

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Das letzte Passahmahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes, nach den in Uebereinstimmung gebrachten Berichten der Synoptiker und des Evangeliums Johannis by D. Chwolson

Review by: W. Bacher

Source: *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Jul., 1893, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Jul., 1893), pp. 680-694

Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1450295>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



University of Pennsylvania Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Jewish Quarterly Review*

JSTOR

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Das letzte Passahmahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes, nach den in Uebereinstimmung gebrachten Berichten der Synoptiker und des Evangeliums Johannis. Von D. CHWOLSON. St. Petersburg, 1892, viii. 132 pp.

THE famous author of this essay, which is published in the *Memoires of the Imperial Academy* of St. Petersburg, endeavours to remove an old difficulty in the exegesis of the New Testament, and to unravel decisively a contradiction between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John. This attempt gives the author the opportunity to treat of an important period in the internal history of Judaism, and to illustrate in a new way certain questions connected with the origin of Christianity. The relation of the Pharisees to the Sadducees serves Chwolson as the subject of new hypotheses based on the Halachic traditions. The essay before us points out, first of all, how necessary the full knowledge of the literature of the Jewish tradition is for the correct understanding of the New Testament. At the same time the essay brings forward some surprising results, and thereby becomes an interesting contribution to the history of Judaism in the last decades of the Second Temple. For this reason it is extremely necessary that such a contribution by so highly esteemed an author should be made known by the means of this periodical to wider circles. I give a short account of Chwolson's essay, and only add my own remarks on some of the points considered.

The starting point of Chwolson's essay is the question, On which day did Jesus celebrate the last Paschal supper? This question, which was regarded already by an author of the seventeenth century (Bynaeus) as "*vetus et nobilis et magnis contententium studiis agitata quaestio*," has also occupied the attention of the expositors of the New Testament during the last two centuries. The question is connected with the contradiction which exists between the report of the three Synoptical Gospels, and that of St. John. In the Gospel of Matthew, xxvi. 17, it is stated that the disciples of Jesus asked him, "on the first day of unleavened bread," where he wished to eat the lamb of the Passover. Mark xiv. 12 relates more distinctly: "on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover," and Luke xxii. 7, "the day of unleavened bread, on which the Passover must be sacrificed." Now, the day of the offering of the lamb

was the 14th Nissan ; the following day, the 15th, would have been consequently the day of the crucifixion of Jesus. According to the Fourth Gospel, however, the day of the crucifixion was "the day before Passover" (St. John xix. 14), consequently the 14th Nissan, so that Jesus would have held the Passover meal on the day before, on the 13th Nissan.

Chwolson, before trying to explain this contradiction, the removal of which critical exegesis declared impossible, and which critics always used as an argument against the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, points out the difficulty in the report of the Synoptic Gospels themselves. They call the 14th Nissan the first day of unleavened bread, *πρώτη τῶν ἀζύμων* ; whereas the same expression, in Delitzsch's translation ראשון לחג המצות, according to the biblical and post-biblical usage, signifies only the 15th Nissan, the first day of the festival of Passover, but never the 14th Nissan, the day on which the Passover was offered. We find, indeed, that the name of the offering, פסח (in Leviticus xxiii. 5, and Numbers xxviii. 16) was transferred to the seven days festival of unleavened bread, which festival was introduced by the offering of the Passover, and the offering was called חג הפסח (*v.* especially Luke xxii. 1, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα). But it was impossible, as Chwolson justly points out against such artificial explanations of the difficulty, to call the 14th Nissan, which was no festival, and on which the unleavened bread was not eaten, an integral part, the first day, of the festival of unleavened bread. Chwolson quotes the Sahidic (Coptic) translation of Matthew xxvi. 17, where instead of "the first day of unleavened bread" we find "the first day of the Pascha." He thinks, that this may be only an emendation, to remove the difficulty of the original ; but the Coptic translator by this change did not correct anything, since יום ראשון לפסח cannot mean any other day but the 15th Nissan.

To this proof that the statements of the Synoptic Gospels in their present form contain an impossibility, Chwolson adds another long argument, which is based on several Halachic considerations, and shows that in the Synoptic Gospels themselves the 15th Nissan, the first day of the festival, can by no means be the day of the crucifixion. Thus their report concerning the preparations of the Paschal meal would be contradictory to their own statements as regards the crucifixion. All these contradictions, together with that of the Gospel of St. John are removed by the conjecture of Chwolson to Matthew xxvi. 17, which he made in a former Russian essay.

This conjecture starts from the supposition, which is based on the statements of the Fathers of the Church, that there existed an *Urschrift* of the Gospel of St. Matthew written in Aramaic. In this original,

he assumes, the verse Matthew xxvi. 17, ran as follows: יומא קרמיא דפטיריא קרב וקרבו תלמידוהי לוח ישוע ואמרו. In consequence of a mistake of a copyist the first of the two words קרב וקרבו, which stand close to one another, and are like as regards their letters, was omitted and the sentence ran יומא קרמיא דפטיריא קרבו תלמידוהי לוח ישוע. This sentence has no sense except when the first two words are taken as a determination of time, so that the sentence in the Greek translation could not be otherwise rendered, than by $\tau\eta$ ($\delta\epsilon$) $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\zeta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu$ $\pi\rho\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omega\nu$ $\text{o}\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\text{I}\eta\sigma\omega\upsilon$. It is, however, not necessary to suppose, as Chwolson does, that יומא was enlarged by ב, for יומא קרמיא without ב can be also a determination of time, as for instance Hosea vii. 5, יום כלכנו, on the day of our King. Whilst I add that $\text{o}\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ does not correspond to יתלמידוהי but to תלמידיא, I cannot forbear to call Chwolson's conjecture brilliant and of persuasive strength.

The difficulty that arose from the expression "the first day of unleavened bread" is entirely removed, and also the contradiction to the Gospel of St. John. For now the 14th Nissan must be assumed as the day of the crucifixion in the Gospel of St. Matthew, and the last Paschal meal, for which now there is no strict date, must have preceded, on the 13th Nissan. I can strengthen Chwolson's conjecture by the fact, that in the Aramaic original of the Gospel קרבו and not אתו or עלו could have indeed corresponded with $\pi\rho\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omega\nu$, since we see that the Septuagint translates קרב in the meaning of "approach," "go near," very often with $\pi\rho\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, as in Levit. x. 4; Exod. xvi. 9; Num. xxxvi. 1; Deut. xxv. 11, etc. There is really only one important objection to Chwolson's conjecture, which otherwise, in consequence of its simplicity, bears the stamp of truth. This objection is, that the emendation cannot be applied to the two passages in Mark and Luke. This objection indeed can only be removed by a further suggestion which is made by Chwolson. Both passages in the form extant originate from a writer who without a clear knowledge of the rules concerning the day of Passover enlarged the corrupted statement in Matth. xxvi. 17, with the addition, that the Passover had to be sacrificed on the same day, viz., on the first day of unleavened bread. It seems to me, that the Sahidic translation of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon$ $\delta\epsilon$ η $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\zeta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu$ in Luke xxii. 7, by "dies autem azymorum propinquus erat" quoted by Chwolson, may be simply explained by supposing that the Greek

¹ Compare, however, שאלו תלמידיו את רבי אלעזר בן צדוק *Hōrayoth*, 13 b; שאלו תלמידיו את ר' אלעזר בן שמוע *Megilla* 27 b, *Sota*, 39 a.

original, which the Sahidic translator used, read *προσῆλθε* instead of *ἦλθε*. *Προσῆλθε* corresponds with *ἔγγιζε* in Luke xxii. 1. This *προσῆλθε*, however, can only be regarded as a confirmation of Chwolson's conjecture, when the sentence *ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα* is considered a later addition. As an analogy to the supposed original reading in Matth. xxvi. 17, may be quoted *καὶ ἐγγύς ἦν τὸ πάσχα* in John ii. 13.

By Chwolson's conjecture the statement of the Gospel of St. John that Jesus celebrated the last Paschal supper on the 13th Nissan, and that the crucifixion took place on the 14th, is shown to have been originally contained in the Synoptic Gospels also. Consequently this date is unanimously given by the authorities, and the question more pointedly arises, Why did Jesus celebrate the Paschal meal not on the day that was fixed by the law, on the 14th Nissan, but on the day before? This difficulty, which now concerns not only the Gospel of St. John, but the Synoptical Gospels likewise, is also removed by Chwolson. The explanation of it leads into the territory of the Halacha, and is therefore introduced by Chwolson in an excursus on the history of the Halacha, mainly of the ancient Halacha, the nature of which can be only inferred from the hints and survivals of earlier traditions. Chwolson's explanation is founded on the same theory as was urged by the Nestor of investigations on Talmudic sources, Joseph Derenbourg, fifty-three years ago.¹ Derenbourg endeavoured to remove the same difficulty. He assumed, that in the year of the crucifixion the 14th Nissan fell on Sabbath, and the offering of the Passover had to be displaced to an earlier day, but not to the day before, to Friday, for the lamb could not have been roasted on that day, but to Thursday, the 12th Nissan. Jesus celebrated his last Paschal meal on the evening of the 12th Nissan, which meal, according to the hypothesis of Derenbourg, was not a real Paschal meal, and is, therefore, called in John xiii. 2, only *δεῖπνον*. This supposition is based on the assumption, that the Halachic rule, which was later on generally accepted, was not yet recognised in the time of Jesus. The later rule permitted, when the 14th Nissan fell on Sabbath, the killing of the Pascal lamb on that day *פסח דיוחה את השבת*. Chwolson, who enumerates several just objections against Derenbourg's supposition, uses the same conjecture as the basis of his explanation. But he supplies a certain foundation for the hypothesis in the form of another supposition, which is itself confirmed by other data,² that the day of the crucifixion was the 14th

¹ *Orientalia*, Amsterdam, 1840, I., p. 184.

² In the fragment of the Gospel of St. Peter, which was lately found,

Nissan and fell on Friday. The Paschal lamb, however, he goes on to say, could not be killed on Friday according to the practice of the Temple at that time. For it is commanded in the Pentateuch (Exod. xii. 6 ; Lev. xxiii. 5 ; Num. ix. 3) that the Passover had to be sacrificed בין הערבים between the two eves. This expression was not explained, as in the later Halacha, to include the whole afternoon, but only the period of the evening twilight (בין השמשות, בין שמיא, from sunset until it becomes quite dark). This short space of time, however, which besides already belonged in part to the Sabbath, was not sufficient for the killing and roasting of the lamb before the beginning of Sabbath. There was accordingly no other expedient than to displace the offering of the sacrifice to Thursday, the 13th Nissan. As regards the consuming of the Passover in the case of such an antedating of the offering, there were according to Chwolson's hypothesis two views: the first declared that the Passover meal must have been celebrated on the evening of the 13th Nissan ; because it is commanded in Exod. xii. 8 and Numb. ix. 11 to consume the Paschal lamb on the same night, and not to leave anything of it till the next morning. According to the other view the Passover meal was to be held on the evening of the 14th Nissan, and this is based chiefly on Deut. xvi. 4, that the lamb had to be entirely consumed only before the morning of the 15th Nissan.

The first view was accepted by Jesus and his disciples, who celebrated the Paschal meal on the evening of the 13th Nissan, whereas the High-priest Caiaphas and his attendants shared the other view. For this reason the latter were unwilling to enter the Prætorium on the day of the crucifixion, in order not to be defiled and become unfit to eat the Paschal lamb on the same evening (John xviii. 28, *ὥστε μὴ μιανῶσιν ἀλλ' ἵνα φαγῶσι τὸ πάσχα*). This is the quintessence of Chwolson's hypothesis, which indeed removes in a simple way all difficulties, and confirms the statements of the Fourth Gospel, which, according to Chwolson's conjecture, completely agree with the Synoptical Gospels. Only we have to accept all his hypotheses. Chwolson himself answers two objections that might be brought forward against his explanation :—(1.) How could the offering of the Passover, which is fixed for the 14th Nissan, be displaced to the 13th ? (2.) How is it possible that the time during which the Passover had to be sacrificed in the Temple was confined to the evening twilight, whereas this short space of time could by no means have been sufficient for the great number of the lambs which had to be offered ?

it is also stated, that Jesus was crucified on the Friday before the festival.

To answer the first objection, Chwolson refers to the displacing of the festivals, which was connected with the fixing of the New Moon, the intercalation of a month, etc., a displacing which was caused by the ancient practice of fixing the New Moon, and was also retained when the rules of the calendar became formulated. This analogy seems to me not quite correct, since the question does not concern the ante-dating or postponing of a festival, but the transference of a religious act from one day to an earlier. Moreover, the 14th Nisan retained its dignity as the real day of the sacrifice and as the eve of the festival of unleavened bread, even when the offering of the Paschal lamb was brought on the 13th Nisan. Chwolson himself supposes that the Priests celebrated the Paschal meal, even in the case of such a transference, on the 14th Nisan. As a correct analogy from the Halacha, may perhaps be quoted the rules of the Mishna in Megilla i. 1, 2, concerning the reading of the scroll of Esther on some earlier day than the actual day on which Purim fell. When the 14th Adar fell on Tuesday or Wednesday, the villagers read the scroll on the Monday before,¹ on the 13th or 12th Adar respectively. Thus when the 14th Adar fell on Friday, they read the Megilla on Thursday, the 13th Adar. When the 14th Adar fell on Sabbath, the reading of the scroll took place not only for the villagers, but for the townsmen also, on Thursday, the 12th Adar. The reason of the ante-dating from Sabbath to an earlier day was that the reading of the Megilla might lead to a transgression of a law concerning the Sabbath (cp. B. Megilla 4 b). These rules not only present an analogy to the displacement of the Passover offering to the 13th Nisan, but also suggest the reason of the ante-dating.

The second objection, that the short space of time in the interval between sunset and total darkness could not have been sufficient for sacrificing the great mass of Paschal lambs, Chwolson answers by showing that the time was in fact sufficient. For, the statements of Josephus and the Talmud which report colossal numbers of Paschal lambs to have been brought into the Temple, cannot be considered historical, but must be reduced to a much smaller number. Chwolson aptly quotes the statements contained in the Mishna Pesachim v. 5-7, which describe the real course of the Paschal sacrifices, and the time that was occupied in offering them. Chwolson also discusses the question whether unleavened bread was eaten with the Paschal lamb at the last supper of Jesus, which took place on the 13th Nisan. Based upon a passage in the Mechilta to Exod. xii. 8 (Bê, § 6),

¹ On Monday and Thursday, which were the days on which fairs and sittings of the court were held, the villagers came to the town to which they belonged; these days were therefore called יום הכניסה.

which is recognised as decisive also by Maimuni (הלכות קרבן פסח, viii. 2 : ואין מצה ומרור מעכבין), Chwolson accepts the view that unleavened bread was not eaten on that occasion. This supports the rite of the Eastern Church, which does not use unleavened, but leavened, bread for the supper. He also treats of St. John xviii. 28, and corrects the mistakes concerning the defiling effect of the Prætorium, which expositors of the New Testament have made in ignorance of the Halacha.

In the foregoing pages I have summarised Chwolson's hypothesis, and have omitted all his arguments on secondary questions. The hypothesis is based on the supposition that the Temple service at the time of Christ followed, not the decisions of the Pharisaic authorities, but the doctrines of the Sadducees. Thus the official Halacha, viz., that adopted by the Temple, was then Sadducean. Chwolson first applies this supposition to the rule which, according to the Talmud, was adopted on the suggestion of Hillel, and in spite of the opposition of the Beni Bathyra, long before the crucifixion of Jesus, the rule פסח דוחה את השבת, "The Passover takes precedence of the Sabbath." Chwolson, critically examining the statements regarding this Halacha (*J. Pesachim* v. 1 ; *B. Pesachim*, 66*a*), considers himself to have proved that Hillel's thesis was not in fact fully accepted at the time of Christ, and that the opposite view (which agreed with the extant practice of the Samaritans when the 14th Nissan falls on Sabbath), remained in force until the last decades of the Temple. He also endeavours to prove from the Tannaitic Midrash that Hillel's views as to the offering of the Paschal lamb, and the supposed triumph of these views, were alike not admitted ; indeed, that the whole discussion was not known generally. In the Tannaitic Midrashim (in the Mechilta to *Exod.* xii. 6 ; *Sifre* to *Num.* ix. 2 and xxviii. 2), a controversy is three times reported between R. Joshua and R. Jonathan, the disciples of R. Ishmael (in the middle of the second century). In this controversy R. Joshua, who holds that the Paschal lamb may be sacrificed on Sabbath, uses the same exegetic arguments as Hillel, without the slightest suggestion that he is repeating Hillel's ancient argumentation. I leave the question undecided, whether the silence of the later Tannaim proves that Hillel's exposition was not known at all. For it may be said that R. Joshua uses arguments that were well known in the Halachic exegesis, so that authorities either did not think any more of the Hillelic origin of the arguments, or considered it unnecessary to mention his name.

I cannot, however, omit to notice one mistake of Chwolson concerning a term of the ancient Halachic exegesis. On R. Joshua's argument, which is based on *Num.* ix. 2, במועדו, that the Paschal lamb

has to be offered "in its appointed season," and even on Sabbath when the 14th Nisan falls on that day, R. Jonathan replies, ממשמע לא שמענו (this is the correct reading in the Sifre to Num. ix. 2, and Yalkut, i. 195). Chwolson translates this phrase as follows: "We did not yet hear anything of this interpretation." He underlines the words "we did not yet hear anything," and seems to find therein an explicit statement of the fact that R. Jonathan did not know the interpretation of במועדו, and that consequently Hillel could not previously have used it. The phrase, however, only means: "We did not yet hear or understand from the wording of *this* Biblical passage the law which thou seekest to find therein." The phrase לא שמענו in this meaning occurs also elsewhere in the Tannaitic Midrash, e.g., in the Mechilta to Exod. xii. 15, עונש שמענו אזרה לא שמענו. As regards the connection of the same with ממשמע הנה compare the Mechilta to Exod. xxii. 23, ממשמע שנאמר והרגתי איני יודע, Sifra to Lev. xi. 9 (W. Weiss, p. 49, b.) ממשמע שנאמר אני. The phrase now under discussion is properly to be explained as elliptical, and to be supplied as follows: ממשמע הנה [שנאמר ויעשו בני ישראל את הפסח במועדו] עדיין לא שמענו [שישחטוהו אף בשבת]. The passage, Num. ix. 2, was perhaps insufficient in the opinion of R. Jonathan, because it treats of one particular Passover, which was celebrated in the second year after the exodus from Egypt, and then the 14th Nisan need not have fallen on Sabbath.

The second detail in the rite of the Temple, which Chwolson supposes to have differed in the time of Jesus from the regulations found in our Halachic literature, is the interpretation of בין הערבים as the fixed time given in the Pentateuch for the offering of the Paschal lamb. For his supposition in this point Chwolson can refer to the unanimous practice of the Samaritans and the Falashas, who at the present time still sacrifice the Passover after sunset. With this practice agrees also the interpretation of the Karaites concerning בין הערבים. But he also proves from the Targumim and the Talmudic literature, that also in the usage of later times בין הערבים did not mean the same space of time as is fixed by the recognised Halacha, the afternoon, but was used as the synonym of בין השמשות or דמדומי חמה.

A third very important difference between the practice in the Temple in the time of Christ and the Pharisaic Halacha, which alone became established as law later on, is supposed by Chwolson to explain two difficult expressions in Luke and John in connection with the elucidation of the question when Jesus celebrated the Passover meal. He supposes that the well-known Sadducean interpretation of ממהרת in Lev. xxiii. 2 was also accepted in practice; consequently the

omer was offered on the day after the Sabbath which fell during the Passover, and thus the Pentecost fell always on Sunday. By this means the Sabbath of Passover acquired a very great importance, and was called the Great Sabbath (John xix. 31, ἡν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου), whereas the σαββάτον δευτερόπρωτον, the second-first Sabbath in Luke vi. 1, has to be explained as one in the series of the Sabbaths from Passover till Pentecost; it is the Sabbath after the festival of unleavened bread, since the Sabbaths and not the weeks were counted.

Chwolson's remarks on the oft-considered question, "When was the counting of the Omer commenced?" will have to be seriously referred to by all who treat of that difficult subject; but here space forbids an examination of the subject. It is of great importance that according to the historical statement in Megillath Taanith, the victory of the Pharisaic explanation that מִמַּחֲרַת הַשַּׁבָּת means the day after the first day of the festival, the 16th Nissan, over the Sadducean, or rather Boethusian (בִּיתוֹסִיִּים), interpretation was perpetuated in the calendar of the festivals. This fact entitles one to infer that this victory was not merely theoretical, but also practical. The hypothesis concerning the Boethusim which Chwolson suggests in the supplements (p. 129), and which completes Geiger's view, is also noteworthy.

Chwolson's fundamental view, as can be seen from the above considerations, is, that in the time of Christ the Sadducean doctrines were followed in the official practice; while the Pharisees only made their views preponderate in the public practice of the sanctuary during the two decades that preceded the destruction of the Temple. On the basis of this principle Chwolson in the appendix of his essay (p. 85-126) endeavours to illustrate the relation of the Sadducees and Pharisees to Jesus, and especially the question:—"Who were guilty of Christ's death?" Since, according to the Gospels, the priestly authorities in the Synhedrion as well as before the Procurator Pilatus, bring about the sentence and the execution of Christ, it can be easily inferred that the Sadducees were the authors of the whole event. They were the possessors of the power both in the Temple and in the Synhedrion, and they were the authors of the event on which Christianity is very largely based, and for which the Jews have suffered centuries of anguish. But Chwolson goes farther and endeavours to show that a hostile relation between Jesus and the Pharisees is entirely excluded *à priori*. He points out that there was no contradiction between Jesus' doctrines and those of the Pharisees, and that the spiritualisation of the religion at which Jesus aimed, formed also a point in the programme of the Pharisaic teachers, who therein followed the initiative of the Prophets. He refers to the fundamental

importance attached to the law concerning the love of one's fellow-creatures, which was taught already before Christ by Hillel and later on by Akiba, both pillars of the Pharisaic doctrine. On the other hand he proves from several statements in the New Testament, that Jesus by no means acted in his way of living against the statutes and customs of Pharasaic practice, for we find that he was without any difficulty admitted publicly to expound his doctrines in the synagogues where the Pharisaic teachers in that time already ruled, and were acknowledged by the people as its leaders. Chwolson explains, that even where Jesus disapproves of Pharisaic doctrines, these are never views generally accepted by the Pharisees, but those of individual teachers. He even finds proofs of the fact that Jesus was on good terms with some Pharisees; thus in Luke vii. 36, where it is stated that Jesus was invited by a Pharisee to partake of his meal, and xiii. 31, where he is warned by Pharisees of the danger that menaces him. Chwolson also endeavours to show that the Jewish teachers, who obtained a full victory for the Pharisaic spirit, did not adopt a hostile position against the pupils and adherents of Jesus, even in the period immediately after the death of Christ, when Christianity withdrew more and more from the body of Judaism. He recalls the circumstance that shortly after the death of Jesus, R. Gamaliel I. (a grandson, or as Chwolson would like to suppose, a son of Hillel), spoke the well-known words reported in Acts v. 33, which accord with the Mishna *Aboth* v. 17. He refers to the Pharisaic scholars, who about 58 A.D., defended the apostle Paul against the Sadducees (Acts xxiii. 9), and to the deputation of the Pharisaic citizens, who (according to Josephus *Antiq.* XX. ix. 1) in 62 A.D. complained before Agrippa II. of James' execution. Chwolson also quotes the relation between R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus and a pupil of Jesus, and several passages of the same kind are found in the Talmudic literature. Of little, or of no demonstrative value at all, however, are the passages from the Talmudic literature by which Chwolson endeavours to prove that the Jewish teachers regarded and treated the Jewish Christians as Jews even after Hadrian, and till the third century; he supposes this in spite of the fact that the Rabbis in the first decades of the second century introduced prescriptions against the *מינים*, the Jewish Christians. Chwolson infers too much, especially from the anecdote in *Chullin* 87^a, about the *ימין* who said grace after the meal at the house of R. Yehuda, the redactor of the Mishna. *מין* and *מינות* cannot always mean the Jewish Christians and Judæo-Christianity; the Jewish adherents of

¹ *צדוקי*, which occurs in the text, is only an alteration of the censure for *מינות*.

Gnostic doctrines, which are based upon dualistic views of the world, are also called Minim. A doctrine of this kind is in the anecdote abovementioned put into the mouth of the first of the two "Minim" there introduced. The fact that the institutions against the Jewish Christians, which were above alluded to, are not contained in R. Yehuda's Mishna, does not prove, as Chwolson thinks, that these institutions were of no strength in the time of the redaction of the Mishna.

For the exegesis of the New Testament and for the history of the Christian prejudice towards the Pharisees, the arguments of Chwolson are interesting wherein he shows that the books of the New Testament, taking the later view concerning the Pharisees, coloured several statements about the life of Jesus. Copyists too, as Chwolson perhaps justly supposes, may have now and then altered *γραμματεῖς*, which originally meant Sadduceean scholars as well as Pharisaic ones, into *φρισαῖοι*. He illustrates clearly Jesus' speech against the Pharisees, contained in Matthew xxiii., by quoting, from the literature of the Jewish tradition, the passages where the hypocrites and the dissemblers in piety amongst the Pharisees are similarly lashed. The rebuke of Jesus is directed only against the blameworthy Pharisees, who are not left unattacked even in the Pharisaic literature.

The irrefutable conclusion which Chwolson thinks himself justified to draw from the argument that there existed no opposition between Jesus and the Pharisees, is that the Pharisees could not have participated in the sentence and execution of Jesus. The same fact results also from the circumstance that the power in the Synhedrion was in the hands of the High Priests and of their Sadducean adherents, as, indeed, according to the reports of the New Testament, the High Priest Caiaphas and his adherents take the lead in the trial of Jesus, and bring about his execution by Pilate. According to Chwolson, the course of proceeding in the trial and the sentence of Jesus also shows that the Pharisees could have had no decisive influence upon it. The procedure in the case of Jesus is contrary to all the recognised rules of the Pharisaic Halacha. The Sadducees, headed by the families of the High Priests, whose violence, covetousness, and unpopularity, are well known from the Talmudic sources, had at that time all influence and power, and their doctrines ruled the religious law and the Temple. Consequently, they, and they alone, were the instigators of the sentence of Jesus, and effected his execution. They did it because they hated him as the opponent of their doctrines, but especially because they feared him as, in political respects, a dangerous character. They, indeed—according to Luke xxiii. 5—told Pilate that Jesus was stirring up the people from Galilee to Judæa.

In the summary of the contents of Chwolson's treatise, here given, I have naturally confined myself to the essential parts of it. The criticism of the New Testament and its exposition on one hand, the internal history of Judaism in the last decades of the Second Temple on the other, will have to take account of this essay of the member of the Academy of St. Petersburg. They will owe to these investigations many a suggestion, although not all the results of Chwolson's inquiries may be taken for sure, and not all his suppositions for proved. The relation between Sadducees and Pharisees, especially the form that it adopted actually in religious practice, will have to be once more revised on the basis of Chwolson's views, and particularly the history of the Halacha will have, from this point of view, to be more fully investigated.¹ Of the excursus and remarks that are inserted by Chwolson, either into the text of his essay, or relegated to the footnotes and additions, I mention only a few, those on the ancient and new Halacha (p. 13-18); Halacha and Agada (pp. 67-72); on the expression חֲבֵרָה in Hillel's sentence on the love of the fellow-creatures (pp. 73-77), where Chwolson shares Güdemann's view against that of Hilgenfeld and Siegfried; on Messianic passages in the Pesikta Rabbati (p. 83, to which may be compared the article of Israel Levi in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, Vol. XXIV., 281-285); general remarks on the latest criticism of the Pentateuch (p. 130).

It only remains to indicate some corrections. At the foot of p. 3 (cp. p. 72, line 11) Chwolson speaks of "the Palestinian Targum, which is ascribed to Jonathan b. Uzziel." He means the so-called Targum of Jerusalem on the Pentateuch, which, in consequence of a mistake, got at a very late date the name, תַּרְגוּם יוֹנָתָן בֶּן עֻזִּיאל, and is still quoted as תַּרְגוּם יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, for instance by Elijah Levita. On p. 22, line 17, instead of Albûn and Albîn, read Abbûn and Abbîn; page 26, note 4, instead of Kauffmann, read Hoffmann; p. 42, line 3, instead of 12, 6, read, 16, 6; p. 62, line 6 from the end, instead of Rabba, read Râbâ; p. 63, note 5, "the lashing was a terrible punishment, whereby it happened that the punished man expired during the execution, or in consequence of it." This description does not correspond with the Rabbinical statements concerning it. On p. 75, line 14, instead of חֲבֵרִינִי, read חֲבֵרֵנִי; to p. 79 (at end) cp. the fact that some Palestinian Amoraim are called חֲבֵרֵהוֹן רַבִּבְנִי (v. Frankel, *Einleitung in den Jerus. Talmud*, p. 85b., and *Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer*, I., p. 173). On pp. 89 and 112, read instead of R. Schimlai, R. Simlai (v. *Die Agada der Pal. Amoräer*, I., p. 552); p. 101, note 1,

¹ Chwolson himself refers to the hints on these points in Weiss, דור דור ודורשיו, I., pp. 118, 144.

instead of *Trois*, read *Troyes*; p. 105, at top, the year 193 is given as that of the death of R. Jehuda I., the other view, that he died about 219, may be taken as more correct. R. Hillel, who expressed the view that no Messiah will come any more (B. Sanhedrin, 99a), was perhaps no other man than Hillel, the son of Samuel b. Nachman, who lived at the end of the third, and at the beginning of the fourth century, consequently he was a contemporary of the Babylonian teacher, R. Joseph, who criticised Hillel's remark.

It would be an omission did I fail to point out the author's exceedingly fresh and lively style, which is always attractive and stimulating, even in the most technical parts of the subject. Sometimes he goes too far in using colloquial expressions, as "the Babylonian gibberish," which Hillel is said to have used in presence of the authorities in Jerusalem to expound his view (p. 29). Chwolson's language assumes a still livelier colour where he points out how important the knowledge of the Talmudic literature is to the Christian theologians for the understanding of the New Testament, or when he becomes the defender of Judaism and its doctrines. Of special interest are also his personal experiences, which form almost the whole contents of the preface; to these belongs also the remark in the footnote on p. 73. I cannot refrain from quoting this remark verbatim, since it is characteristic of the mind of the author. Whilst speaking of the meaning of *Chaber*, the opposite of which is the *Am-haarez*, Chwolson says: "There are some people who find in the Rabbinic statements and precepts concerning the *Am-haarez* Pharisaic haughtiness and Pharisaic intolerance. This is by no means true, and I understand the Pharisees entirely. I myself was born and brought up in a circle where the opposition between *Chaber* (now called *Lamdan* למדן), and the *Am-haarez* was still active, although not in the same acuteness as in ancient times. There was in my youth amongst the Russo-Polish Jews no other education but Rabbinic scholarship. The *Lamdan* in his way was an educated man, and, which is the chief point, he ordinarily was a thoroughly moral and well-mannered man. He was serious, religious, really pious, never slandered anybody (רכילות), and במושב לעים לא ישב, wherefore he shunned card-tables and drinking-bouts, and entertained full veneration and regard towards other people. He never used an indecent or equivocal expression (לצנות, ניבול פה, the soiling of the mouth); he very highly esteemed behaviour and decent demeanour דרך ארץ, and this not only in society, but also in his quiet little chamber. He also treated his children gently, his wife with respect and love, and he was pure and honest in commerce and life. So was my late father, and so were all my male relatives whom I knew, and who all were *Lam-*

danim. The Am-haarez, the uneducated, often indeed, if not always, was in many respects the opposite of the Lamdan. He ordinarily was rough and harsh, abused and swore vulgarly, used coarse and indecent words and ambiguous expressions; very often treated his wife and his children hardly and rudely. Therefore it was taken very ill of a poor Lamdan, when he gave his pious, chaste, and modest daughter, who never in her life had heard a coarse, indecent expression, in marriage to a rich Am-haarez. For this reason I appreciate well R. Meir's sentence, who said (B. Pesachim, 49^b): "He who marries his daughter to an Am-haarez acts in the same way as if he had cast her before a lion." The Am-haarez of now-a-days is, however, by no means suspected of neglecting the religious precepts, as was the case in ancient time. The Lamdan, therefore, does not hesitate at all to eat with him and to have friendly intercourse with him. But there were also amongst the uneducated people men distinguished by piety, charity, and decent behaviour, and such men were, indeed, treated with respect by the Lamdanim. Not the Rabbinic scholarship formed the partition wall, but the education and the civilisation which was the consequence of the learning. Modern Europeans are not different, only we have a different measure for education from theirs, and as regards the morality, ignorance is in some circles very often pretended when the personage who wants to be received into society, though even in possession of no commendable qualities, deserves regard in other respects."

What Chwolson here relates from his own remembrance as to the morality and self-esteem of the Russian Jews with Talmudic education, amongst whom he was brought up, is a contribution of great value for the Talmud-Judaism which is now so often brought into controversy and so much abused. It is a satisfying testimonial of good conduct to the Jews of Russia, who now leave their country in ever-increasing masses, a testimonial given at least to those amongst them that are educated in Rabbinic literature. But it is, at the same time, a good testimonial of the courage and the warm heart of the author. Though he has long ago left the Jewish ranks, Chwolson, occupying a highly esteemed position, and regarded as one of the Russian authorities in scholarship, used all the weight of his name and reputation against the terrible blood-accusation. And now in this strictly learned essay, which, however, though not confessedly, first of all endeavours, by the means of scientific research, to remove the most dangerous cause of the Christian hatred of Jews, he seizes the opportunity to give to his unhappy brethren in race a testimonial of their moral superiority. Though an old man of seventy-three years, he, with juvenile vigour and inspiration, steps into the breach—this is

VOL. V.

Y Y

a particularly prominent tendency of his essay—and energetically reminds the teachers of Christianity that only the investigation of the Jewish traditional literature leads to the correct knowledge of the origin of Christianity. Thus Chwolson's essay deserves recognition not only as a scientific investigation, but as a plea on behalf of justice to traditional Judaism.

W. BACHER.

Literature of Responsa.

THIS branch of learning is the exclusive domain of Dr. Joël Müller, of Berlin. He has just issued a new and (as far as possible) critical edition, with copious notes, of the rare הלכות פסקות מן הגאונים, printed at Constantinople, 1516 (Nos. 9 to 11 of the החוקר, and also to be had in a separate form). For some periods of Jewish history the Responsa are the only documents which we possess, and when these *disjecta membra* have been collected and critically edited, the history of the Gaonim period will benefit by it. We regret that in the present edition an alphabetical index of authors of the Responsa does not follow that of the matter of them. It is true that the names with reference to this collection of Responsa are found in Dr. Joël Müller's מפתח, but it would have been more handy to have them also in each collection of Responsa. The eleventh report of the *Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin* (1893), is preceded by an interesting essay by the same author on the Responsa of R. Meschullam, son of R. Kalonymos. This Rabbi came with his father from Italy to Mayence, and from there he moved on to Lorraine, according to Dr. J. Müller. This last fact was, however, contested by Herr Epstein (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, t. xxiv., p. 151), where this scholar tries to prove that Meschullam founded a school in Italy. We believe that Dr. J. Müller has more ground for his supposition concerning the second home of Meschullam than Herr Epstein. However, until new documents turn up by which we shall be able to settle the question whether Meschullam lived partly in Italy or not, we must suppose that there were two noted Meschullams, at the same epoch, the one in the South of France (Arles), and another in Mayence and Lorraine. Very interesting are the passages where Dr. J. Müller treats of the introduction of Midrashic literature by Meschullam, as well as some ritual usages in the synagogues of the Rhine countries and Lorraine. Meschullam was also the author of liturgical pieces, which show a progress in language; and though he belonged to the famous school of Calir, it was a progress which stimulated the reform in liturgical matter in the synagogues.

A. NEUBAUER.