

## CHAPTER VII

### THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

The psalms and hymns that lauded the gods at length went hand in hand, in the ancient world, with oaths and adjurations whose purpose was to exert influence and pressure upon the gods to fulfil the will and aspirations of human beings. The formula of the adjuration, the knowledge of which was in the possession of sorcerers, enchanters, and miracle-workers, was primarily based on knowledge of the Divine Name. The Name was endowed with power. The Name and the Power were synonyms.<sup>1</sup> The discovery of the secret name of the god, which implied control of the divinity, occupied an important place both in Egyptian mythology and in the magical practice of the diviners and sorcerers, whose magic arts consisted of the muttering of names.<sup>2</sup> Such concepts and practices were prevalent both in the Hellenistic and in the Roman periods not only in Egypt but also in Eretz-Israel.

It is true that in the Bible itself the magical element is excluded from the faith.<sup>3</sup> There is no adjuration by God's name, nor is use made of it. God's name is called, it is mentioned, when there is a desire for His blessing, for His response; but He that responds and blesses is God, not the priest by mentioning the Name.<sup>4</sup> But the Name itself, even if it is not an instrument or implement that works and achieves miracles and wonders, reflects the presence of the Deity and expresses His power and might; and it may be assumed that in the popular consciousness this distinction was not strictly maintained. Indeed we have many testimonies from the era of the Hasmoneans and after of the prevalence of the view that there was latent power

## THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

in the Name and of its use in adjurations. In *I Enoch* (lxix 14), the Prince of Oaths tells Michael ‘to show him the hidden name in order that he might enunciate it in the oath, so that those might quake before that name and oath’; and in the *Book of Jubilees* (xxxvi 7) Isaac adjures by ‘a great oath... by the name glorious and honoured and great’. Ḥoni Ha-me‘aggel [the Circle-Drawer], who lived in the days of Simeon b. Sheṭah and Alexander Jannaeus, ‘drew a circle and stood within it and said... I swear by Thy great name that I will not stir hence until Thou have pity on Thy children’ (*M. Ta’anit* iii, 8).

The Jewish Hellenistic writer Artapanus<sup>5</sup> narrates in the style of Egyptian stories that Pharaoh fell into a dead faint when Moses muttered the Name in answer to his question ‘Who is the Lord?’ Moses revived him, but the priest to whom Moses delivered the Name inscribed on a tablet died in great agony. Although Josephus does not cite the whole story of Artapanus, yet he also says ‘Then God revealed to him (= Moses) His name, which ere then had not come to men’s ears, and of which I am forbidden to speak.’<sup>6</sup> That the Name was used when Moses met Pharaoh is not mentioned in Josephus’ writings nor in Rabbinic sources, but it is actually in the latter that there is a reference to Moses’ use of the Name in other contexts. In one of the versions of the story about the raising of Joseph’s coffin, which the Egyptians had sunk in the Nile, it is stated that ‘Moses took a tablet of gold and engraved thereon the Ineffable Name and cast it therein [into the Nile].’<sup>7</sup> Güdemann already noted the resemblance between the legend about Joseph’s coffin and the Egyptian legend of Osiris in Plutarch’s account.<sup>8</sup> Possibly the Haggada about Joseph’s coffin originated in Egypt, and it is not surprising that it mentions Moses’ use of the Name. From there it reached Eretz-Israel and found a place in the Rabbinic homilies. On behalf of the Tanna R. Nehemiah it is reported that Moses pronounced the Name against the Egyptian and slew him. The same thought is expressed by R. Levi in other words: ‘He slew him with Israel’s mysteries’.<sup>9</sup> On the verse ‘The sea saw it and fled’ (Psalms cxiv 3) the Tanna R. Nehorai said: ‘It saw the Ineffable Name engraved upon the rod and it was rent asunder’.<sup>10</sup> In the Apocryphal work designated *The Prayer of Manasses*, the author of which was apparently a Greek Jew, the worshipper says to God: ‘Who hast bound the sea by the word of Thy command, who hast

## CHAPTER VII

shut up the Deep and sealed it with Thy terrible and glorious Name.’<sup>11</sup> The first part of the verse recalls the Midrash that states that God sealed, with the Torah, ‘the Okeanos that it should not issue forth and flood the world’.<sup>12</sup> Without doubt, in the second part the reference is to sealing with something on which the Name was written, resembling the legend transmitted by ‘a certain Rabbi, who was arranging Haggadic material before R. Joḥanan’,<sup>13</sup> concerning David, to wit, that when he dug the foundations of the Temple and the Deep threatened to flood the world, ‘he wrote the Name on a sherd and threw it into the Deep’. The use of the Name, which is attributed here to David and to his counsellor Ahitophel, is also known from the Haggada about Solomon and Ashmedai (*T.B. Gittin* 68a). Unquestionably, the authors of the Haggadot regarding David and Solomon transmitted ancient legends that gained currency in circles that used the Name themselves. The *Amora Rabba* relates that certain seafarers smote the stormy sea with clubs on which was engraved the sentence ‘I am that I am, Yah, the Lord of hosts’, and it ceased its raging (*T.B. Bava Batra* 73a). When Josephus describes the great wisdom of Solomon—his knowledge, for example, of the way to wage war against the evil spirits—he adds that he left behind him formulas of exorcisms, and appends to this statement a story concerning one Eleazar, a fellow countryman and contemporary, who knew this wisdom and ‘adjured the demon never to come back into him, speaking Solomon’s name and reciting the incantations which he had composed’ (*Ant.* viii, 2, 5). Circles that made use of names and adjurations fostered traditions and Haggadot about the acts of earlier generations in this sphere. In magical Greek papyri there are mentioned ‘the holy secret book of Moses, which is called the Eighth or the Sanctified’ and ‘the secret book about the Great Name’ by Moses.<sup>14</sup> In these papyri there occur Hebrew Names in Greek transcription, such as Ἀδωναῖε [*Ādonay*, ‘Lord’], Ἰάω [*Yāhō* (part of the Tetragrammaton)], βασημμ, and also the phrase βεσεν βερειθεν βεριο, which represents *bēshēm Bāryā(thā)n Bāryā*, ‘In the name of our Creator, the Creator’.<sup>15</sup> These Names, most of which are only epithets, found their way into the Greek papyri after they had long been used in amulets and Hebrew invocations, and it appears that their use in lieu of the Tetragrammaton is the result of a lengthy process that led

## THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

to the restriction of the writing of the Ineffable Name and to its substitution by other sigla or various names and epithets<sup>16</sup>, as well as to stringent limitations on its enunciation. The Name remained in its original spelling only in the Bible, but in the later books there are clear indications that it was pronounced 'Ādonay,<sup>17</sup> just as it was rendered in the Septuagint by ὁ Κύριος;<sup>18</sup> and there are Greek MSS. in which the Tetragrammaton is written in ancient Hebrew letters, without being translated at all.<sup>19</sup> In this form the Name is written both in the Habakkuk Commentary and in the chapters of the Psalms recently discovered.<sup>20</sup> When Philo mentions the Name inscribed on the *ḥîṣ* [the golden plate in front of the high priest's turban], he adds that it 'shows a name which only those whose ears and tongues are purified may hear or speak in the holy place, and no other person, nor in any other place at all. That name has four letters, so says that master learned in divine verities [the *theologus*], who, it may be, gives them as symbols of the first numbers, one, two, three and four.'<sup>21</sup> Also in Synagogue worship the Name was not pronounced, and in blessing the people outside the Temple the priests used only a Divine epithet. In the Temple, however, they pronounced the Ineffable Name<sup>22</sup> in the benediction, and on the Day of Atonement the high priest used to mention the Name ten times: 'six times in connection with the bull, three times in connection with the he-goat, and once in connection with the lots' (*Tosefta Yoma* ii, 2). He likewise enunciated it in the confession in the version 'ānnā *ha-shēm* ['O Lord'], and in the prayer in which he besought atonement: 'ānnā' *ba-shēm kappēr nā'* ['I beseech Thee by Thy Name make Thou atonement']—an oath that seems like an adjuration.<sup>23</sup> But we have clear evidence of the care that was taken in mentioning the Name even in the Sanctuary: 'At first he used to utter it aloud; when unruly men increased, he used to utter it softly. R. Ṭarfon said: I was standing among my brother priests in the line and I inclined my ear towards the high priest and I heard him muffle [literally, 'swallow'] it [the Name] in the melody of the priests. At first it was entrusted to all men; but when unruly men increased, it was confided only to those who were worthy.'<sup>24</sup> An example of the muffling of the Name is perhaps to be found in the testimony of R. Judah, that when they went in procession round the altar they used to say "Ānî wā-Hô,

## CHAPTER VII

save us we pray!’ (M. *Sukka* iv, 5). ’*Ānî wā-Hô* is simply a mumbled version of ’*Ānnā* and the Name.<sup>25</sup> it would appear that also in the sentence they uttered upon departing ’*Yfy lěkhā mizbēah*’, the word *yfy* is not an expression of eulogy [‘beauty’] addressed to the altar but a Divine epithet, reminiscent of the enunciation of the Name (*yfy-ywy*),<sup>26</sup> and the meaning of the utterance is ‘O Lord, the altar is Thine’, as in R. Eliezer’s phrase ‘To *Yah*, yea to Thee is the altar!’<sup>27</sup> The testimonies to this caution that the high priest observed on the Day of Atonement, and which the priests certainly practised during the rest of the year when reciting the priestly benediction, belong to the close of the Temple area; there is reason, however, to suppose that it was not adopted instantaneously, but was undoubtedly the result of a long process. There is a tradition, it is true, that declares ‘when Simeon the Just died, they ceased to use the Name in the benediction’<sup>28</sup> but in another version it is merely stated that ‘after the festival he was ill for seven days and died, and his colleagues refrained from using the Name in the benediction’. The meaning may simply be that on account of their grief and mourning the priests refrained for some time after his death from using the Name in the priestly benediction.<sup>29</sup> At any rate, we must not regard this tradition as fundamental and infer from it, in contradiction of all other sources, that a law was promulgated forbidding the use of the Name in the priestly benediction in the Temple.<sup>30</sup> And undoubtedly this tradition did not antedate the enactment ordaining ‘that a man should use the Name in greeting his fellow’ (M. *Berakhot* ix 5). This Mishnaic text, which has been given various interpretations,<sup>31</sup> must not be deprived of its literal sense nor sundered from the preceding statement: ‘At the close of every benediction in the Temple they used to say *min hā-’ōlām* “From everlasting” [literally, “From the world”, world in Hebrew meaning also “eternity”];<sup>32</sup> but when the sectarians corrupted their teaching, saying “there is but one world”, the (Sages) enacted that one should say *min hā-’ōlām wě-’ad hā-’ōlām* “from everlasting to everlasting [literally, ‘from world to world’]”.’ The expression *mē-’ōlām wě-’ad ’ōlām* ‘from everlasting to everlasting’ occurs several times in the Bible (Psalms xc 2; ciii 17) and also in benedictory formulas, as, for example, in the prayer attributed to David ‘Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the God of Israel our father, forever and ever’ (I Chron-

## THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

icles xxix 10). At the close of the first section of the Book of Psalms we find ‘Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting! [*mē-hā-‘ōlām wě-‘ad hā-ōlām*] Amen and Amen’ (Psalms xli 14; and in analogous phrasing in Psalms cvi 48), and in Nehemiah ix 5 ‘Then the Levites... said, “Stand up and bless the Lord your God from everlasting to everlasting”, etc.’ This formula simply means ‘through all generations’, ‘for ever’ and the like, just as *mē‘attā wě-‘ad ‘ōlām*, ‘from now and for ever’.<sup>33</sup> The sectarians who corrupted their teaching and declared that there was only one world are apparently the Sadducees. Their corruption caused the Sages to insist that at the close of every benediction in the Temple one should say ‘from everlasting to everlasting’. Before this reform this closing benedictory formula was not used at all.<sup>34</sup> Similarly, when the sectarians corrupted their teaching, the Sages enacted that a man should use the Name in greeting his fellow. Here it is not stated with regard to which corrupt teaching this enactment was made, but if the same sectarians are spoken of, we can infer from the remedial regulation that in this case, too, the reference is to Sadducees, who denied Divine Providence.<sup>35</sup> The reform, which renews an ancient benedictory formula of the Bible—‘The Lord be with you’, ‘The Lord bless thee’—was intended to instil the belief in Divine Providence, and is not at all concerned with the pronunciation of the Name. It is improbable that only at such periods as the priests employed an epithet exclusively in the priestly benediction when pronounced outside the Temple, the Name was not used in greetings but merely a Divine title; for we observed that in ancient times, going back to the early Hasmoneans, care was taken not to mention the Name, and other designations were substituted for it. If the exact date when caution began to be exercised in respect of the pronunciation of the Name in the Temple and it commenced to be muffled is unknown to us, the reason at least for the change is stated: ‘when unruly men increased’, and these unruly men are none other than people who used the Name irresponsibly; compare the expression ‘be profuse in vows or levity’ (*M. Demai* ii, 3).

The use of amulets was extremely widespread; this is attested both by the Halakhot that mention them incidentally, as for example, ‘a man should not go out [on the Sabbath]... either with phylacteries or with an amulet’ (*M. Shabbat* vi, 2), ‘He that takes out [on the Sabbath]

## CHAPTER VII

leather to make an amulet...’ (*ibid.* viii, 2–3),<sup>36</sup> and by popular parables, such as: ‘R. Ḥunya in the name of R. Benjamin b. Levi said: This is comparable to a king who said to his son “Go and do business”. He replied “Father, I am afraid to journey on land because of bandits, and to travel by sea because of pirates. What did his father do? He took a rod and hollowed it out and placed an amulet in it and warned his son, saying to him: “Let this rod be in your hand and you shall not fear any creature”.’<sup>37</sup> The very secrecy and fear that enveloped the Ineffable Name and its pronunciation strengthened the belief in its power and in the value of its use, and people did not refrain from employing it both in amulets and in enchantments. It is significant that to the statement of R. Akiba, who numbered one that uttered a charm over a wound among those who have no share in the world to come, Abba Saul added ‘Also he that pronounces the Name with its proper letters’ (*M. Sanhedrin* x, 1). It is probable that this pronunciation of the Name with its proper letters was connected with the utterance of charms. It was to this, apparently, that the Amora R. Mana referred in his comment on Abba Saul’s ruling: ‘like the Cutheans, when they take an oath’ (*T.P. ibid.* x, 5, p. 28b), that is, like the Samaritans who swear by the Name when an oath is imposed.<sup>38</sup> Although we know that the earlier Samaritans, in contrast to the later Samaritans,<sup>39</sup> pronounced the Name with its proper letters, and made use of it for magical purposes, yet it is clear that Abba Saul, like R. Akiba, referred to Jews. Mention should be made in this connection of the teaching ‘whoever makes use of the Ineffable Name has no share in the world to come’, which is cited in *’Avot de-R. Nathan* (Recension I, xii, p. 56) as an explanation of Hillel’s saying ‘whoever uses the Crown perishes’ (*M. ’Avot*, i, 13).<sup>40</sup>

The writing of the Names in amulets and for magical purposes was performed according to the usual practice in this art. The Name of twelve letters, mentioned in a Babylonian Baraita, and the Name of forty-two letters, of which Rav speaks (*T.B. Qiddushin* 71a), and the Name of seventy-two letters, with which, R. Avin tells us, the Holy One, blessed be He, redeemed the children of Israel from Egypt<sup>41</sup> — none of these is explained either in the Talmud or in the Amoraic Midrashim. On the other hand, there are numerous philosophical and mystical explanations.<sup>42</sup> But undoubtedly the discovery of the magical

## THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

papyri has served to clarify the subject of these Names, as M. Gaster and L. Blau<sup>43</sup> have shown. In these papyri the sounds of the Greek alphabet are used for the combination of names ἐπτάγραμματον ὄνομα in various patterns. This combination of letters, which is called ἀναγραμματίζειν, was achieved by Jews by means of the Tetragrammaton. Writing it three times produced the Name of twelve letters. A triangular structure, whose base consists of twelve letters—that is, three times the Tetragrammaton—and the succeeding lines contain progressively one letter less, until at the apex the Tetragrammaton is attained, comprises a total of seventy-two letters. The first four rows form the Name of forty-two letters. Since these Names, which were called the ‘Great Name’, were based upon the Tetragrammaton, it is not surprising that the same rules of caution were applied to their transmission. In a Babylonian Baraita it is stated, in parallelism with what we learnt about the Tetragrammaton: ‘The Rabbis taught: At first the twelve-lettered Name was entrusted to all men; but when unruly men increased, it was confined only to the pious members of the priesthood...’ Even clearer restrictions are found in the statement of Rav Judah, who said in the name of Rav: ‘The Name of forty-two letters is entrusted only to one who is pious and humble, is middle-aged, is not irascible, is not given to drunkenness, and is not insistent on his rights. And he who knows the Name, and uses it with due care, and keeps it in purity, is beloved in Heaven and cherished on earth, and his fellow creatures stand in awe of him, and he inherits two worlds—this world and the world to come’ (*T.B. Qiddushin, ibid.*). All the conditions that those worthy to have the Name entrusted to them were required to fulfil have as their object that the one who knows the Name should be careful of it and keep it in purity, not using it for any unworthy purpose. The Halakha prescribes the penalty of flogging for whoever uses the Name in cursing his fellow. This is an ancient Halakha. It is taught in an anonymous Baraita (*Tosefta Makkot* v, 10, p. 444, and *T.P. Shevu’ot* iii, 12, p. 35a), which is transmitted in the name of R. Jose the Galilean.<sup>44</sup> It is noteworthy that in *The Manual of Discipline* it is stated with regard to one who curses, using the Name, ‘that he may never return to the council [formal membership] of the Community’ (*Serekh ha-yahad*, 7, 1, ed. Licht, p. 160).



## CHAPTER VII

As regards the use of the Name for cursing, it is related by the Amoraim: ‘Samuel once heard, as he was passing, a Persian cursing his son by the Name and he died’ (*T.P. Yoma* iii, 7, p. 40d). The effective power lies in the Name itself, and it does not matter whether the Divine designation is uttered by a Persian man or woman (*Eccles. Rabba* iii, 11). Whoever is not careful in using it may kill people; hence the condition not to entrust it to an irascible person. Another stipulation is that the Name may not be confided to one who is dependent on others, as we learn from the following story: ‘A certain physician in Sepphoris said to R. Phinehas bar Hama: “Come! I will entrust it [the Name] to you.” He replied: “I am unable to receive it.” “Why?” (the physician) asked him. He replied: “Because I eat tithe, and one who is familiar with it [the Name] may partake of nothing given him by any man”’ (*T.P. loc. cit.*). The reason is more fully explained in the parallel source: ‘Lest he ask something of a man, and if he does not give it to him, he will become angry with him and slay him.’<sup>45</sup> The inherent power in the Ineffable Name also serves to explain why it is concealed and unknown: ‘Thus said the Holy One, blessed be He: Now if when I have concealed the Ineffable Name from them, they slay by using an epithet, how much more so would they do so, if I openly entrusted to them the Ineffable Name!’ (*Eccles. Rabba, loc. cit.*). Those Sages who knew the secret of the Ineffable Name regarded its concealment from the general public as a punishment. Thus R. Joshua b. Levi in the name of R. Phinehas b. Jair replied to the question: Why are the Jews not answered when they pray?—‘Because they do not know the secret of the Ineffable Name’.<sup>46</sup> Knowledge of the Name is regarded as the privilege of certain generations. R. Abba bar Kahana said: Two generations used the Ineffable Name—the men of the Great Assembly<sup>47</sup> and the generation of the Hadrianic persecutions... and some say that also in the generation of Hezekiah and in that of Zedekiah the Ineffable Name was known, as it is said: (Therefore) “Thus saith the Lord [the God of Israel]: ‘Behold, I will turn back the weapons of war that are in your hands”’ (Jeremiah xxi 4). What are the weapons of war? The reference is to the Ineffable Name, for they used to go forth to war, but did not wage war, yet their enemies fell; when, however, their iniquities caused the Temple to be destroyed, they [the Israelites] fell into the hands

## THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

of their enemies. R. Aibu and the Rabbis expressed different views. R. Aibu said: The angels scraped off the Name that was upon them [the soldiers]; while the Rabbis declared: It peeled off of its own accord' (*Midrash Tehillim* xxxvi 8). These Amoraim of the third century, who tell us that the soldiers of Zedekiah used the Ineffable Name by inscribing it on their bodies, limit the intrinsic power of the Name, since the sins caused it to be annulled. Similarly, it is stated that the Tanna R. Ḥanina b. Teradion, one of the heroes of the generation of the Hadrianic persecutions, who knew the secret of the Ineffable Name, was punished because he uttered the Name with its proper letters (*T.B. 'Avoda Zara* 18a), apparently with a view to using it. Clearly, the view that R. Ḥanina b. Teradion was punished is that of the Amoraim. Noteworthy is the fact that in the narratives dealing with men who knew the secret of the Name there appear a 'physician' and an almost unknown Sage, while those to whom it is desired to reveal the secret—and in the end the knowledge is not imparted—are the leaders of the generation. On the one hand, knowledge of the Name was regarded as indicative of a high religious and spiritual degree, and on the other, the dangers involved in the revelation of the Name, and even more so in its use, were recognized. Hence, restraint, which implied a forgoing of privilege, was decided upon. R. Joḥanan ruled: 'the Tetragrammaton may be confided by the Sages to their disciples once in a septennate.' When Rava 'proposed to expound it at a public lecture, a certain old man [elder] said: it is spelt [Exodus iii 15] *lē'allēm*.'<sup>48</sup> He alluded thereby to the exposition transmitted by Rav Naḥman bar Isaac: "This is My name for ever [*lē'ōlām*]"; but it is spelt *lē'allem* ["to conceal"]'.<sup>49</sup> A solution to the contradiction between this exposition and the continuation of the verse 'and this is My memorial unto all generations' can be found in another teaching of the same Amora: The world to come is not like this world; in this world (the Ineffable Name) is written with *Yôd Hē'* [the initial letters of the Tetragrammaton] and read '*Āleph Dālet* [the initial letters of '*Ādōnay*], but in the world to come it will all be one—(His name) will be read with *Yôd Hē'*, and written with *Yôd Hē'*' (*T.B. Pesahim* 50a). In this saying the Sage resigns himself to a religiously imperfect world: the knowledge of the Name and its pronunciation shall be complete only in the world to come, when

## CHAPTER VII

God's name will be one, and there will be no danger of its being contaminated by other names and used in a polytheistic-syncretistic sense, a practice that was widely current in the magical literature, in amulets, and in invocations. The sources that refer to the use by wicked people of the 'name of impurity' are few.<sup>50</sup> For such a concept opens the way to a dualistic outlook. Even Balaam is said to have used the Ineffable Name.<sup>51</sup>

It seems to me that the account we have given above suffices to refute the view of Christian theologians who sought to discover in the non-enunciation of the Name and the substitution of epithets for it a fundamental difference between Judaism and Biblical religion. Equally unacceptable is the view that the desistance from the pronunciation of the Name had its origin in the Babylonian Exile,<sup>52</sup> and that it resulted from fear of the Gentiles' mockery and blasphemies of the type mentioned in Ezekiel (xxxvi 20) and Psalms (xl 5 [4]; lxxiv 10). It appears that actually the discontinuance of the enunciation and mention of the Name was intended to prevent the blurring of the distance between God and man and the use of the Name for magical purposes. But this fact does not indicate a 'decline' in Israel's faith or the estrangement of Judaism from God, for it was precisely the sense of God's nearness that found expression, as we have seen, in the designations that are indicative of it; only in them and in their interpretations—as in relation to the Ineffable Name—there is also manifest that tension between the feeling of aloofness and nearness, which characterizes the attitude of the Sages to God.

## CHAPTER VII

## THE POWER OF THE DIVINE NAME

1. See The Acts of the Apostles IV 7. Onkelos rendered the Scripture ‘and that My name be declared’—‘and that they may relate the mighty acts of My name’.♦
2. See above, p. 701, n. 1.♦
3. See Kaufmann, *Toledot ha-'Emuna ha-Yisre'elit*, I, p. 481, n. 17. Despite Kaufmann's strictures, Buber, in *Königtum Gottes*, Berlin 1932, pp. 83–85, appears to be right in his interpretation of Exodus iii 13 ff., according to which these verses express the annulment of the magic character of the Name. Kaufmann's argument that it is nowhere stated in the Torah ‘Do not practise magic with the name of the Lord’ is not valid, for it is obvious that the general prohibition of witchcraft includes also sorcery of this kind.♦
4. See L. Löw, *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, Szegedin 1889, pp. 187 ff.; B. Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, 1903, pp. 1 ff.♦
5. Fragments of his work ‘On the Jews’ have been preserved in that of Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.*, IX, 27. See J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, pp. 160 ff. and p. 235; A. Dietrich, *Abraxas*, 1891, pp. 70 ff.; cf. B. Jacob, *op. cit.*, p. 109, and Julius Guttman, *Ha-Sifrutha-Helenistit*, II, p. 130.♦
6. *Ant.*, II, 275; on his attitude to Artapanus, see Freudenthal and Guttman, *loc. cit.* On the various interpretations of the expression *Shēm ha-Mēfôrāsh* [literally ‘the Tetragrammaton pronounced’; rendered in the text: ‘the Ineffable Name’], see Max Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprach- und Sagenkunde*, Berlin 1911, pp. 238–258; it is clear that from the practical aspect, the Name, which only few knew how to pronounce and to interpret, was a ‘Hidden Name’ set apart and holy.♦
7. *Mekhilta de-R. Ishmael*, Massekhta de-Wa-yehi, Petihta, p. 78, according to the Munich MS.; the parallel passages are indicated in the notes *ibid.* It seems to me that this reading (similarly, in *Midrash Aggada*, ed. S. Buber, Vienna 1894, p. 143 we find: ‘and Moses wrote the Ineffable Name and cast it into the Nile’) is old and not a later addition. In other recensions of the *Mekhilta* the text has: ‘He took a pebble and cast it therein’, which is, appar-

## CHAPTER VII

- ently, an abridgement of the recension of the *Tanḥuma*, Be-shallah, § 2: 'He took a pebble and engraved on it "Arise, O ox!".' In the *Mekhilta de-R. Ishmael*, *loc. cit.*, and in the parallel passages dependent on it, it is stated only that Moses said 'Joseph, Joseph! (the time) has arrived (for the fulfilment of) the oath that the Holy One, blessed be He, swore to Abraham', etc. ♦
8. M. Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Leipzig 1876, pp. 26 ff.; see J. Guttmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 111 ff. ♦
  9. *Leviticus Rabba* xxxii, 4, p. 745; *Tanḥuma*, Exodus ix. On the different interpretations *ad loc.*, see M. Kasher, *Torah Shlemah* [Talmudic-Midrashic Encyclopedia on the Pentateuch], Exodus, p. 80, n. 102. ♦
  10. *Deut. Rabba* iii, 8; in ed. Lieberman, p. 87, the dictum is in the name of R. Judah; in *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana*, p. 308, the reading is: 'R. Nehemiah said, The Ineffable Name was engraven on it — "The Lord of hosts is His name"'; but in the Carmoly MS. the text has 'R. Judah' (see the vv.ll. *ibid.*). In *Yalqut Shim'oni*, Pt. I, § 181, there is cited in the name of a 'Midrash': 'When Moses and Aaron came, they stood before Pharaoh... and in their hand was the rod of God on which was engraved the Ineffable Name'; and *ibid.* § 168, excerpted from the annals of Moses, 'Behold, there was engraved on it the name of the Lord God of hosts, written in full on the rod'. The version of the Haggada given in *Pirqê de-R. Eliezer* xl implies that the letters were inscribed on the rod, as is also stated in *Tanḥuma*, Wa-'era' 8, ed. Buber; see *Šekhel Tov* to Exodus, ed. Buber, Berlin 1901, p. 27. All this contradicts the *Mekhilta de-R. Ishmael*, Wa-yehi, iv, p. 102, where it is stated that the sea did not flee on account of the Holy Name (see vv.ll. *ibid.*), nor at the sight of the rod, but only when 'the Holy One, blessed be He, revealed Himself'; see above, p. 136. ♦
  11. The interpretation given by E.S. Hartom, *Ha-Sēfārîm ha-Ĥisônîm* [Apocrypha], ed. A. Kahana, I, p. 332, to this verse is improbable. ♦
  12. *Tanḥuma*, Bereshit i. See *Pirqê de-R. Eliezer*, iii, 'Until the world was created, there was only the Holy One, blessed be He, and His Name'; this is the reading in the first printed edition, Constantinople 1514, and in the Venice edition, 1544. ♦
  13. *T.B. Sukka* 53a; this is also the reading in the Munich MS. and in the Berlin MS. According to Rashi's interpretation—'He said to him: since you have reminded me of the matter, this is what was said'—the speaker was Rav Ḥisda; but according to the text of the MSS. we must read before this 'If so, fifteen' etc. 'He answered him, Fifteen', in which case the speaker was 'a certain Rabbi'. See *Diqduqe Soferim*, Sukka, p. 174, nn. 4 and 8. The story is related in answer to Rav Ḥisda's question 'With reference to what did David utter these fifteen Songs of Ascent?' ♦
  14. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, Pt. II, Berlin 1931, pp. 105, 120, and also p. 28; see G. Alon, *Tarbiz*, XXI, 1950, p. 33 (= *Mehqarim be-Toledot Yisra'el*, 1957, Pt. I, p. 196). ♦
  15. So correctly interpreted by S. Lieberman, *Tarbiz* XXVII, 1958, p. 184; see *Mekhilta de-R. Ishmael*, Mishpaṭim, XVII, p. 310: 'R. Simeon b. Yoḥai

## NOTES · PAGES 124–127

- said... whoever associates the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, with idols deserves annihilation'; possibly his statement was made with reference to the use of the Divine Names and the letters of the Torah in amulets and invocations alongside the names of idols. ♦
16. See J. Z. Lauterbach, 'Substitutes for the Tetragrammaton', *Proceedings of the AAJR*, XXII, 1930–1931, pp. 39–67. ♦
  17. Compare II Sam. vii 28: *wě-'attā 'Ādōnay YHWH 'attā hū hā-'Ēlōhîm* ['And now, O Lord God, Thou alone art God'] with I Chron. xvii 26: *wě-'attā YHWH 'attā hū hā-'Ēlōhîm* ['And now, O Lord, Thou alone art God']. In Ezekiel we find *kō'āmar 'Ādōnay YHWH* ['Thus saith the Lord God'] 122 times and *nē'ûm 'Ādōnay YHWH* ['Saith the Lord God'] 81 times, but in Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi there is not a single instance. The Masoretic vocalization of the Tetragrammaton in all the above-mentioned passages is that of *'Ēlōhîm*; cf. the annotation of R. Elijah Gaon of Vilna to *'Orah Hayyim* § 5 '... and therefore when two Names are in juxtaposition, its vocalization is sometimes that of *'Ēlōhîm*, but the pointing of the Name itself [i.e. the Tetragrammaton] is unknown like all the cases of *Kētîv* in the Torah, and its vocalization is the secret of the Ineffable Name; see B. Jacob, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 ff. ♦
  18. Lev. xxiv 16 is translated ὀνομάζων δὲ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θανάτῳ θανατούσθω; see A. Geiger, *Urschrift*<sup>2</sup>, Frankfurt-On-Main 1928, pp. 262 ff., and the Addenda *ibid.* pp. 11 ff.; F. Perles, *Annalekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, Munich 1895, pp. 12–20; I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, Leiden 1948, p. 66. ♦
  19. As in the Genizah fragment containing Psalms translated by Aquila; see C. Taylor, *Cairo Genizah Palimpsests*, Cambridge 1900, pp. 54–65. So, too, in all five columns of the palimpsest of the Hexapla of the *Codex Ambrosianus*, the Tetragrammaton is written in Hebrew letters. See P. Kahle, 'Die von Origenes verwendeten griech. Bibelhandschriften', *Studia Patristica*, IV, 1961, p. 107, Kahle's conclusion is that the translation of the Name by κύριος does not pertain to the original Septuagint text. Nor is κύριος found in the sense of the Divine Name in the Hellenistic literature of the third and second centuries B.C.E.; see *ibid.* p. 116. But compare above p. 718, n. 51, and also W. Baudissin, *Kyrios*, I, P. 5; II, pp. 236 ff. ♦
  20. See A. M. Habermann, *Megillot Midbar Yehuda*, 1959, p. 31. In view of the fact that this feature is not found in the Scroll of Isaiah, it seems that the practice was restricted to annotations and to the Psalms that were used for instruction. See *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan*, Oxford 1962, Vol. III, pp. 55 and 95; cf. also *ibid.* Vol. IV, 1965. See further Y. Yadin, 'Another Fragment of the Psalms Scroll from Qumran 11', *Textus*, V, 1966, pp. 6–7. ♦
  21. *De Vita Mosis*, II, 114; the Septuagint, Exodus XXVIII 36, already translates: καὶ ἐκτύψεις ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτύπωμα σφραγίδος, Ἁγίασμα Κυρίου. See the *Letter of Aristeas* 98; Josephus, *Wars*, v, 5, 7 (235); *Ant.* iii, 7. 6 (178); *T.P. Yoma* iv, 1, p. 41 c; *T.B. Shabbat* 63b; I. Heinemann, *Philons griechische*

## CHAPTER VII

- und jüdische Bildung*, Breslau 1932, pp. 19–21; S. Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law*, Cambridge Mass. 1940, p. 41. ♦
22. *M. Soṭa* vii, 6; *Sifre*, Našo', § 39, p. 43; see *ibid.* note to line 9; H. Albeck, *Seder Nashim*, Supplements, p. 387. ♦
23. See S. Lieberman, *op. cit.*, p. 184; *Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah*, Mo'ed, p. 755. ♦
24. *T.P. Yoma* iii, 7, p. 40d. In *Sifre Zuṭa*, Be-midbar VI, 27, p. 250, the tradition regarding R. Ṭarfon is transferred to the 'priestly benediction', in which case the expression 'and I inclined my ear towards the high priest' is strange. In *T.B. Qiddushin* 71a, the beginning of the Baraita is also different. Instead of 'Once I was standing among my brother priests in the line', we find there 'Once I went up after my mother's brother to the priests' platform...'. The Baraita concerning R. Ṭarfon is taught there immediately after the Baraita regarding the Twelve-Lettered Name. S. Ch. Kook, 'Bě-'inyānē Shēmôt ha-Qēdôshîm' [On the Sacred Names], in his volume of essays, *Iyyûnim û-Meḥqārîm*, Pt. I, Jerusalem 1959, pp. 164 ff., suggests that also the last sentence in the Palestinian Talmud 'At first it was made known...' refers to the Twelve-Lettered Name, but this is without foundation. There is no reference to this Name either in the Palestinian Talmud or in *Sifre Zuṭa*, and even in the Babylonian Talmud there is no need to regard the Baraita about R. Ṭarfon as referring to the Name spoken of in the preceding Baraita. In the current editions it is stated 'And I heard him swallow the Name in the melody of his brother priests', and in the MS. Munich the reading is '... for they swallowed the Name in the chanting...'; and the reference is undoubtedly to the Tetragrammaton. ♦
25. See A. Geiger, *Qēvûṣat Ma'āmārîm* [Nachgelassene Schriften], Berlin 1877, p. 102; Ben Yehuda, *Millon* [Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew], III, p. 1264, n. 3, deals with the subject at great length, but does not mention Geiger's views. Other explanations are given by L. Blau, *op. cit.*, p. 134, n. 2; G. Alon, *Meḥqarim*, Pt. I, p. 200. H. Yalon, *Kirjath Sepher*, XXVIII, 1952, p. 71 already dealt with *HW'H*, *HW'H* in *Serekh ha-Yahad* ['Manual of Discipline'] (See ed. Licht, Jerusalem 1965, pp. 160, 181) and 'Ānî wā-Hû'; possibly these forms simply reflect what was indistinctly heard [as a result of the muffling ('swallowing') of the Name by the high priest]. ♦
26. See Blau, *op. cit.*, p. 131, where he refers to the names in the papyri  $\omega\phi\eta$ ,  $\omega\pi\eta$ ; the whole subject is an addition to the Mishna from the Baraita. Cf. J. N. Epstein, *Māvô' lě-Nōsaḥ ha-Mishnā*, pp. 928, 952; S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah*, Mo'ed, p. 871. Similar to  $\text{יפֿי}$  is the epithet  $\text{יִסִי}$ , *M. Sanhedrin* VII, 10, spelt in MSS.  $\text{יִסִי}$  (*Diqduqe Soferim* 80a) and vocalized, in the Kaufmann MS., *Yôsēh*; possibly the other epithet was pronounced *Yôfēh*. ♦
27. In the light of this interpretation it is also possible to understand the objection raised by the Babylonian Talmud, *loc. cit.*, p. 46b, that the expression *Lě- Yāh û-lěkhā* appears to imply that *lě- Yāh* ['to the Lord'] and *lěkhā* ['to Thee'] do not refer to the same Being; see S. Lieberman, "Alē 'Ayin', the *S.Z. Schocken Jubilee Volume*, Jerusalem 1948–1952, p. 81. ♦

## NOTES · PAGES 128–129

28. *Tosefta Sota* xiii, 8, p. 319; the first version is that of the printed edd. and the Vienna MS., and the second is that of the Erfurt MS. ♦
29. This is also the explanation of B. Jacob, *op. cit.*, p. 175, n. 3. ♦
30. This is the approach of A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, Pt. I, p. 29; he freely emends the text of the Mishna and the Tosefta of Berakhot, but his whole historic structure is unsound. It is based on the dictum of R. Joshua b. Levi (*T.P. Berakhot* ix, p. 14c; *T.B. Makkot* 23b): ‘Three things were enacted by the earthly court, to which the Heavenly Court gave assent. These are: the reading of the Scroll (of Esther), greeting with the Divine Name, and the bringing of the (Levite’s) tithe (to the Temple chamber)’ (In the Palestinian Talmud ‘the banned property of Jericho’ is counted but not ‘the bringing of the tithe’). Marmorstein links all the things together and attributes them to adjacent periods, and in this way he comes to the enactment made against the priests who succeeded Simon. The aforementioned dictum is supported by verses pertaining to periods far removed from one another, and the number is only intended to indicate enactments made by the earthly court to which assent was given by the Heavenly Court. Marmorstein’s interpretation of Psalms cxxix 8, according to which ‘they that go by’ are the Hellenists, who did not accept the enactment of the Sages to use the Ineffable Name in their greetings, is purely imaginary; and undoubtedly Sirach xli 20 has no bearing on our subject. See M. H. Segal, pp. 281–282. ♦
31. See H. Albeck, *Seder Zera’im*, Supplements, p. 339. ♦
32. In the Kaufmann MS., Lowe, and the MS. of Maimonides, the reading is: ‘At the close [*hôtam* sing, instead of *hôtēmē*] of every benediction recited in the Temple was the formula “from everlasting”...’ ♦
33. See A. Krochmal, ‘*Iyyun Tefilla* [Prayer Studyl, 1885, p. 22; S. A. Lowenstamm, *Tarbiz*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 313–316. ♦
34. The Mishna enumerates Temple usages, including the formula used at the close of the benedictions. The sentence beginning ‘When the sectarians corrupted their teaching’ does not mark the beginning of a new subject, but states when this closing formula was introduced. The *Tosefta Berakhot*, vi, 21, adds the reason for the enactment: ‘thus making known that this world...’ The Mishna gives us the beginning of the concluding phrase, ‘from everlasting’, the Tosefta cites the end of the phrase ‘to everlasting’ (but there is evidence of the opposite version, both in the Mishna and in the Tosefta), and there is no disagreement between them; both refer to the same formula ‘from everlasting to everlasting’. This explanation removes the difficulties that both the earlier and later expositors struggled to solve: see S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshutah*, *Zera’im*, pp. 122–123. According to our interpretation, therefore, the ending was never ‘from everlasting’ or ‘to everlasting’ alone, but when the concluding formula was instituted, it took the familiar form ‘from everlasting to everlasting’. ♦
35. This explanation of the enactment concerning salutations was also given by Mann, *Text and Studies*, Pt. I, Cincinnati 1931, pp. 581–582; only, following



## CHAPTER VII

- the opinion of A. Büchler (*Priester und Cultus*, Vienna 1895, p. 176) regarding the first enactment, he dated it to the close of the Temple era, but there is no proof of this. On the views relating to Divine Providence, see below, chapter xi. ♦
36. See *T.B. Shabbat* 115b: 'Benedictions and amulets, although they contain letters of the Name and many Torah passages, may not be rescued from a fire [on the Sabbath]. See *ibid.* 61 b; *Tosefta ibid.* xiii, 14; *Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah ibid.*, p. 205; cf. L. Blau, *op. cit.*, pp. 44–95. ♦
37. *Lev. Rabba*, XXV, p. 567. On the great care that they took in writing the Name, see *Tosefta Berakhot* iii, 22; cf. *Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah*, Pt. I, p. 47. For one who enquires of his staff, see *Tosefta Shabbat* vii (viii), 4; *Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah ibid.*, p. 93; cf. also *T.P. Nedarim* x, 1 p. 41a (= *Mo'ed Qaṭan* iii, 2, p. 82a): 'R. Me'ir's staff was in my hand and it instructed me'. ♦
38. See Israel Lévi, 'Ueber einige Fragmente aus der Mischna des Abba Saul', *Bericht über die Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin*, 1876, pp. 33–34. Epiphanius, *Contra Haer.*, 24, 14, states that Peter ascribed his power to the knowledge of barbaric names—καὶ ὀνόματα βαρβαρικά. In *Tanḥuma*, Wa-yeshev, § 2, in the account of the War of the Samaritans at the beginning of the period of the Second Temple, it is stated: 'What did Ezra and Zerubbabel and Joshua do? They assembled the entire Congregation in the Temple of the Lord... and the Levites sang and played and they banned, anathematized, and excommunicated the Cutheans by the mystery of the Ineffable Name.' ♦
39. See Z. Ben Ḥayyim, '*Ha-Hôgîm ha-Shômĕrônîm 'et ha-Shĕm bĕ-'Otiyôtāw?* [Do the Samaritans pronounce the Name as it is spelt?]' *Sefer Eretz-Israel*, iii, 1954, p. 147; cf. *ibid.*, p. 150, n. 48. ♦
40. See the commentary of R. Beḥai to *M. 'Avot*, ed. J. L. Deutsch, Jerusalem (undated), p. 17; cf. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism etc.*, p. 54. ♦
41. *Gen. Rabba*, xliv, 19, p. 442. ♦
42. See *More Nevukhim* [Guide of the Perplexed], Pt. I, lxii; cf. '*Oṣar ha-Ge'onim to Qiddushin*, p. 176, and the note of B. Lewin *ad loc.* The arithmetical combination of W. Bacher, *Die Agada des bab. Amoräer*, Strassburg 1878, pp. 17ff., who thought he could find the Name of forty-two letters in the dictum of Rav concerning the ten things with which the Holy One, blessed be He, created the world, *T.B. Hagiga* 12a, was already rightly rejected by L. Blau; see also above, p. 197. ♦
43. M. Gaster, 'The Sword of Moses', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London 1896, pp. 156ff. (= *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic etc.*, vol. I, London 1925, pp. 295 ff); Blau, *op. cit.*, pp. 141–145. ♦
44. *T.B. Shevu'ot* 21a: 'R. Judah said in the name of R. Jose the Galilean', and so, too, *T.B. Makkot* 16a; in *T.B. Temura* 3a the text has only 'in the name of R. Jose the Galilean', but the Munich MS. reads: 'R. Judah said in the name of R. Jose the Galilean'. In Tractates *Makkot* and *Temurah*, Rashi explains 'by the Name' to mean 'by the Name of the Holy One, blessed be He', but in *Shevu'ot* he glosses, 'by the Specific Name'. ♦

## NOTES · PAGES 129–134

45. *Eccles. Rabba*, *loc. cit.* There the order is reversed: it is R. Phinehas bar Hama who asks the physician to reveal to him the secret of the Ineffable Name, and the physician refused for the reason mentioned, but the version of the Palestinian Talmud appears to be the more original. In the *Qundres 'Aḥaron* [Addendum] of the *Yalquṭ Shim'oni* (see L. Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments*, p. 311) the reading is: 'R. Jose in Sepphoris said to R. Phinehas bar Ḥama...', but this appears to be a corrupt version. A similar divergence is found also in the story about R. 'Onyani bar Susai and R. Ḥanina of Sepphoris. According to the Palestinian Talmud, R. 'Onyani offers to reveal the Name to R. Ḥanina; but in *Eccles. Rabba* the reverse is stated. R. 'Onyana bar Susai, unlike R. Ḥanina, is not a well-known Sage, and is cited in the Palestinian Talmud only four times; see my remarks in *IEJ*, IX (1959), p. 152. Cf. also *Pesiqta Rabbati* § 21, p. 104a: 'Just as I create and destroy worlds, so does My Name create and destroy worlds.' ♦
46. *Pesiqta Rabbati* § 22, p. 114b; cf. S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah*, Mo'ed, p. 755, n. 14. ♦
47. Lieberman, *ibid.*, refers to *T.B. Yoma* 69b, where Rav declares that Ezra magnified God by pronouncing the Ineffable Name; see also *T.P. Berakhot* vii, p. 11c. ♦
48. *T.B. Qiddushin* 71 a, where the passage is preceded by a Baraita that explains the *Mishna* 'Eduyot viii, 7: 'It is taught: There was another (family) there, and the Sages did not wish to disclose it, but they confided the information to their sons and disciples once in a septennate', etc. With regard to this statement, too, Rav Naḥman the son of Isaac said 'Reason supports' etc. Now it may be argued that the dictum of R. Joḥanan regarding the Name is only an interpretation transferred from elsewhere, especially since in *T.P. Qiddushin* iv, 5, p. 65c only the first topic is cited, and with reference to it R. Joḥanan observes: 'By the Temple! I recognize them, but what can be done seeing that the leaders of the generation have become mixed up with them!' Nevertheless, it seems that the authenticity of the saying is not to be doubted, since it begins a complete discussion on the subject of the pronunciation of the Name and the teaching of the secret thereof. Apparently it was transferred here on account of the similarity between the Baraita and the dictum of R. Joḥanan. ♦
49. So, too, is Ecclesiastes iii 22 expounded in the homilies of *Ecc. Rabba*, *ibid.*; see also the Targum, *ibid.* ♦
50. On the verse, Gen. xxv 6, 'But unto the sons of the concubines, that Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts', R. Jeremiah bar Abba said: '(It means) that he confided to them the name of impurity' (*T.B. Sanhedrin* 91a). Rashi in his commentary to Genesis, *loc. cit.*, cites the saying, and the commentators go to great trouble in their endeavour to explain away the difficulty of the dictum. Some have emended the text to read 'the Name in impurity'; see M. Kasher, *Torah Shelemah*, Ḥayyê Sārā, p. 596. Compare also L. Ginzberg, *Legends*, V, p. 265, and p. 301. The attempt by H. J. Schoeps, *Aus frühchristli-*

## CHAPTER VII

*chen Zeit*, Tübingen 1950, pp. 252ff., to identify Balaam with Simon Magus, who is also alleged to have flown, is no more probable than the identification with Jesus; see my observations in *Tarbiz*, XXV (1956), pp. 281ff. In the description of the teraphim of Laban in *Pirqê de-R. Eliezer xxxvi* (omitted in the ed. containing the commentary of R. David Luria) it is also stated 'On the golden plate [שִׁשֶׁ] (of the high priest) is inscribed the name of the spirit of impurity' (in the Ginzburg MS. 111, 'on the golden (*as* [= 'plate', like שִׁשֶׁ above]'); while on our verse Targum Pseudo-Jonathan declares 'and they inscribed magical formulas on a golden plate'; see above, p. 734, n. 10. ♦

51. In the *Yelammedenu*, cited in *Yalqut Shim'oni*, Be-midbar, § 785, it is stated that Balaam 'flew and ascended by using the Ineffable Name'. In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Numbers xxxi 8 it is already stated 'He performed an act of magic and flew in the air of the sky'. See H. M. Horowitz, *Aggadat Aggadot*, Berlin 1881, pp. 78–79, and *ibid.* n. 26; he did not see the *Yalqut Shim'oni*, hence he wrote that the author of the Haggadah derived it from the statement of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan; cf. *Tanḥuma Maṭṭot*, § 4; *Num. Rabba*, xx, 20. ♦
52. See B. Jacob, *op. cit.* ♦