראל  
ברכות תפלות קדושות והבדלות (תלמוד בבלי, ברכות, לג, א.)

Who were the men of the Great Synagogue? They were the leaders of the early Pharisees in Jerusalem, who arose in the Hellenistic period. These early Pharisees were highly influenced by their Hellenistic environment. They as well as the leaders of the Jewish aristocracy, priesthood and military men in Jerusalem, as early as the third century BCE, acquired some Greek education and were acquainted with Greek culture and language. Thus, Judaism in the Hellenistic period, in the Diaspora as well as in Palestine, became Hellenistic Judaism.

Jews as part of the Hellenistic world became acquainted also with Greek table manners and dietary habits for meals. Among the Greeks, men poured libations for themselves and their families before and after meals. As a result of their Hellenization in the Greek period, Jews adopted private rituals such as the cup of blessing which was a blessing pronounced over a cup of wine, along with a blessing over bread, before and after meals.

Wine is first mentioned in Jewish private ritual in the Hellenistic period. The practice of drinking wine at the Paschal meal is first recorded in the Book of JUBILEES, written between 161 and 140 BCE.

"And all Israel was eating the flesh of the paschal lamb, and



DRINKING THE WINE, and was lauding and blessing, and giving thanks to the Lord.." (JUBILEES 49:6, in THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE O.T., edited by R.H.Charles. Oxford, 1976, V.2, p.80).

In Hellenistic Judaism, wine was considered a heavenly drink. Those who blessed and drank a full cup of wine, would share not only the bounty of this world, but also divine life and immortality in the world to come, the Messianic kingdom. Wine became for Jews a Messianic symbol, namely that by drinking the cup of wine, one would partake of the Messiah himself and usher in the Messianic kingdom. The cup was the true mystery, and according to Philo, only the initiated or those purified by Jewish law, may be told about this sacred mystic rite.

In the New Testament, at Jesus' Last Supper, two cups of wine are mentioned. One, in the Grace before the Meal, and one, in the Grace After the Meal. Mark 14:23 is the Grace before the Meal: "And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it". 1 Corinthians 11:25 is the Grace After the Meal: "the cup, after supper".

In the first century CE, when Josephus described the communal meals of the Essenes, he stated that they recited Grace before and after meals. "At the beginning and at the close they do homage to God as the bountiful giver of life" (Josephus. JEWISH WAR. Book 2, chapter 8, section 5. Loeb Classical Library).

In the Mishna, compiled around 200 CE, it is prescr-

ibed that one should say Grace before and after meals.

ועל המזון . . . . . מברך לפניהם ולאחריהם.  
(משנה, ברכות, פרק ג משנה ד)

Grace was recited before meals, with a cup of wine, and recited after meals, with a cup of wine. This makes a total of two cups of wine.

If the 4 cups of wine in the Paschal meal are not of Biblical origin, where did they come from? The Rabbis in the Tannaitic period instituted 4 cups of wine for the night of Passover. This we derive from their enactment mentioned in the Mishna, that advised charity officials, when distributing wine to a poor Jewish person, not to diminish from the 4 cups of wine due him.

עני שבישראל . . . לא יפחתו לו מארבע כוסות של יין.  
(משנה, פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה א, הוצאת לו)

Where are the 4 cups of wine derived from? This question is posed in the Jerusalem Talmud. In order to find a Biblical justification for the 4 cups, Rabbi Yohanan Bar Nappaha, an Amora of third century Israel, stated, in the name of his teacher, Rabbi Benaya, that they represent the four redemptions of Israel in Egypt, mentioned in Exodus 6:6-7; והוצאתי והצלתי וגאלתי ולקחתי.

מנין לארבע כוסות? רבי יוחנן בשם רבי בנייה:  
כנגד ארבע גאולות לכן אמור לבני ישראל אני ה' והוצאתי . . .  
והצלתי וגאלתי ולקחתי. (תלמוד ירושלמי, תעלום הוצאת  
בומברג, פרק עשירי)

That the Tannaitic Rabbis instituted the 4 cups of wine for the Paschal meal, is corroborated by Raba, the

Babylonian Amora of the 4th century, and Rabina, the Babylonian Amora of the 5th century.

דבא...ארבע כסי תיקנו רבנן. (תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, קיז, ב)  
 רבינא אמר: ארבעה כסי תיקנו רבנן. (תלמוד בבלי, פסחים, קט, ב)

For the Jews as well as the Greeks, the most important blessing of the wine was after the meal, unless the cup of blessing was a Kiddush or Habdalah for a special kind of meal.

When the Paschal meal consisted of a main course, two cups of wine were drunk, one for the Kiddush before the meal, and another one for the Grace after the Meal.

However, in the third quarter of the first century, another course, a course of appetizers, was placed before the main course, making the main course, the second course.

The Kiddush or first cup, which used to be before the main course, was placed before the first course, the course of appetizers. But the Romans had a custom of drinking a cup of wine before the meal which arose during the reign of Emperor Tiberius Claudius (14-37 CE). So the Rabbis added a cup of wine before the main or second course of the Paschal meal. Now there was a cup of wine for Kiddush before the first course, the course of appetizers, a second cup before the main course, and a third cup for the Grace after Meals.

In the Jerusalem Talmud, it is stated that wine drunk during the meal doesn't intoxicate, while wine drunk after the meal, intoxicates.

יין של אחר המזון משכר, שבתוך המזון אינו משכר.  
(תלמוד ירושלמי, תצלום הוצאת בומברג, פסחים, פרק עשירי, הלכה ח)

This means that the third cup of wine which was drunk at the conclusion of the Paschal meal, before the recitation of Grace after Meals, was considered a part of the meal, and did not intoxicate.

THE MISHNAH ON WHICH THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD RESTS,  
by W.H. Lowe, Cambridge, 1883. פרק עשירי, פסחים, משנה

הלכה ו

- (1) מזגג לו פֹּוס שלישי וברך על מזונו
- (2) רביעי גומר את ההלל ואומר עליו ברכת השיר
- (3) בִּין הכוסות האלו אם רצה לשתות ישתה
- (4) בִּין שלישי לרביעי לא ישתה.

הלכה ז

- (5) אין מְפַטְיִרְיִן אחר הפסח

BABYLONIAN TALMUD CODEX MUNICH 95, Jerusalem, 1970.

מסכת פסחים, פרק עשירי

- (1) מזגג לו כוס שלישי מברך עליו ברכת מזונו
- (2) רביעי גומר את ההלל ואומר עליו ברכת השיר
- (3) מן הכוסות הללו אם רוצה לשתות ישתה
- (4) בִּין שלישי לרביעי לא ישתה
- (5) ואין מְפַטְיִרְיִן אחר הפסח

When we compare line 3 of the Lowe Mishna with the Mishna in Codex Munich 95, we can see that the word

בִּין = מן + From. In line 4 ל = From.

My reading and translation of this Mishna is:

בין הכוסות האלו = FROM these cups

אם רצה לשתות = if he desires to drink

ישתה בין שלישי = he may drink from the third cup

לרביעי לא ישתה = FROM the fourth cup, he should not drink.

אין מפטיקין אחר הפסח = One does not (drink) from a cup of wine after the Paschal meal.

From the wording of our Mishna, we see that it states "they mixed a third cup of wine for him" מזוג לו כוס שלישי, but for the fourth cup of wine (רביעי), it does not state that was mixed with water. The word מזוג is missing. This means that a fourth cup of wine was poured, but it was not mixed with water for drinking.

We know that Rabbi Eliezer, a Tanna of Israel in the late first century, stated that we do not say the benediction over wine until we put water into it.

אין מברכין על היין עד שיתן לתוכו מים, דברי רבי ליעזר.  
(משנה, הוצאת לו, ברכות, פרק ז, הלכה ה)

We learn from the Mishna that one may drink from the third cup of wine, but not from the fourth cup of wine. The third cup of wine was considered part of the Paschal meal because it was mixed with water and drunk before the Grace after Meals, while the fourth cup was not mixed with water and came after the conclusion of the meal. Therefore it was not permissible to drink the fourth cup because wine after the meal could cause intoxication.

If the number of cups of wine to be drunk at the Paschal meal was to be limited to 3, and the 4th cup was not to be drunk, then why did the Tannaitic Rabbis institute 4 cups of wine? Why did they change from the number three to the number four in the number of cups?

Pauline Christianity interpreted the wine at the Paschal meal to be the blood of Jesus. "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Corinthians 11:25). The idea of the threefold Godhead, the Pauline concept of the Trinity, in which new converts were baptized "in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 28:19), caused the Rabbis to increase the number of the cups of wine at the Paschal meal from 3 to 4. By eliminating the number three, which could be interpreted as a sign of the Trinity, the Rabbis countered any Christian illusions and interpretations given to the wine in the Paschal meal. In Rabbinic Judaism, the doctrine of the mystical symbolism of the wine representing blood was not recognized by the Rabbis.

When Christianity became the state religion of the Roman Empire in the 4th century, the Rabbis questioned the necessity of diluting wine with water for ritual purposes since it was part of Christian theology. By the 5th century, wine mixed with water for ritual purposes, was discontinued in Judaism.

How can we explain the fact that today, Jews drink four cups of wine at the Paschal meal,

when the Mishna in chapter 10 of Tractate Pesahim, prescribed that only three cups of wine were to be drunk? This happened because the correct reading of this Mishna was forgotten, and the word *מפטירין* in the verse

*מפטירין אחר הפסח* was not understood anymore as a Greek word, but was assumed to be a Hebrew word with another connotation.

They forgot that this Mishna stated that the 4th cup should not be drunk. When mixing wine with water was abandoned by the 5th century, it was forgotten that the 4th cup of wine was never mixed with water. Since all the cups of wine were not mixed with water anymore, all the four cups began to be drunk.

For an explanation of the word *מפטירין*, please consult my book:

LEXICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL AND RABBINIC PASSOVER, by Rabbi George Wolf, New York, 1991, pages 177-180.

WAS THE LAST SUPPER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT  
A PASCHAL MEAL?

Jews spoke an early Rabbinic Hebrew, in daily life and in the school, in the New Testament period. Paul, who was born in Tarsus in Cilicia, Turkey, spoke Hebrew to the people in Jerusalem. Acts 21:40 stated that: "He spoke to them in the Hebrew language". Jesus, who was born in Israel, certainly spoke Hebrew to his disciples. Paul claimed that Jesus spoke to him in the Hebrew language. "I heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language, Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me" (Acts 25:14).

Jesus' words are recorded in the Gospels, but not one of them, is the work of an eye-witness. When the Gospels were translated into Greek, they were altered with deletions and additions, not found in the original Hebrew versions, in order to meet the theological needs of the Church at that time.

Jesus was a nationalistic Jew who addressed himself only to Jews. He said: "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"(Matthew 15:24). "It is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to dogs" (Matthew 15:26). He was scrupulous in observing Jewish law. "Not an iota , not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished" (Matthew 5:18). "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than one dot of the law to become void" (Luke 16:17).



Many Pharisees were his followers. "But some believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees rose up" (Acts 15:5). Many priests also joined them. "And the number of the disciples multiplied greatly in Jerusalem, and a great many of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). Jesus' adherents were pious Jews who practiced Jewish ceremonial laws and were "all zealous for the law" (Acts 21:20). The early followers of Jesus, or first Christians, were faithful observant Jews, who never intended to break away from the Synagogue, from Judaism, or inaugurate a new religion.

Paul was in conflict with the Christian community in Jerusalem because he taught precepts that were contrary to the Jewish religion. Paul's gospel negated the Jewish tradition of unique spiritual status with God. Faith in Jesus replaced the observance of Biblical commandments and obligations which were abrogated because "Israel who pursued the righteousness which is based on law did not succeed in fulfilling that law. Why? Because they did not pursue it through faith, but as if it were based on works" (Romans 9:31-32).

According to Paul, only those who believed in Jesus were the true Israel, "for not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel" (Romans 9:6). "This means that it is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned as descendants" (Romans 9:8). "But he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a

matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal" (Romans 2:29). "The promise to Abraham and his descendants, that they should inherit the world, did not come through the law but through righteousness of faith" (Romans 4:13).

Paul repudiated the Judean Christian interpretation of Christianity by asserting that his interpretation of Christianity was superior to theirs because the gospel which he preached, "I did not receive it from men, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Galatians 1:12).

Since Paul's interpretation of Christianity did not depend on the teachings of the Judean Christians, but on a divine act of revelation, all their teachings were unnecessary for Christianity. Thus, the teachings of the Jerusalem Christian Church and its Judaism were abrogated.

After the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, the early Rabbis renamed the Festival of Unleavened Bread as the Pesach Festival. The Pesach Festival celebrated Israel's Exodus from Egypt and God's continued protection of his people, as he did in Egypt through the blood of the Paschal lamb, leading to future redemption.

In early Christianity, the Jewish Festival of Unleavened Bread was reinterpreted too, not to celebrate the Exodus, but to fit the Pauline interpretation of Christianity and the future redemption of mankind through Jesus.

Some scholars identified the Last Supper as a Paschal meal, while others do not agree with this interpretation. The Synoptic Gospels portrayed the Last Supper as a Paschal meal, but there was no mention in the Gospel of John of the kind of meal it was, for it stated only "and during supper" (John 13:2). John 13:1 stated, however, that it was "now before the feast of the Pass-over". We can conclude from this that it was also a Paschal meal.

In Matthew, Mark and Luke, the festival was called Unleavened Bread because that was its name at the time of their redaction before 80 CE. John called the festival Passover because it was redacted after 80-86 CE, after the new name Passover arose.

When the Synoptic Gospels used the name Passover, they meant the Paschal lamb. Josephus, in his JEWISH WAR, written about 75 CE, also used the old name Feast of Unleavened Bread.

"Now on the first DAY OF UNLEAVENED BREAD the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Where will you have us prepare for you to eat the Passover?" (Matthew 26:17).

"And on the first DAY OF UNLEAVENED BREAD, when they sacrificed the passover lamb, his disciples said to him, Where will you have us go and prepare for you to EAT THE PASSOVER?" (Mark 14:12).

"Then came the DAY OF UNLEAVENED BREAD on which the passover lamb had to be sacrificed" (Luke 22:7).

"And he said to them, I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer" (Luke 22:15).

From the Synoptic Gospels we noticed that the Last Supper was a sacrificial meal, in which a Paschal lamb was eaten.

Matthew 26:19 "And the disciples did as Jesus had directed them, and they PREPARED THE PASSOVER".

Mark 14:16 "And they prepared the Passover".

Luke 22:8 "So Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare the passover for us, that we may eat it".

In the Synoptic Gospels, there is no mention of eating a Paschal lamb during the meal, even though the texts stated earlier that a lamb was prepared for the meal. Most probably the original texts mentioned the consumption of a lamb during the meal, but it was deleted later in order to conform to the Pauline interpretation that Jesus himself was the Paschal lamb.

"For Christ, our Passover lamb, has been sacrificed" (1 Corinthians 5:7). "He appeared to put away sin by sacrifice of himself" (Hebrews 9:26).

"The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him, and said, Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29).

Since Jesus was the Paschal lamb, we can understand why the Last Supper was not portrayed as a Paschal sacrificial meal in the Gospel of John. The main item, the Paschal lamb, was removed from the meal in the Synoptic Gospels, while from the Gospel of John, the rest of the Paschal food items were deleted.

Those scholars who claimed that the Last Supper was

not a Paschal meal because it had to be a family affair, with women and children present, have forgotten that this was not a strictly Biblical Paschal meal anymore. While the Biblical Paschal meal was limited to immediate families, the Paschal meal had already been adjusted during the reign of Queen Salome Alexandra (76-67 BCE), by the Pharisees, who reinterpreted the phrase in Exodus 12:6  $\text{בֵּית הַפֶּסַח}$  and  $\text{בֵּית הַפֶּסַח}$  in the Bible, to mean the time before the beginning of the festival, or the afternoon, so that the Paschal lamb was slaughtered in the afternoon, from the ninth to the eleventh hour (= 3 to 5 PM). The Pharisees moved back the hours of sacrifice from the evening to the afternoon, thus extending the time of sacrifice.

Josephus, in his JEWISH WAR, testified that in the first century CE, eating the Paschal lamb was not an immediate family affair anymore, but of a new family composed of associations or fraternities, who arranged well in advance the celebration of the eating of the Paschal lamb.

"on the occasion of the feast called Passover, at which they sacrifice from the 9th to the 11th hour, and a little fraternity as it were, gather round each sacrifice of not fewer than 10 persons (feasting alone not being permitted), while the companies often include as many as 20..."

(Josephus. JEWISH WAR. Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1968. Book VI, 9, 3 )

Jesus and his disciples too formed an association or fraternity (  $\pi\pi\pi\pi\pi$  ), to partake of the Paschal sacrificial meal. Jesus sent his disciples Peter and John, to prepare the passover, namely the Paschal lamb, so that the fraternity of Jesus would be able to eat it (Luke 22:8).

"and as they were eating, he said, ... He who has dipped his hand in the dish with me" (Matthew 26:21, 23).

"one who is dipping bread in the same dish with me" (Mark 14:20).

"So when he had dipped the morsel" (John 13:26).

Scholars hold that these verses referred to the eating of appetizers before the Paschal meal. During the days of Jesus, no appetizers were eaten as a first course before the main or second course of the Paschal meal. The eating of appetizers as a first course was instituted in the third quarter of the first century.

In Jesus' day, diners ate from a common bowl or dish. Around the end of the first century CE, a new custom appeared, according to which each diner ate from his own private bowl.

In Pauline Christianity, the unleavened bread or matza, represented the body of Jesus, while the wine became the blood of Jesus.

"Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to the disciples and said, Take, eat, THIS IS MY BODY" (Matthew 26:26).

"And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, Drink of it, all of you; for THIS IS MY BLOOD of the covenant, which is poured out for the forgiveness of sins" (Matthew 26:27-28).

"...he took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them, and said, Take; THIS IS MY BODY"(Mark 14:22).

"And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, THIS IS MY BLOOD of the covenant, which is poured out for many"(Mark 14:23-24).

"And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves" (Luke 22:17).

This seems to be the original version of Jesus' statement, without the Pauline addition.

"And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, THIS IS MY BODY" (Luke 22:19-20). This contains the Pauline addition.

Paul's statements are found in Corinthians and in Romans.

1 Corinthians 11:23-24 "he ... took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, THIS IS MY BODY which is for you".

1 Corinthians 11:25 "also the cup, after supper, saying, THIS CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT IN MY BLOOD".

Paul stated that Jesus was set forth by God to be "as an expiation BY HIS BLOOD" (Romans 3:25).

At the Last Supper, the disciples ate, but Jesus is not portrayed as eating because, according to Pauline theology, if he was the Paschal lamb, he could not be shown as partaking of himself.

Jesus could have said that the Paschal lamb represented his body, but this would have been impossible according to Pauline theology. In the New Testament, it is written that Jesus said that the unleavened bread symbolized his body. He couldn't have said that too. This is a Pauline interpolation into the text of the Last Supper.

Where did this idea that unleavened bread represented the Paschal lamb come from. Unleavened bread is a form of bread. In the Bible, unleavened bread (  $\text{מַצָּה}$  ) is called  $\text{חֶמֶץ}$  bread.

In the Hebrew Bible the word  $\text{חֶמֶץ}$  has 2 connotations :  
1) flesh      2) bread.

Matza or unleavened bread is  $\text{חֶמֶץ}$ =(bread).

Paschal lamb is                       $\text{חֶמֶץ}$ =(flesh).

Therefore:matza (  $\text{חֶמֶץ}$  )= Paschal lamb (  $\text{חֶמֶץ}$  ) .

Thus, according to Paul, eating the unleavened bread was equivalent to eating the Paschal lamb or Jesus.

In Rabbinic Judaism, we have a similar occurrence. After the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, no more sacrifices were offered. The unleavened bread then came to represent the Paschal lamb, or sacrifice. In the Rabbinic Seder, the unleavened bread assumed an



importance equal to the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb.

Another Pauline interpretation, that wine represented blood, or that drinking wine meant a symbolic drinking of blood, was inserted into Jesus' words at the Last Supper. This could never have been uttered by Jesus. At the Jewish Paschal meal, wine never represented blood.

In Jesus' day, the Paschal meal consisted only of a main course. A first course of appetizers, before the main course, was added to the banquet in the third quarter of the first century. Jesus and his disciples were depicted in the Last Supper eating a main course, with unleavened bread and wine. "And as they were at table eating" (Mark 14:17).

The principal foods eaten during the main course, the Paschal lamb and the bitter herbs, were excised from the original version of the text of the New Testament because they were to serve other theological needs of the Church. Jesus became the Paschal lamb. The late redactors of the Gospels were not interested in describing the Last Supper as a Paschal meal, but to emphasize only those features of the meal that were continued in the Church's ritual. "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Corinthians 11:26).

According to Josephus, in the first century CE, the Essenes, at the beginning and end of their meals, said blessings over bread and wine. They had two cups of wine. "Thus at the beginning and at the close they do homage to God as the bountiful giver of life" (Josephus.

JEWISH WAR II, 128-133. Loeb Classical Library).

According to Matthew, Mark and 1 Corinthians, Jesus ate from the unleavened bread and then immediately followed it by drinking a cup of wine. The cup of wine in these books, was the cup of benediction which followed at the conclusion of the main course. Paul stated so, "In the same way also the cup after supper" (1 Corinthians 11:25). This cup is associated with the Grace After Meals, which stems from the tradition of meals held by an association or fraternity (קניין).

In the Gospel of Luke, we are told that Jesus first "took a cup" (22:17), and then "he took bread"(22:19), which is not in the same order as in Matthew, Mark and 1 Corinthians. According to the description in the Gospel of Luke, the cup of wine that Jesus had divided among his disciples, was the first cup of wine which preceded the main course. Thus, we have two cups of wine mentioned at the Last Supper.

The cup of benediction came into Judaism under Greek influence. It was believed that men could achieve immortality by consuming the divine fluids, wine and bread. Wine was a messianic symbol, and drinking it, meant partaking of the Messiah himself.

Among Jews, the most important blessing over the wine, was after the meal, unless the cup of benediction was used to inaugurate a special kind of meal. In the Last Supper, two cups of wine were listed. The first cup of wine was before the main course, in the Gospel of Luke, while the second cup, was at the end of the main

course, in the books of Matthew, Mark and 1 Corinthians.

The Jewish Paschal festival was completely reinterpreted by Paul. The Paschal lamb was now Jesus. Paul said, "For Christ, our paschal lamb has been sacrificed" (1 Corinthians 5:7). The unleavened bread became the body of Jesus. "Jesus...took bread...and said, This is my body" (1 Corinthians 11:23-24). The cup of wine became the blood of Jesus. "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Corinthians 11:25). The bitter herbs became the sufferings of Jesus. "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer" (Luke 22:15).

Jesus' Last Supper, which was originally a Paschal meal, now, under Pauline interpretation, became an act of worship, the Christian Eucharist in remembrance of Jesus, with the consumption of small portions of bread and wine. "Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me" (1 Corinthians 11:25). "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Corinthians 11:26).

This new Christian Pesach festival didn't need any Paschal lambs, bitter herbs, or even unleavened bread anymore. Paul said, "Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Corinthians 5:8).

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aharoni, Yohanan. THE LAND OF THE BIBLE: A HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY. London, 1979.
- Aistleitner, Joseph. WÖRTERBUCH DER UGARITISCHEN SPRACHE. 4te, Verbesserte Auflage. Berlin, 1974.
- Albright, William F. YAHWEH AND THE GODS OF CANAAN. Garden City, New York, 1968.
- THE ANCHOR BIBLE. Garden City, New York, 1964-.
- THE ANCHOR BIBLE DICTIONARY. 6 volumes. New York, 1992.
- ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN TEXTS RELATING TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. Edited by James B. Pritchard. Princeton, 1969.
- BABYLONIAN TALMUD. CODEX MUNICH 95. 3 Vols. Jerusalem, 1970.
- BABYLONIAN TALMUD. Translated into English under the editorship of I. Epstein. 35 Vols. London, 1952.
- Barr, James. COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY AND THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Oxford, 1968.
- Bauer, H. & P. Leander. GRAMMATIK DES BIBLISCH-ARAMÄISCHEN. Halle, 1927.
- Bauer, H. & P. Leander. HISTORISCHE GRAMMATIK DER HEBRÄISCHEN SPRACHE DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS. Halle, 1922.
- Beeston, A.F.L., et al., SABAIC DICTIONARY. Louvain-la-Neuve and Beirut, 1982.
- Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer. מלון הלשון העברית הישנה והחדשה מאת אליעזר בן יהודה. 8 כרכים, ניו יורק, 1960
- Bergsträsser, G. HEBRAISCHE GRAMMATIK. Leipzig, 1918-29.
- Bezold, Carl. BABYLONISCH-ASSYRISCHES GLOSSAR. Heidelberg, 1926.

- BIBLIA HEBRAICA STUTTGARTENSIA. Stuttgart, 1984.
- Brockelmann, Karl. LEXICON SYRIACUM. Hildesheim, 1966.
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, & Charles A. Briggs. A HEBREW AND ENGLISH LEXICON TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. Oxford, 1955.
- Budge, E.A. Wallis. AN EGYPTIAN HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY. 2 Vols., New York, 1960.
- Buhl, Frants. WILHELM GESENIUS' HEBRAISCHES UND ARAM-AISCHES HANDWORTERBUCH UBER DAS ALTE TESTAMENT. 16te Auflage. Leipzig, 1915.
- Charles, R. H., Editor. THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. 2 Vols. Oxford, 1913.
- Charlesworth, James, Rditor. THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUD-EPIGRAPHA. 2 Vols. Garden City, New York, 1983-1985.
- Chomsky, William. DAVID KIMHI'S HEBREW GRAMMAR (MIKHLOL). Philadelphia, 1953.
- Cohen, M.R. BIBLICAL HAPAX LEGOMENA IN THE LIGHT OF AKKADIAN AND UGARITIC. Missoula, 1978.
- Cooke, G.A. A TEXTBOOK OF NORTH-SEMITIC INSCPTIONS. Oxford, 1903.
- Dalman, Gustaf H. ARAMAI<sup>sch</sup>-NEUHEBRÄI<sup>sch</sup>ES HANDWÖRTERBUCH ZU TARGUM, TALMUD UND MIDRASCH. Gottingen, 1938.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. ASSYRI<sup>sch</sup>ES HANDWÖRTERBUCH. Leipzig, 1896.
- A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, Edited by James Hastings. 4 Vols. plus Supplement. Edinburgh, 1898.
- Dillmann, August. LEXICON LINGUAE AETHIOPICAE. N.Y.1955.
- Driver, S. R. NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT & TOPOGRAPHY OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL. 2nd edition. Oxford, 1913.

- Driver, S. R. A TREATISE ON THE USE OF THE TENSES IN HEBREW. 3rd. edition. Oxford, 1892 .
- Drower, E. S. & R. Macuch. A MANDAIC DICTIONARY. Oxford, 1963.
- Ehrlich, Arnold B. .1969 . ניו יורק, כרכים 3 . מקרא כפשוטו .
- Elijah Bahur. Basle, 1601 . ספר החשבני לאליהו בחור .
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA BIBLICA. Ed. by T.K. Cheyne & J.S. Black, New York, 1914.
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA BIBLICA. .1988-1955 , ירושלים, אנציקלופדיה מקראית . 9 כרכים,
- THE ENCYCLOPEDIA JUDAICA. 16 Vols. Jerusalem, 1971.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham. .1983 -1979 , ירושלים, דמלון החדש מאת אברהם אבן-שושן . 8 כרכים .
- Faulkner, Raymond O. A. A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF MIDDLE EGYPTIAN. Oxford, 1962.
- Fuenn, Samuel J. .1923 . ורשה, שמואל יוסף פיין . 4 כרכים . האוצר, אוצר לשון המקרא והמשנה מאת
- Fuerst, Julius. A HEBREW AND CHALDEE LEXICON TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. 5th edition. London, 1885.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. GESENIUS' HEBREW GRAMMAR. Edited & enlarged by E. Kautzsch & A.E. Cowley. Oxford, 1960.
- Gibson, J.C.L. CANAANITE MYTHS AND LEGENDS. Edinburgh, 1978.
- Gibson, J.C.L. TEXTBOOK OF SYRIAN SEMITIC INSCRIPTIONS . 3 Vols. Oxford, 1971-1982.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. UGARITIC TEXTBOOK. Rome, 1967.
- Gordon, S.L. 12 v. גרדון, ש.ל. תורה נביאים וכתובים עם באור חדש מאת ש.ל.
- Greenspahn, Frederick E. HAPAX LEGOMENA IN BIBLICAL HEBREW. Chico, 1984.

Guillaume, Alfred. HEBREW AND ARABIC LEXICOGRAPHY.  
Leiden, 1965.

Gur, Judah. .1950, מלון עברי מאת יהודה גור. מהדורה רביעית. תל אביב, 1950.  
THE HOLY BIBLE. Authorized King James Version. Oxford, 1970.  
THE HOLY BIBLE. NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION. Grand Rapids, 1988.  
THE HOLY SCRIPTURES ACCORDING TO THE MASORETIC TEXT.  
Philadelphia, 1917.

Ibn Ganah, Abulwalid M. ספר הזרשים מאת ר' יונה בן גנאח.  
ברלין, 1896.

INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.  
Edinburgh.

INTERPRETER'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. 4 Vols. plus  
SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUME. Nashville, 1962.

Jacob, B. DAS ERSTE BUCH DER TORA: GENESIS. New York, 1974,  
Jastrow, Marcus. A DICTIONARY OF THE TARGUMIM, THE  
TALMUD BABLI AND YERUSHALMI, AND THE MIDRASHIC LITERATURE.  
New York, 1971.

Jean, Charles F. & Jacob Hoftijer. DICTIONNAIRE DES  
INSCRIPTIONS SEMITIQUES DE L'OUEST. Leiden, 1965.

THE JERUSALEM BIBLE. Garden City, N.Y., 1966.

THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA. 12 Volumes. New York, 1912.

JOSEPHUS WORKS. Edited by H. St. John Thackeray et al.  
Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1926-1965. 9 Vols.

Jouon, Paul. A GRAMMAR OF BIBLICAL HEBREW. Translated  
& revised by T. Muraoka, 2 Vols., Rome, 1991.

Kahana, Abraham, Editor. תורה נביאים וכתובים עם פרוש מדעי.  
יוצא בהשתתפות למדנים מומחים על ידי אברום כהנא.

Keil, C.F. & Franz Delitzsch. COMMENTARY ON THE OLD  
TESTAMENT. 10 Vols. Grand Rapids, 1986.

- Koehler, Ludwig & Walter Baumgartner. LEXICON IN VETERIS TESTAMENTI LIBROS. Leiden, 1958.
- Kohut, Alexander. ערוך השלם מאת חנוך יהודה קאהוט. 8 כרכים. וינה, 1926.
- König, F.E. HISTORISCH-KRITISCHES LEHRGEBÄUDE DER HEBRÄISCHEN SPRACHE. 3 Vols. Leipzig, 1881-1897.
- Kraus, Samuel. GRIECHISCHE UND LATEINISCHE LEHNWÖRTER IM TALMUD, MIDRASCH UND TARGUM. 2Vols. Berlin, 1898-1899.
- Krauss, Samuel. קדמוניות החלמוד מאת שמואל קרויס. 2 כרכים ב4 חלקים. ברלין תרע"ד- חל אביב, תש"ה.
- Kraus, Samuel. TALMUDISCHE ARCHAEOLOGIE. 3Vols. Leipzig, 1910-1912.
- Kraus, Samuel. חוספות הערוך השלם להרב חנוך יהודה קהוט מאת שמואל קרויס. ניו יורק, 1955.
- Krupnick, Baruch & A. M. Silberman. A DICTIONARY OF THE TALMUD, THE MIDRASH AND THE TARGUM. 2Vols. London, 1927.
- Lane, Edward W. ARABIC-ENGLISH LEXICON. 8Vols. London, 1863-1893.
- Lesko, Leonard H. A DICTIONARY OF LATE EGYPTIAN. 5Vols. Providence, 1982-1990.
- Leslau, Wolf. ETHIOPIC AND SOUTH ARABIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HEBREW LEXICON. Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1958.
- Levy, Jacob. CHALDAISCHES WÖRTERBUCH ÜBER DIE TARGUMIM. 2Vols in 1, Köln, 1959.
- Levy, Jacob. WÖRTERBUCH ÜBER DIE TALMUDIM UND MIDRASHIM. Zweite Auflage mit Nachtragen und Berichtigungen von Lazarus Goldschmidt. 4Vols. Berlin und Wien, 1924.
- Liddel, H. G. & R. Scott. A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON. Oxford, 1968.



- Loewenstamm, Samuel & J. Blau. THESAURUS OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE. 3Vols. Jerusalem, 1957-1968.
- Maclean, Arthur J. A DICTIONARY OF THE DIALECTS OF VERNACULAR SYRIAC. Oxford, 1901.
- Meissner, Bruno. SUPPLEMENT ZU DEN ASSYRISCHEN HANDWÖRTERBUCHERN. Leiden, 1898.
- מקראות גדולות: חמשה חומשי תורה עם ששים פרושים והוספות בששה כרכים .  
הוצאת שולזינגר, ניו יורק, 1978 .
- מקראות גדולות: נ"ך עם ל"ב פרשים. 2 כרכים. הוצאת שולזינגר. 1945 .
- MISHNA CODEX PARMA (DE ROSSI 138). Jerusalem, 1970.
- MISCHNACODEX KAUFMANN A50. Faksimile-Ausgabe von Georg Beer. Jerusalem, 1968.
- THE MISHNAH ON WHICH THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD RESTS.  
Edited by W.H. Lowe. Cambridge, 1883.
- משנה עם פרוש הדמ"ס. דפוס ראשון, נפולי, 1492 . הוצאת א.מ.הברמן.  
ירושלים, 1970 .
- THE MISHNAH. Translated by Herbert Danby. Oxford, 1933.
- MISHNAYOTH. Translated by Philip Blackman. 7 Volumes.  
New York, 1963.
- ששה סדרי משנה: מפורש בידי חנוך אלבק. ששה כרכים .  
ירושלים-תל אביב, 1958-1952 .
- Muss-Arnolt, W. A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF THE ASSYRIAN LANGUAGE. 2 Vols. Berlin, 1905.
- THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE WITH THE APOCRYPHA. Oxford, 1970.
- THE OXFORD ANNOTATED BIBLE WITH THE APOCRYPHA. Revised Standard Version. New York, 1965.
- Palache, J.L. SEMANTIC NOTES ON THE HEBREW LEXICON.  
Leiden, 1959.

- SAMARITAN VERSION OF THE PENTATEUCH. Edited by Avraham & Ratson Sadaqa. 5 Vols. Tel Aviv, 1961-1965.
- SEPTUAGINTA. Edited by A. Rahlfs. Stuttgart, 1959.
- Smith, J. Payne. A COMPENDIOUS SYRIAC DICTIONARY. Oxford, 1903.
- Sparks, H.F.D., Editor. THE APOCRYPHAL OLD TESTAMENT. Oxford, 1987.
- Sperber, Alexander. A HISTORICAL GRAMMAR OF BIBLICAL HEBREW. Leiden, 1966.
- Steinberg, Joshua. מלון החנ"ך, עברית וארמית מאת יהושע שטיינברג. מהדורה רביעית. תל אביב, 1964.
- TANAKH: A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES ACCORDING TO THE TRADITIONAL HEBREW TEXT. Philadelphia, 1985.
- THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. 6 Volumes. Grand Rapids, 1974-1990.
- תורה נביאים כתובים. הוצאת קורן. ירושלים, 1986.
- תורה נביאים כתובים מפורשים על ידי א.ש. זרטום וערוכים בידי מ.ד. קאסוטו. 16 כרכים. תל אביב, 1969.
- Torczyner, Harry. פשוטו של מקרא מאת נ.ה. טור-סיני. 6 כרכים. ירושלים, 1962-1968.
- Tregelles, Samuel P. GESENIUS' HEBREW & CHALDEE LEXICON TO THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES. Grand Rapids, 1950.
- Wehr, Hans. A DICTIONARY OF MODERN WRITTEN ARABIC. Edited by J. Milton Cowan. 3rd edition. Ithaca. 1976.
- Wolf, George. LEXICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL AND RABBINIC PASSOVER. New York, 1991.
- Wolf, George. SOME LEXICOGRAPHICAL COMMENTS ON THE HEBREW BIBLE. New York, 1990.

## INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

| CHAPTER & VERSE | PAGE      | CHAPTER & VERSE | PAGE  |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-------|
| GENESIS         |           | DEUTERONOMY     |       |
| 1:6             | 15-16     | 28:58           | 18    |
| 1:7             | 15-16     | 32:3            | 17    |
| 1:8             | 15-16     | JOSHUA          |       |
| 1:20            | 16        | 6:13            | 80    |
| 1:27            | 10        | JUDGES          |       |
| 2:9             | 9-14      | 5:30            | 40-41 |
| 2:17            | 9-14      | 14:9            | 80-81 |
| 3:22            | 13        | I SAMUEL        |       |
| 4:26            | 17        | 6:12            | 83    |
| 8:3             | 83        | II SAMUEL       |       |
| 8:5             | 83        | 3:8             | 41-42 |
| 8:7             | 83-84     | 3:16            | 82    |
| 11:4            | 23-24     | 5:10            | 82    |
| 11:9            | 23        | 8:10            | 44-45 |
| 12:8            | 17        | 14:22           | 45    |
| 12:9            | 84        | 16:13           | 82    |
| 16:13           | 17        | I KINGS         |       |
| 28:17           | 23        | 4:4             | 27    |
| 41:33           | 25        | 4:5             | 27    |
| 41:40           | 28-29, 25 | 4:6             | 27    |
| 41:41           | 25        | 4:7             | 26    |
| 41:43           | 25        | 5:17            | 18    |
| 42:6            | 26        | 5:19            | 18    |
| 43:19           | 26        | 8:17            | 18    |
| 44:1            | 26        | 8:20            | 19    |
| 44:4            | 26        | 20:37           | 81    |
| 49:3            | 75        | 22:23           | 36    |
| EXODUS          |           | II KINGS        |       |
| 5:9             | 31-33     | 6:9             | 58    |
| 12:24           | 32        | 10:5            | 26    |
| LEVITICUS       |           | 15:19           | 46-48 |
| 23:27           | 32        | 15:29           | 46-48 |
| 24:11           | 17        | 18:31           | 43-44 |
| 24:16           | 17        | NUMBERS         |       |
| NUMBERS         |           | 11:20           | 37    |
| 11:20           | 37        | 18:7            | 32    |
| 18:7            | 32        |                 |       |

| CHAPTER & VERSE | PAGE  | CHAPTER & VERSE | PAGE  |
|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| ISAIAH          |       | RUTH            |       |
| 3:16            | 81    | 1:1             | 64    |
| 9:14            | 35    | DANIEL          |       |
| 15:5            | 54-55 | 12:2            | 39    |
| 18:7            | 19    | EZRA            |       |
| 19:22           | 81    | 4:10            | 46-51 |
| 28:1            | 65-68 | I CHRONICLES    |       |
| 29:1            | 52-53 | 5:26            | 46-48 |
| 30:15           | 59-60 | 18:10           | 45    |
| 30:30           | 61    |                 |       |
| 36:16           | 43-44 |                 |       |
| 55:13           | 18    |                 |       |
| 66:24           | 39    |                 |       |
| JEREMIAH        |       |                 |       |
| 12:17           | 81    |                 |       |
| 14:14           | 34    |                 |       |
| 23:32           | 35-36 |                 |       |
| 27:10           | 34    |                 |       |
| 29:23           | 35    |                 |       |
| 48:5            | 54-57 |                 |       |
| HABAKKUK        |       |                 |       |
| 2:4             | 69-72 |                 |       |
| ZECHARIAH       |       |                 |       |
| 13:3            | 36    |                 |       |
| PSALMS          |       |                 |       |
| 17:9            | 30    |                 |       |
| 22:10           | 74-75 |                 |       |
| 48:14           | 76-77 |                 |       |
| 71:6            | 73    |                 |       |
| 72:19           | 18    |                 |       |
| 113:2           | 18    |                 |       |
| 126:6           | 82    |                 |       |
| PROVERBS        |       |                 |       |
| 29:9            | 62-63 |                 |       |
| JOB             |       |                 |       |
| 19:6            | 30    |                 |       |
| 39:30           | 79    |                 |       |

## GLOSSARY AND INDEX OF MY NEW INTERPRETATIONS

- תִּגְלַת־פִּלְסֶרֶס** The Assyrian King Tiglath-Pileser III  
 (744-727 BCE). Ezra 4:10. pp.46-48.
- שָׁרַף** to kneel in homage.  
 2 Samuel 8:10; 14:22; 1 Chronicles  
 18:10. pp. 44-45.
- שָׁרַף** homage.  
 2 Kings 18:31; Isaiah 36:16. pp.43-4.
- גִּבּוֹר** a protector. Psalms 71:6. p.73.
- גִּבּוֹר** a powerhouse. Psalms 22:10. p.75.
- גִּבּוֹר** a cone. Isaiah 28:1. p. 68.
- זָבַח** a sacrifice. Exodus 5:9. pp.31-33.
- מָוֶת** death, mortality.  
 Genesis 2:9, 17. pp. 9-14.
- וּמִצִּי** vomit. Isaiah 66:24; Daniel 12:2.  
 p. 39.
- שָׁקֵט** calmness. Isaiah 30:15. pp.59-60.
- וּמִצִּי** vomit. Numbers 11:20. p. 37.
- גִּבּוֹר** besieger. Isaiah 29:1. pp.52-53.
- גִּבּוֹר** a powerhouse. Genesis 49:3. p.75.
- פְּלִיטָה** a male prostitute. 2 Samuel 3:8. pp.41-2.

- לקף to catch, rob. Job 19:6; Psalms 17:9.  
p.30.
- לשק to adhere. Genesis 41:40. pp.28-29.
- מַבְדִּיל a separation. Genesis 1:6. pp.15-16.
- נַחַח prayer. Isaiah 30:15. pp. 59-60.
- נַחַח strength. Isaiah 30:30. p.61.
- נַחַח victory. Proverbs 29:9. pp.62-63.
- נַחֲתִים powerful. 2Kings 6:9. p. 58.
- עִיר tower. Genesis 11:4. pp.21-24.
- עַל chief. Genesis 41:33, 40,41, 43;  
42:6; 43:19; 44:1, 4 ; 1 Kings  
4:4-7; 2 Kings 10:5. pp.25-29.
- עלע to lick. Job 39:30. p. 79.
- עער to shout. Isaiah 15:5. pp.54-55.
- עַפְלָה a crook. Habakkuk 2:4. pp.71-72.
- פּוֹס to think. Psalms 48:14. p.77.
- צַר a call. Jeremiah 48:5. pp.54-57.
- קָרִיָּה a province. Ezra 4:10. pp.50-51.
- רֹאשׁ a phallus. Judges 5:30; 2 Samuel 3:8.  
pp. 40-42.

רְקִיעַ a partition. Genesis 1:6-8, 20.  
pp. 15-16.

שׁוּבָה repentance. Isaiah 30:15. pp. 59-60.

שְׁלוֹם an alliance. 2 Samuel 8:10;  
1 Chronicles 18:10. pp.44-45.

שֵׁם God.

Genesis 4:26; 11:4; 12:8; 16:13; Leviticus  
24:11, 16; Deuteronomy 28:58; 32:3; 1 Kings  
5:17, 19; 8:17, 20; Isaiah 18:7; 55:13;  
Psalms 72:19; 113:2. pp.17-20; 23-4.

שָׁמְעוּ they sounded. Jeremiah 48:5. pp.54-7.

שְׁפוֹט (noun) rule. Ruth 1:1. p.64.

שֶׁקֶר fake, fakery. Exodus 5:9; 1 Kings 22:23;  
Isaiah 9:14; Jeremiah 14:14; 23:32; 27:10;  
29:23; Zechariah 13:3. pp. 33-36.

תְּפֹאֶרֶת wreath. Isaiah 28:1. pp. 67-68.

חַס וְנִשְׁלַם שׁוּב לֹא בִּוְרָא עוֹלָם

וחשלם מלאכת הקודש  
מאת הרב גדליהו וואלף  
בעיר ניו יורק שבאמריקה  
יום ג' ז' טבת תשנ"ד  
יום הולדתו. ספרי מוקדש  
לאבי היקר ר' צבי וואלף ז"ל  
ולאמי היקרה מרת רבקה וואלף ז"ל.

University of California Library  
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

Phone Renewals  
310/825-9188

OL JAN 12 2004

REC'D YRL 12 8 2003



University of California, Los Angeles



L 007 216 128 4