Never before have I been officially encouraged to indulge in this pastime and I appreciate the privilege.  

1. A dictionary like Kittel's, specialising in theological themes, needs constant updating—even if we leave aside certain pervasive simplifications in the area of semantics which have lately come under attack. The scant article on the Land, *ge*, for example, must be completely redone in view of W.D. Davies's pioneering work. A more general desideratum is the inclusion of quite a few concepts at first sight not qualifying. In fact, just because the theology is in these cases implied, part of an overall attitude, rather than explicit, *ad hoc*, we may come here upon clues to deeper strata. *Phimoo*, "to muzzle", to be adverted to below (under 5) has no entry. I published both a lecture and a little book on the Scriptural use of "sudden" and a number of particles denoting "at once". Since, as quite often, I did not spell out my major intent, I was apparently misunderstood as being interested in nothing but philological exactitude. But I meant more. "Sudden" is apt to reflect an inner experience clearly reaching into the numinous: "and suddenly there was a multitude of the

1 Read at the Symposium de Interrelatione Evangeliorum, Pascha 1984, Jerusalem. I am grateful to William David Davies for his criticism and encouragement.
2 G. Kittel set it up, editing *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, in 1933.
4 Sasse, in vol. 1, pp. 676 ff.
5 It will suffice to name *The Gospel and the Land*, 1974.
heavenly host". But even the innocuous-seeming "at once" can be far from religiously neutral. Two examples:

(i) Mark employs *euthys* 40 to 50 times against 15 to 20 in Matthew, 17 in Luke cum Acts, 6 in John. Even though the literal sense "at once" is not seldom present, the sense "duly"—OED: "in due manner, order, form or season"—is never absent and at times the only one. Jesus at Capernaum taught as one having authority "and *euthys* there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit".8 "Duly" and nothing else. It is Mark's way of conveying his fundamental estimate of these events: they take place one after another in a planful (planmässig), inevitable unfolding. Three stretches are lacking the significant connective: the day of questions, the apocalypse and the passion. These he took over from elsewhere without bringing them into line. To the first I shall return below (under 4).

It may be worth adding that the shading-off of *euthys* into "duly" does not originate with Mark; it is met with, e.g., in Aristotle.9 The root meaning of the word is "straight", and English "straight" or "straightways" also occasionally veers towards "duly".

(ii) *Parachrema*, which we may translate "forthwith" in order to keep it apart from *euthys*, occurs in one Matthean pericope, never in Mark, 16 times in Luke cum Acts, never in John. Luke's predilection for the word is explicable by its frequency in medical literature. However, in the New Testament it invariably refers to the immediate, miraculous actualisation of a decision from on high, mostly of Jesus. He takes Jairus's daughter by the hand and tells her to arise "and her spirit came again and she arose forthwith".10 Peter, in his name, commands a lame man to walk and takes him by the hand "and forthwith his feet received strength".11 Again, Peter tells Sapphira that she is doomed to instant death "and she fell down forthwith".12 The quick success of a wonder-worker's intervention is, of course, a widespread phenomenon: in Lucian, a magician assembles all reptiles of a farm and blows on them "and they were instantly—*autika*—

8 Mark 1.23.
9 Aristotle, Metaphysics, 4.2.6.10.1004a.
11 Acts 3.7.
12 Acts 5.10.
burned”. On a vulgar level, the illusionist’s “presto” belongs here. Yet there are also those in touch with powers that will cure or destroy over time. I guess this delayed-action prodigy is a later growth; for one thing, the evidence is so much less evident. But it, too, goes back to long before New Testament times. At any rate, Luke’s parachrema does tell us something about his thoughts concerning the effect of a divine or divinely-sanctioned verdict. In the one Matthean pericope with parachrema, incidentally, the fig-tree cursed by Jesus withers “forthwith” while Mark has the disciples find it withered a day later.

2. It so happens that a passage containing euthys furnishes what I regard as conclusive proof that Matthew draws on Mark, our written Mark. Let me at the outset reassure upholsters of the former’s priority that I shall eventually meet them a quarter of the way (under 5).

To start with Matthew: “Having been baptized, Jesus at once came up out of the water; and behold, the heavens were rent and he saw the Spirit of God descending”. “He at once came up out of the water”—this is passing strange. Why ever should he have stayed down? Now look at Mark. Jesus was baptized “and at once, having come out of the water, he saw the heavens rent and the Spirit descending”. To put “at once” in front, next to a participle not linked to it, and only then the verb which it does qualify is a favourite Marcan device: Jesus is sending two disciples to a certain village “and at once, having entered into it, you will find a colt tied”. The statement “and at once, having come up out of the water, he saw” etc. is tremendously meaningful. Euthys here signifies “and directly” as well as “and duly”. It is at the moment of his emerging from baptism that a proselyte to Judaism’s transmutation takes place: “He immerses and comes up, behold, he is like an Israelite in all respects”. Matthew makes two sentences of Mark’s one, changing the participle into a finite mood. The result ought to be: “Jesus came up and at once

13 Lucian, *The Lover of Lies*, 13 i.f.
14 The two kinds of miracles represent a dichotomy met in practically all areas of life. In a forthcoming paper, “The Moment and the Flow of Time”, I give other examples.
16 Matthew 3.16, Mark 1.10.
17 Mark 11.2.
18 Babylonian Yebamoth 47b.
the heavens were rent". But he mispunctuates his source, joins the
adverb to the participle and reads "and at once having come up,
he saw the heavens rent". Hence the absurd ring to his presenta-
tion. It is readily explained in this way and I do not think it can be
in any other. Luke, not surprisingly, cuts out the coming up
altogether; it is on Jesus's praying that the heavens open.¹⁹

3. My inference from this episode would hold even without the
Jewish pattern behind Mark. Even without it, that is, he would
make sense while Matthew would be intelligible only as proceeding
from his account. At this juncture, however, I confess that
time and again I find Mark preserving more accurately the
conditions of Jesus's ministry, both as to basic, popularly-shared
Jewish life and beliefs and as to peculiar traits of the protagonist’s
circle. Such an impression, of course, is not reached without close
attention to extra-Biblical material shedding light on the con-
temporary situation, Midrash and Talmud inter alia.

Take the battle between precept and example as man’s guide. I
shall be brief about it, since I have said enough elsewhere.²⁰ The
main trend of the period, spreading from Sadducees to other
groups, was to confine fully-binding force to precept alone. The
Zadokite Fragments,²¹ combating polygamy and probably also
divorce, adduce three verses from the Pentateuch: “Male and
female created he them”, at the time understood to describe the
ideal, androgynous Ur-Adam,²² “The animals went in two by
two”²³ and “The king shall not multiply wives to himself”.²⁴ The
first two offer examples, the third is a precept. It is safe to assume
that the third—not really a good text for general consumption—
was appended in response to the movement just mentioned. Similarly, both Matthew²⁵ and Mark,²⁶ in the controversy about

“Responsibilities of Master and Disciples”, in New Testament Studies, xix (1972),
4 ff., and The Old Testament in the New: a Jewish Perspective, section III. Of the
last-mentioned piece, only the German translation by W. Schuller has so far
appeared, Das Alte Testament im Neuen—aus jüdischer Sicht. It forms vol. 10,
1984, of the series Xenia, and section III is found on pp. 10 f.
²¹ Zadokite Fragments 7.1 ff.
²² Genesis 1.27, 5.2, Genesis Rabba on 1.26 f., Mekhilta on Exodus 12.40,
Philo, Creation, 24.76, Allegorical Interpretation, 2.4.13, Who is the Heir, 33.164.
²³ Genesis 7.9.
²⁴ Deuteronomy 17.17.
²⁵ Matthew 19.3 ff.
²⁶ Mark 10.2 ff.
divorce, begin with "Male and female created he them" and then add "And the twain shall be one flesh". No doubt in this case, too, the example once stood by itself but was gradually found inadequate in debate with opponents.

When we go on from here to the Sabbath dispute caused by the disciples plucking corn, Mark—followed by Luke—is content with the example of David and his band who, as they were hungry, ate of the shewbread reserved for the priests. Matthew provides supplementary defence based on precept; according to the Book of Numbers the Temple service overrides the Sabbath restrictions—a fortiori (yes, the text needs a highly-refined extensive interpretation by the method "light and weighty" to be applicable) the present, greater task will do so. The reverse development is out of the question: had Mark had the more cogent argument available, he would not have dropped it. It should be remembered that at Rome also, by the 1st century, example no longer sufficed in matters of licit or illicit.

Another problem I need not enlarge on is denial of one's faith under duress. The Marcan account of Peter's conduct, when suspected of association with Jesus, precisely reflects the position of the sages, in essence going back to the Old Testament era. His first reply is to one person only, the High Priest's maid, and the formulation is evasive, "I do not understand". According to majority doctrine, a renunciation in private was less terrible than one in public, and equivocation less terrible than outright disavowal. The second reply is to the maid amidst bystanders: in public, though still oblique. Then the bystanders press him

27 Genesis 2.24.
28 Mark 2.23 ff.
30 I Samuel 21.3 ff.
31 Matthew 12.1 ff.
32 Numbers 28.9 f.
33 A related illustration may be found in my "The Three Quotations from Homer in Digest, 18.1.1.1", in Cambridge Law Journal, x (1949), 215.
35 Mark 14.66 ff.
36 E.g. Genesis Rabba on 35.17, referring to the disguise of students of Joshua ben Hananiah in a persecution around A.D. 100, Tanhuma on Numbers 20.12, as for the publicity of Moses's disbelief, Esther Rabba on 2.20, as for the queen's tacit concealment of her religion.
and he swears: "I know not the man". In public and direct: the extreme betrayal. None of the parallels in the other three gospels\(^{37}\) is equally pristine.

It may be worth pointing out that there is nothing academic about the distinctions here operative. Any member of an embattled minority would be familiar with them. They are indeed a sort of natural law, apt to recur wherever certain conditions exist. In Europe, in the 1930s and 1940s, I suppose there was hardly a state or group that did not at some stage or other arrive at the norm—often felt rather than spelled out—that, while to save your neck by a concession in private and/or ambiguous might be venial, a public, unqualified abandonment of your cause would not: its effect would be so much more devastating.

4. About my next item I discover one or two new facets each time I return to it.\(^{38}\) It is in any case particularly relevant to this conference’s endeavour. It may be observed at once that it, too, involves a matter which, though most present-day students will find it recondite, was anything but that for the nuclear Christian sect: the Passover-eve recital, the Haggadah.

This time I begin with Mark. Four questions are considered in succession: Is it lawful to pay tribute to Caesar? Asked by Pharisees and Herodians. If a woman goes through a number of levirate marriages, whose wife will she be on resurrection? Asked by Sadducees. Which is the foremost commandment? Asked by a scribe admiring Jesus’s stand. How can the Messiah be David’s son (in accordance with numerous texts—at least as understood at the time\(^{39}\)) seeing that David (in the Psalter\(^{40}\)) calls him his Lord? Asked by Jesus. As there is no logical or historical link between these matters, their compilation has been looked on as relatively late and artificial. In reality, what we have before us is the earliest composite chapter in the gospels.

There is first-century evidence in the Talmud\(^{41}\) of a division of questions into four types: "of wisdom", about points of law; "of


\(^{39}\) 1 Samuel 7.12 ff., Isaiah 11.1, 10, Jeremiah 23.5, Psalms 89.4 f., 132.11 etc.

\(^{40}\) Psalms 110.1.

\(^{41}\) Babylonian Niddah 69b ff.
vulgar mockery", such as whether the child Elisha brought back to life\textsuperscript{42} conveyed uncleanness, as a corpse; "of the proper way of the land", about practical piety; and "of interpretation", about inconsistencies in the Bible, as when one verse speaks of God's choice of Zion, another of his rejection.\textsuperscript{43} The New Testament questions manifestly fall under this schema: the inquiry concerning the permissibility of tribute, the gibe at resurrection, the wish for an overall direction, the puzzle of contradiction. It can be shown, however, that they are put together, not from any scholastic bent, but in analogy to a section of the Haggadah.\textsuperscript{44} In it, the four Pentateuchic admonitions to instruct the youth in the subject of the exodus are taken to represent the categories under notice. The passage mentioning "the testimonies, statutes and judgments which the Lord has commanded us"\textsuperscript{45} represents legal exploration. That where the youth asks "What mean you by this service?"—"you" instead of "we"—represents contemptuous disavowal of communion. That with the general "What is this?"\textsuperscript{47} represents honest, open search. That where the instruction refers to "what the Lord did unto me when I came forth from Egypt"\textsuperscript{48} is at variance with other statements according to which the Lord rescued not "me" but "us", "your fathers", etc.\textsuperscript{49}

The dependence of the Marcan piece on the Seder is beyond doubt. The four classes appear in the same sequence, different from the Talmudic one. The answer to the juridical problem is cryptic in both cases. (When those out to inflame the Romans against Jesus speak of an absolute prohibition of tribute,\textsuperscript{50} they are misrepresenting him.) While these and other, similar data might be held inconclusive, what clinches the argument is that both in the Haggadah and in Mark—and not in the Talmudic paradigms—the final question is put by the instructor. Moreover, as if to underline its singularity, in both—and not in the Talmud—it is left unanswered. Why? The authors of the Passover liturgy

\textsuperscript{42} II Kings 4.18 ff.
\textsuperscript{43} Psalms 132.13, Jeremiah 32.31.
\textsuperscript{44} In the first, pre-meal half, beginning: "With regard to four sons, disciples, speaks the Torah".
\textsuperscript{45} Deuteronomy 6.20 f.
\textsuperscript{46} Exodus 12.26 f.
\textsuperscript{47} Exodus 13.14.
\textsuperscript{48} Exodus 13.8.
\textsuperscript{49} E.g. Deuteronomy 26.8, Joshua 24.6.
\textsuperscript{50} Luke 23.2.
noticed that the first three of their quotes respecting instruction employ some phrasing like "and when your son asks you in time to come, you shall say"; whereas the fourth one, omitting the son's initiative, starts right off "and you shall show your son in that day, saying". Whence they inferred that Scripture distinguishes between the following four characters among sons or disciples: the wise one, asking about law, the wicked one, asking in order to jeer, the simply pious one, asking for plain guidance—these three are pretty obvious—and, far less obvious, the one who refrains from asking. He is to be stimulated by father or master, who will cite him a text controverted elsewhere. To add the solution would defeat the aim, which is the encouragement of participation. Jesus's closing riddle is intelligible only—but also fully—against the background of the Haggadah.

Indeed, it is more faithful to its model than most current editions and translations make it look. In the Haggadah, the fourth category is introduced thus: "And he who does not know how to ask, you [father or master] open for him [i.e. open the discourse for him by posing a text to be elucidated\(^{51}\)""). In precise conformity, Mark introduces it "And no one any further dared to ask him, and commencing the discourse Jesus said". Ordinarily, the section "And no man any further dared to ask him" is treated, not as leading up to the fourth question, by Jesus, but as depicting the effect of his reaction to the third. But that reaction is the opposite of intimidating; his concluding words are "You are not far from the kingdom". Besides, my paragraphing is supported by excellent medieval authority.\(^{52}\) The New English Bible accepts it.\(^{53}\) But it still omits the initial "and"; and it substitutes the elegant "and Jesus went on to say" for the heavy "and commencing the discourse Jesus said". Yet, while "to commence and say"\(^{54}\) is often rather eroded, denoting little more than "to

\(^{51}\) On this sense of pathah, "to open", see W. Bacher, *Die Bibellexegetische Terminologie der Tannaiten* (1899), pp. 162 f.


\(^{54}\) *Apokrinomai kai lego*, in Hebrew 'ana we'amar; e.g. Deuteronomy 21.7, Job 3.2. In old-fashioned German Bibles, one often finds anheben und sagen, more satisfactory than the scrupulous "to answer and say" or antworten und sagen. Though, come to think of it, it does obscure the ultimate provenance of the phrase. So does das Wort nehmen und sagen, to which E. Klostermann resorts, *Das Markus-Evangelium* (4th ed., 1950), p. 128. But it gets the meaning absolutely.
speak", in the present instance it has its full value: emphatically, the master makes the beginning. I am not saying that, had I been on the Dodd committee, I might not, in deference to the less pedantic reader—the "simply pious"—have voted for the smoother expression.

The day of questions allows us a moving glimpse of the kind of Seder celebrated by the believers in the very first decades after the crucifixion: in the main traditional, with the customary elaborations of the Mosaic exodus supplemented and slowly replaced by parallels from the more recent one. They had not so far developed their own literary structures, the new wine was as yet poured into old bottles. One result, by the way, is that (except for minor adjustments) the material of the supplements must be extremely near in date to the events; in other words, there is the strongest presumption in favour of the historicity (on the whole) of the four incidents here assembled. However, to pursue this line would take me too far from the central topic.

Very likely the chapter is one of those reported by Eusebius— who quotes Papias, who quotes yet prior testimony—to have reached Mark from Peter. Let us go again through the four portions. The problem of tribute to Caesar is closely related to that of temple tax, brought up in Matthew, with Peter a prominent figure. I have suggested elsewhere that the episode is more significant than commonly thought. An intriguing feature may be added: Jesus does not wait for Peter to ask—he might never have done so—but "anticipates" him and himself raises the question, about law this time. As for Jesus’s rebuttal of the denial of resurrection, in a lecture just published I remark on Peter, in Acts, distinctly harking back to it. Brotherly love appears in I Peter but, admittedly, no extensive apostolic communication

55 Ecclesiastical History, 3.39.15.
59 1 Peter 3.9.
would be without some such maxim and in any case the authorship of the Epistle is uncertain. What is striking, however, is Peter’s intense engagement in question 4, the son of David—Lord of David discrepancy, in his Pentecostal address, with echoes later on. It was taken for granted, of course, that, as Scripture cannot err, every conflict between two (or more) passages must, on careful probing, turn out to be merely apparent: the passages, it will emerge, cover different ground, each of them having its own range of validity. In the Talmudic paradigm adduced above, the line “God has chosen Zion”—from the Psalter, i.e. David—is regarded as applying to the time before Solomon married the daughter of Pharaoh, the line “the city has been a provocation of my anger”—from Jeremiah—to the time after. From the answer to the wicked questioner in the Haggadah, it can be seen that one way of reconciling the statement “the Lord freed me from Egypt” with references to the freeing of “us”, “your fathers” or the like, was to assign to the former the message that deliverance took place only for the sake of him who trusts in God and not for his scoffing adversary. Peter (if I may give a deplorably rough summary) explains that, while David cherished the promise that the Messiah would be a descendant of his, he also foresaw that that personage would be far superior to him, in being raised from Hades to a seat at the right hand of God without experiencing corruption.

Quite apart from these details—if Mark received this Seder collage from Peter, it would chime in exactly with what we find in Eusebius: Peter “shaped his teachings in accordance with the demands of any occasion, instead of purporting to make an orderly presentation of the Lord’s sayings; so that Mark did nothing wrong in thus writing down some pieces as he remembered them”. An explicit apology, required at a time when it was still feasible directly to compare, or contrast, the actual sequence, etc. of the incidents with that adjusted to novel requirements—to the revised Passover-eve recital, for instance. Suppose, as an example, that the clash with the Sadducees, question 2, in reality took place before that with the Pharisees and Herodians, question 1, Peter, we are given to understand, switched them around so as to fit into

60 Acts 2.25 ff.
61 Acts 5.31.
62 I Kings 11.1.
the customary Seder; and Mark, in adopting his order, acted only as a loyal transmitter whom it would be unfair to censure. Let us recall at this juncture the conspicuous absence of the Marcan euchys. No “and duly there were the Sadducees” or the like. This chapter is not part of the planmassige course of events: it is structured so as to satisfy a chreia, a particular want.

When I appealed to ancient Church tradition about thirty years ago, the reaction was so cool that in the first draft of this paper I still felt I had to defend myself. To judge by the present symposium, however, respect for that witness is increasing. At any rate, a major reason for spurning it is surely that it has not seemed possible to make sense, real, concrete sense, of Eusebius’s text (except by doing violence to it, one way or another). Well, it is possible: the shaping of the material with a view to the demands of the Seder worship is a case—there may be others—perfectly according with what we are told. Here may be the place to stress that there would scarcely be a greater communal need around, say, A.D. 40, than for guidance on just those issues (the sequence being determined by the Haggadah model): (1) What did the group owe to the foreign government and the native priesthood, an unholy alliance between which had just contrived the horrid death of its head? (2) What about resurrection, linchpin of the group’s hope? (3) What, beyond all minutiae, did the group’s head expect of members and would-be members big or small, near or far? (4) What about the strangely miraculous Messiahship of the group’s head? Peter, or whoever amplified the recital expounding the old redemption with parallels from the new, chose well.

In passing—the Haggadah introduces one “who does not know how to ask” whereas Mark has “no one dare to ask”. The character unter review is met in Philo, as “not daring”63 (Generally, this root is quite rare in his work.64) The perfect man, we are told, ought to teach “those of the young who are willing; and if a less daring one hesitates through awe—or shame—and is slow to come forward to learn, he himself ought to go and pour out guidance”. “Not to know how to” and “not to dare to” are near enough; psychology will find countless ties; either, for example, may cause or result from the other. Still, they are not

63 Philo, Special Laws, 4.26.140.
identical. My hunch is that “not to dare to” would be more readily used of a disciple’s position *vis-à-vis* the master, a Socrates, an Apollonius, a Hillel, “not to know how to” of an as yet untrained son’s *vis-à-vis* his father. The former has more of an aura of formal distance about it. Even while the Temple stood, only a fraction of Jewry made the Passover pilgrimage. Since A.D. 70, the Jewish Seder has become largely confined to the family. Largely, never absolutely; and especially in the immediate post-destruction phase, approximations to the past were sought—witness an illustrious gathering at Lydda, under Gamaliel II, mentioned in the *Tosephta*, and one at Bene-Berak, under Eliezer ben Hycanus, Joshua ben Hananiah, Eleazar ben Azariah, Akiba and Tarphon, which actually came to be commemorated in the Haggadah itself. But with no more groups of devotees going up to Jerusalem under a revered leader, the dice were loaded in favour of a family affair. It is not surprising, therefore, that “not to know how to” alone survives in the liturgy.

When we now proceed to Matthew and Luke, their versions are plainly due to incomprehension of the original scheme. The straightforward, pious seeker has become a decoy—though an inquiry concerning the most basic commandment is hardly a promising trap. Luke, in addition, transfers this section to a totally different context which, it has been noticed, it does not fit; while the questioner, despite his bad faith, still earns Jesus’s approval. As for the lack of daring, Matthew gives it what seems to him a more plausible place at the end of the entire chapter: nobody could answer Jesus’s question and that stopped people asking him. In Luke, the clause still precedes Jesus’s question. But

---

65 *Tosephta Pesahim* 10.12.

66 C.K. Barrett points out to me that the disciple who does not ask yet receives the appropriate instruction may be in John’s mind in several verses of ch. 16. Perhaps 4.33 f. is a further instance: much as in 16.19 f., Jesus replies to a question the disciples put, not to him, but to each other. Complex problems are raised by 21.12: none of the disciples “dare to examine Jesus” as, risen, he shows himself a third time. Whoever authored this pericope just conceivably preferred “to examine” to “to ask” in order to indicate that what still puzzles the disciples, by now clear as to the identity of their visitor, is his precise nature in this state, no longer with the dead but not yet ascended. Nor shall I inspect an occasion when the disciples “fear to ask Jesus” about a particularly frightening matter, Mark 9.32, Luke 9.45.

from forming the introduction—"and no one dared and Jesus commenced"—it is turned into the reason some scribes admire his refutation of the Sadducees: they admire it, that is, "because [gar] no one any further dared to ask him anything". The Midrash of the four sons or disciples is shattered and scattered. Far be it from me to deny that, in the process, valuable new perspectives have been introduced.

How, one may wonder, could somebody as close to Jewish practice as Matthew deal with the material in this insensitive fashion? The answer is that, once the chapter was transmitted by itself, no longer embedded in the regular Passover service, it was easy to miss the connection. After all, it has taken till the mid-twentieth century to rediscover it. We must bear in mind that the exchanges presented, though they were no longer of such acute concern in his day as in Peter's, were still important enough. Right to the present their weight has seemed to scholars adequate ground for their being placed together by evangelical redaction.68 It is only natural, therefore, that, unschooled in higher criticism, he did not go behind the compendium at hand: strong corroboration, once again, of his coming in the wake of Mark, removed from the original setting by a decisive step.

It may be worth noting that divergencies independent of the overall scheme confirm Mark's antiquity. In the debate about resurrection, in Mark, Jesus appeals to "the Book of Moses, at the Bush". "The Bush" is the Rabbinic appellation of the relevant portion. Matthew—though not Luke—drops this detail. In my lecture just adverted to, I attach importance also to Mark's mention of "the power of God"—dropped by Luke though not by Matthew—as well as to his use, once, of "to be waked" instead of "to be raised" or "to rise"—met in neither of the other two. In the summary advice, Mark alone quotes "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is the only Lord". Moreover, the scrupulous repetition of Jesus's advice to the questioner, culminating in an expansion, is consonant with a method of study then prevailing: but I cannot here dwell on it.69 Neither Matthew nor Luke reproduces it

68 See K. H. Rengstorff, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (9th ed.), pp. 225 ff., seeing in the first three sections Jesus's separation from the various religious parties and in the fourth a counter-attack on the scribes.

69 Much relevant material is offered by S. Krauss, Talmudische Archäologie, iii (1912, repr. 1960), 231 ff. The notions Mishnah and Tannaite owe something to this method.
(understandably: it sounds de trop) except that the latter, under its influence, assigns the whole answer to the questioner—which renders the mala fide motivation all the more incongruous.

Two objections to the foregoing exposé have been communicated to me. One is that the Pharisaic-Herodian question about tax concerns political controversy, and hence falls outside the law. This presupposes a fairyland where the two provinces are kept apart. It does not exist anywhere today—think, in the U.S.A., of conscription, desegregation, restrictions on trade with Cuba—and it did not then. Rabbinic decisions on fiercely debated public issues are legion. Quite a few are alluded to in the New Testament: e.g. re the Samaritans and re litigation against a fellow-Jew before a heathen court. As for tax to the Romans, Judas of Galilee condemned it as recognition of their sovereignty in the place of God's. The evolution culminating in the slogan "The law of the State is the law" is beset by difficulties with tax; and Paul, preaching submission, singles out this item. While a Mishnaic provision treats murderers, robbers and tax-collectors as equally deserving to be misled, the part regarding tax-collectors is toned down in the Gemara: a political change. That already Old Testament laws often deal with topics involving acute political tensions is well known: the position of slaves, naturalization, limitations on the monarchy, mixed marriage. Nor should it be thought that this class has come to an end. It never will. The period of terror 1933-1946 and again the building up of Israel have produced a large number of opinions having to do with politics, affected by it and trying to affect it. Note: "Permissible",
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exestin, occurs six more times in Mark, invariably respecting a legal, halakhic point.\footnote{Mark 2.24, 26 (twice), 3.4, 6.18, 10.2.}

The other objection is that, contrary to my assumption, the Ur-Christians may not have had a Passover service at all. I shall not submit detailed evidence. It is so unlikely: an abandonment, at one blow, nation-wide, of the cherished institution. It may, however, be useful to expand slightly on the scenario. To begin with the sizable part of the population not journeying to the capital but spending the festival at home. Some families would consist entirely of unbelievers, some entirely of believers, and some of both. (A simplification, since it leaves out degrees of belief or unbelief.) In the third—no doubt fairly numerous—group, an abrupt, concerted opting out of the believers would have meant forgoing a unique opportunity for propagating the good news. As for the pilgrims—more engaged theologically, on the whole, than those staying behind—believers would tend to join together. Thus a growing proportion of Passover-eve companies at Jerusalem was fervently dedicated to the new faith. It was here, above all, that reports and reflections about the recent, ultimate salvation were appended to those about the preparatory one, gradually linked together and in the end given decisive prominence. Certainly, before long, as other occasions for formulating end-time history developed—the daily sacred meal assemblies, for example\footnote{See J. Jeremias, \textit{Die Abendmahlswoorde Jesu} (3rd ed., 1960), pp. 60 f.}—and as gentile converts played an increasing role, this Christian Seder lost in importance. Still, it ought to be granted ten to fifteen years, ten to fifteen most intense, most productive years.

5. A reservation is none the less called for. In Mark and Luke, Jesus “answers well” or “says well” when challenged by the Sadducees, in Matthew he “muzzles” them, \textit{phimoo}. It is not unthinkable that Matthew, independently of any other source, wants a more forceful expression. But I wonder. It is a most uncommon one. Elsewhere in the gospels it is confined to the defeat of a subhuman aggressor: an unclean spirit in one Marcan
pericope—where Luke follows suit—a raging storm in another—
with neither Matthew nor Luke conforming. In the Epistles
(if we disregard references to the Old Testament prohibition
of muzzling an ox while threshing) it occurs once only, in
I Peter. Here, indeed, it is employed much as in the dispute with
the Sadducees: the apostle—or his amaneuensis—writes that
Christians should by their goodness “muzzle the ignorance of
foolish men”. What chiefly deserves attention is the Haggadah’s
use of a comparable term: the reply to the scoffer is “to blunt his
teeth”. (A fairly literal application is met, for example, in the
comment that Esau kissed Jacob in order to bite him but the
latter’s neck turned into marble, so the former’s teeth became
blunt; the transferred one in the prediction that Shiloh, the
Messianic king, will blunt the teeth of the nations.) Maybe—but
this is not essential to my argument—a variant of the liturgy once
contained the very term “to muzzle”, hasam, quite fitting: the
Targum to the Psalter has every liar’s mouth “muzzled”. We
should bear in mind the fluidity, even within literal muzzling,
between different shades. Thus Paul, in quoting the law about the
ox, puts the cruder kimoo, to which quite a few copyists prefer the
Septuagintal Phimoo. Anyhow, I suspect that Matthew in this
passage enshrines a Haggadah tradition equal in antiquity with
Mark’s and, who knows?, supplied by the proto-Matthew in
Hebrew we hear of from Eusebius. By the way, Hebrew rather
than Aramaic (which is regularly substituted nowadays) would be
the natural choice for an evangelist in direct touch with the
primitive Christian Seder celebrations, dominated by Hebrew.

Am I making too much of a single phrase? It does not, however,
stand alone. I have already furnished grounds for deriving the
Massacre of the Innocents from the Seder. In this case, Matthew
passes on a fully-fledged Ur-Christian parallel to the Passover-eve
exegesis of a kind of Credo from Deuteronomy. The first story

83 Mark 1.25, Luke 4.35.
85 Deuteronomy 25.4, I Corinthians 9.9 (see below), I Timothy 5.18.
87 Genesis Rabba on 33.4.
88 Genesis Rabba on 49.10.
89 Psalms 107.42. On the other hand, in Psalms 39.2, the sufferer puts a
muzzle on his own mouth when irked by the wicked.
p. 41.
Matthew tells of Jesus, that is, corresponds to the first story in the Haggadah. 91

I find nothing of the sort in Luke.

6. The Third Gospel, in fact, not unexpectedly offers a contrast to the first two, being far less closely tied to the traditional Judaism of the time. Its author’s dissociation from it becomes manifest when we look, say, at his report in Acts of the installation of seven servers of tables. 92 Throughout his writings, he attaches particular relevance to the concept of Jesus as the new Moses, the final prophet predicted by Deuteronomy, mighty in deed and word, and delivering his people despite their rejection of him 93 — perhaps partly because, for him, Jesus, like Moses, is “the founder of a religion”. 94 In this report, then, he makes the Mosaic pattern continue in the Church, the new holy community which, he realizes, must be prepared for a long march. With outstanding artistry he alludes to the appointment of Joshua as well as three other Old Testament chapters where Moses delegates some of his burdens: the creation of judges for routine disputes, the promotion of seventy elders to assist him and the creation of officers of the tribes. In none of all this, however, can he be shown to draw on Rabbinic interpretations of or legends built up around those texts.

We may obtain help from here for assessing certain passages in his Gospel: reflections rooted in Rabbinic teaching do not presumably originate with him. Take the Parable of the Unjust Steward. 95 Its basic message is to emulate, in the ultimate crisis

that has arrived, the tycoon's henchman who in the nick of time undoes some of his cruel work by lightening the load of the debtors. An excursus represents him as dubiously motivated—afraid of shameful poverty, intent on providing himself with grateful supporters—and emphasizes that even so he receives praise from Jesus.\footnote{96} This expresses the pragmatic standpoint versus the perfectionist in a debate dividing the Rabbis. It is worth noting that the pragmatists took the description in Genesis of Noah as virtuous "in his generation" in the sense of "compared with others in that inferior epoch": such relative superiority, we hear from Philo and Judah ben Ilai, sufficed for his salvation though he would not have passed in a godly age.\footnote{97} Just so, Jesus explains that those belonging to the pre-redemption aeon, when they behave like the steward, rank as wiser "for their generation", "considering their surroundings", than would the sons of the light, the redeemed ones. It is safe to regard the whole of this as a pre-Lucan elaboration: a conclusion corroborated by the attempt in the following verses to mitigate the effect and veer towards perfectionism.

On the other hand, when the original ending of the episode of the young Jesus abandoning his parents for a debate in the Temple is toned down,\footnote{98} by the assurance that he "subjected himself to them", quite possibly we have to do with an amendment by Luke. By this time, the sect was consolidated; and whereas, earlier on, the young were to break away from their stubborn elders for a radically fresh start, what was now needed for an orderly development was respectful submission.

7. My inclination is obviously against speculative, absolutist theories and in favour of flexible ones, re-tested again and again. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. No case, no line, no particle is so trivial that it may not require modification or even scrapping of the most logically argued, magnificent general proposition. Which leaning does not prevent me from seeing the value of the opposite.

\footnote{Aramaic Gospels", in BULLETIN, xxix (1945-46), 71—I differed from C.C. Torrey and expressed preference for the text as it stands "just because it is so inconvenient", I had no inkling that some day I might hit on an explanation.}

\footnote{"The lord" with the definite article must refer to him.}

\footnote{Genesis 6.9, Philo, \textit{On Abraham}, 7.36 ff., Genesis Rabba on 6.9.}

\footnote{Luke 2.41 ff. See my \textit{Civil Disobedience in Antiquity} (1972), pp. 47 ff.}
No doubt the progress of mathematical machinery will be of colossal help to synoptic research. I regret that I am too set in my ways to take the big step from disputation to computation. Let me end up, then, by indicating an inadequately tapped potential of a different kind.

A hope, however faint, I am prey to is that more earnest attention will be paid in future to the Jewish material. With some notable exceptions such as G. Vermes's *Jesus the Jew*, New Testament research is satisfied with scratching the surface, i.e. a dutiful acknowledgment of Strack-Billerbeck or the like. Few texts omitted there are ever inspected. As if—I am exaggerating, though not overmuch and in a good cause—as if classical specialists in Socrates were content to analyze Dr. Adams's *Religious Teachers of Greece*, supplemented by the Oxford *Companion*, but never went into the writings of his age and in his language. Whereas, naturally, they are expected to talk and write in fifth-century B.C. Greek better than those who lived then: Ionic, Doric, Laconian, lapidary, tragic, colloquial. Hardly any probers into Christian origins are fluent—really fluent—in the tongue Jesus spoke. Recently, working in a splendid academic theological library, I needed a Passover Haggadah. They had one poor old copy in a remote corner amidst low-ranking fringe liturgy. I asked around a little among the students present—admittedly no scientific poll—and not one of them had ever thought of looking up the little volume, be it even for a glance at the vernacular. Yet that is where it all started. How are we to account for this amazing situation?

Before trying an answer, I ought to clarify my approach in two respects. Firstly, I do not subscribe to the rigid doctrine that the insider alone understands, that only a Jew, a Christian, a black, an Aryan, a woman, a man, can appreciate the experience and thinking of the group. No doubt part of it is inaccessible. But a great deal is not, and part is actually easier for non-members to be aware of, as proved by Shakespeare on Othello and Shylock, de Toqueville on the Americans, Ruth Fulton Benedict on the Japanese. Nor, indeed, are such ectogenous insights confined to sympathizers. As love may make blind, hate may make seeing.


Just remember the grains, or lumps, of truth about the enemy unearthed in sectarian polemics. Folk wisdom agrees with me, applying to the individual what I am here saying about groups. A seeker for advice is told, on one occasion, that there is nothing for it but to look into his own heart, on another, that he should make an effort to stand outside himself. Often the latter position has its advantages.

As for the capacity of a literary product to be comprehended beyond its original circle, it is futile to deny it in the face of Aesop’s fables, the Thousand-and-One-Nights, the stories of Helen of Troy or Heracles or Parsifal, the teachings of Confucius or Buddha, the Bible itself. Granted that some points will be missed in the transition, a large number will come through and, once again, the foreign recipient may make contributions enriching the native interpretation. Simple, basic features may be discovered or re-discovered—the “parallelism of members” in Hebrew poetry, for instance, described by Bishop Lowth of the eighteenth century. (A little like the disclosure to M. Jourdain in *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* that he has talked prose all his life.) Or profound implications: the Oedipus complex, the Hebrew monarchy as the exemplar of institutions flawed yet divinely sanctioned in order to prevent worse, “for the hardness of your heart”.

Secondly, I do not believe in scholarship as the sole key to a great work. A reader or listener genuinely attuned needs none of the philologist’s equipment to enter into the author’s world. He may find treasures old and new in a translation of a translation of a translation. Schopenhauer became acquainted with the Upanishads through a Latin rendering of a Persian rendering; Philo relied chiefly on the Septuagint. In fact, many an intuition arrived at outside academia has proved valuable inside. (Which does not mean that others must be of lesser worth.) Hunches of long ago, such as that the tale of Noah and Ham alludes to castration, or that there is a point in Esther not revealing her lineage rather than telling a falsehood about it, tend to be taken up by modern exegesis. To be sure, a wealth of information of a certain kind is open only to the savant: how Israelite prophecy relates to Canaanite, or Pauline oratory to Hellenistic. But certain other kinds are probably rendered harder of attain-

---

101 See above, n. 36.
ment by his very mindset. An analphabet in a “backward” region may hear more than a professor in “the stars in their courses fought with Sisera” or “not what I will but what thou wilt”.

My observations, then, have regard only to our peculiar fraternity, pledged by the meticulous application of agreed methods over time to build up a, by and large, dependable body of knowledge, ever growing in breadth, depth and refinement—despite its intrinsic, never quite eradicable, shortcomings. It is within this context only that the neglect of a cluster of sources manifestly of first-rate importance calls for an explanation.

Two reasons one occasionally comes across—I say, occasionally, because in the main the phenomenon is not faced—do certainly play a role. One is the inordinate difficulty of the documents in question. Much of the discussion baffles even a student with perfect Hebrew and Aramaic, so idiosyncratic are its logic and formulation; in fact, the majority of present-day Rabbis leave huge chunks alone. Moreover, the dating of utterances and of what they are about not seldom raises problems. And so on. To brush aside something one cannot cope with as irrelevant is a common and, up to a point, sound defence mechanism. I have elsewhere confessed to my shelving away a textbook on Roman law in Bulgarian sent me from Sofia, persuading myself that it was unlikely to prove of substantial aid. Still, there must be more to the general, persistent shelving away under notice. After all, in other provinces—say, cuneiform or Homeric studies—similar obstacles have acted as a worthwhile challenge rather than a keep-off sign. Hittite fragments are exploited to the full though the language is beset with riddles. In my own lifetime, the Babylonian and Assyrian laws and Hammurabi himself, as well as the Iliad and Odyssey and their constituent parts, have been assigned to considerably varying epochs; yet the experts soldier on, conscious of the price of letting go.

Here is a relatively simple shot at sorting out different strata in the Haggadah—admitting that the result may be proved wrong by superior reconsideration or fresh evidence. Twice a series of divine benefactions is enumerated, once in verse and once in prose. It is only the latter version which characterizes the Temple as built “to atone for all our transgressions”. Which suggests a date for it from before A.D. 70 and a later one for the poetic list. A turning of prose into poetry is in any case more likely than the reverse. See New Testament Studies, v. 176.
The other reason given here and there is anti-semitism. Since this emotion, like its counterpart anti-gentilism, operates in untold guises, from the most direct and brutal to the most oblique and rarefied, far be it from me to make light of it. None the less, I wonder whether a third factor is not at work, in addition to these two: a reluctance unreservedly to humanize Jesus—his human side, that is—to place him right in, not above, his historical and social milieu. For the safeguarding of reverential distance, it is better not to know too much. In an entirely different connection, several decades ago, I commented on the cosmetic apparatus of theologians to Father Corbishley. "O yes", he replied, "they are all monophysites". It is an instinctive attitude, avowed neither to the world nor to the self, hence the more compulsive. Being brought up in that stern, orthodox branch of Judaism where God is the wholly other, I have every sympathy with it.

In the 'fifties and 'sixties, as the Dead Sea Scrolls became a popular sensation, there was a moment of suspense. That a valid, scholarly appraisal of the New Testament presupposes familiarity with the surrounding evidence—familiarity as easy as that of the Socrates scholar with Plato, Aristophanes, Thucydides—loomed as an inescapable conclusion; and a few enthusiasts indeed believed that henceforth thorough immersion in the Jewish sources would be de rigueur in the pertinent Departments. Significantly, too, I heard of two learned Jewish converts to Christianity who were so bowled over as to consider going back on their conversion. They had, plainly, been unrealistic before—otherwise the finds would have made no difference one way or the other. (It may not be accidental that they were Protestants, less comfortable, it would seem, with the divinity of Jesus than Catholics and in consequence keener on eliminating the other side. Corbishley is a Catholic. True, J.A.T. Robinson, who, in The Human Face of God, 103 movingly pleads against monophysitism, is an Anglican, C. K. Barrett, who in Jesus and the Gospel Tradition 104 can write that "the suffering was more acute than the human Jesus had foreseen", a Methodist.) By now, however, the flurry is over and things are pretty much back to normal.

Support for my guess may be gleaned from many other spheres of Western culture, but I shall restrict myself to one illustration.

104 1967, p. 108.
When I came to England before World War II, under the Lord Chamberlain’s rules—since dropped—it was permissible to bring God on the stage, but not Jesus. Whatever the official argumentation, the true aim of this at first sight, to a Jew at least, staggering arrangement was protection of Jesus’s divinity. God is no need of such a measure. It matters not what you do to him: he may break into a guffaw, sneeze, show sexual interest, perform a handstand—he remains God. Jesus’s divine side, the rules imply, is too precarious, so the safer course is to suppress the human one altogether.\(^\text{105}\)

To expand the quest in the direction I am advocating would require not only tremendous, confident openness but also much bureaucratic, unselfish labour. For, if serious, lasting gains are desired, to begin with, a considerable number of young graduands or graduates must be sent out for long, intensive training; not, that is, to get a smattering, but to become masters. The reward of their seniors would consist in watching the new, ampler inquiries take root and bear fruit. Who can say it will not happen? “Omnam lo’ ka’asher yir’e ha’adham abhal lakkol zeman we’eth lekhol hepheš tahath hashshamayim, “Indeed, not as man sees; but for everything there is a moment, and a time for all business under heaven”. Thus, Wessely, in 1782, calling on the Austrian Jews to respond to Joseph II’s Edict of Tolerance and add a broad education in German to the traditional, exclusive concern with Torah.

\(^\text{105}\) A little comparable to the blockage in the New Testament field is that in medieval Roman and Canon Law, whose exponents are not at home, by proper standards, in Islamic (or, for that matter, medieval Jewish) Law. The next fundamental breakthrough will come through a generation seriously exploring the mutual influence between West and East. In this case, too, the difficulty of the task is not the only obstacle. Among the others are a time-hallowed feeling of superiority and the fear of what may emerge. Experto crede! While a Director of the Robbins Library at U. C. Berkeley School of Law, I had ample opportunity of watching the feeding and starving of different interests—the starving often from non-remembrance or, if memory was jolted, relieved by the expression of unspecified good intentions for the future.