

readings from primary sources and quotations which, although different from MT, are philologically akin to it. Lastly we shall have to note those readings from these same sources—again in a separate apparatus—which do not belong to the proto-massoretic circle, and are part of an alternative, by no means necessarily superior, tradition.²⁰

I do not want to dwell, for the moment, any longer on this classification, but it should be stressed that without such an attempt biblical philology is bound to remain the abused handmaid of textual criticism, and that the so-called lower Bible-criticism will lack any sound philological basis.

It may be, that by now I have succeeded in making it clear why my work on the concordance seemed to me to bear some relationship to my attempts in the field of "Philologia Sacra." This is, of course, a side-light, an illustration only, and nothing can be proved conclusively in such a way. But it does happen sometimes that we fail to appreciate the complexity of our problems, only to become aware of it when things are reduced *ad absurdum* outside their proper province. It is with this intention that I dare hope to have shown what the student of biblical philology can learn from the mistakes in the Bible-concordance.

Jerusalem.

M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN

²⁰ Thus the same witnesses will furnish the material for the proto-massoretic apparatus of a future critical edition and for the separate apparatus which will contain those readings which are not philologically akin to MT. On the necessity of arranging the material from our different sources in different apparatuses, working our way backward until the proto-biblical target can eventually be reached, cf. also *V.T.*, *loc. cit.*, p. 199.

²¹ I use this term not only for want of a better one, but also to avoid confusion with SPERBER'S "Pre-massoretic" Bible. This latter term should be reserved in future discussion for the study of the history of the massoretic vocalisation-and accent system. Cf. now his *Masoretic Hebrew in The Pre-Masoretic Bible I*, Copenhagen 1956.

The Influence of Symposia Literature on the Literary Form of the Pesah Haggadah*

A. The Problem

THERE ARE MORE than twenty passages in the Bible, ranging from *Exodus* to the *Second Book of Chronicles*, which deal in one way or another with the ordinances of *hagh ha-pesah* and *hagh ha-masoth*. The Rabbis of mishnaic times were already aware of some inconsistencies in the ancient records. They speak, for instance, of *pesah misrayim* and *pesah le-dhoroth*. Modern Old Testament scholars, in particular, have drawn attention to the variety of Biblical source material on the subject. To mention only a few of the more striking discrepancies: originally Pesah was observed as a domestic festivity. The whole account in *Exodus* xii has no trace of the deuteronomic centralization of sacrificial worship. In *Exodus* xii: 22 ff, the sprinkling of the blood on the lintel and the two sideposts of the door is commanded "as a statute unto thee and thy sons for ever." The passages in *Deuteronomy*, *Joshua*, the *Second Book of Kings*, *Ezra* and the *Second Book of Chronicles*, though phrased in more general terms, do not mention any such ordinance. And what in the *Exodus* account seems to refer entirely to the duties of every householder, is transferred in *Ezra* to the tasks of the priests and Levites.

Only one aspect seems to be an unchangeable feature of the Pesah traditions from hoary antiquity to the present day—the duty incumbent on every father and teacher in Israel to perpetuate the memory of the story of the Exodus from Egypt and to pass it on to the next generation. Four sections in the Pentateuch are supposed to accentuate this obligation.¹ A fifth quotation from *Exodus* x: 2 is not used as a proof-text in the traditional Haggadah, though it occurs in the *Midhrash ha-Gadhol* in the name of Rabh Huna, in the *Guide of the Perplexed*, iii: 39, and in the *Haggadah of the Karaites*.²

* I am indebted to my colleague, Mr. J. G. Weiss, for drawing my attention to the structural and historical relationship between the Haggadah and Symposia Literature. My friend, Dr. J. Rosenwasser, has made valuable suggestions on various points which have a bearing on this enquiry.

¹ *Exodus* xii: 26 ff, xiii: 6 ff and 14, and *Deuteronomy* vi: 12 f.

Continued at foot of next page

JOURNAL of Jewish Studies, Vol. VIII

Nos. 1+2, 1957

It appears, however, that at best only the first three passages have a bearing on what later became the statutory liturgy of the *Pesah Haggadah*. The context of the question of the son in *Deuteronomy* deals generally with "testimonies, statutes and ordinances," which, though traced back to the time of the Exodus, have nothing to do with the specific laws of Passover, such as the paschal lamb, unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Even the first three commandments in *Exodus* bear only remote resemblance to their ultimate transformation in the *Haggadah*, if we consider their original *Sitz im Leben*. The Samaritans, for instance, have nothing corresponding to the Jewish Seder Service in their early history. Their table hymns appear first in the fourteenth century. In obedience to the law in *Exodus* xii: 7 and xii: 22, they merely dip a little bunch of hyssop into a bowl of blood and touch the lintel and sideposts of their huts with it. On a number of occasions, the custom has been observed that adults and children mark their foreheads and probably their arms or hands with blood.³ In *Exodus* xiii: 9, the exhortation to tell the son is immediately followed by the sentence "And it shall be as a sign upon your hand and for a memory between your eyes, so that the Torah of the Lord should be in your mouth, because the Lord has brought you forth from Egypt with a strong hand. And thou shalt keep this statute at its proper season from year to year."

A very similar, though shorter, instruction occurs in verse 16, after reference has been made to the slaying of the first-born in Egypt. Chapter xii: 26 stands in the same context. What was originally meant to be preserved in the memory of future generations was simply the annual domestic sacrifice and the accompanying blood rite,⁴ the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and a brief explanatory reference to the

³ For a recent comprehensive treatment of the celebration of the Passover among the Samaritans cf. the Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Leeds by J. LERNER, *A Critical Investigation and Translation of the Special Liturgies of the Samaritans for their Passover*, 1956.

⁴ For a late reminiscence of its originally prophylactic character cf. *Jubilees* ii: 15. Cf. also the phenomenological study by F. BAMMEL, *Das Heilige Mahl im Glauben der Völker*, Gütersloh, 1956, p. 56. On the early replacement of the dipping of hyssop into a bowl of blood and the touching of lintel and sideposts into the two *tibbulim* cf. the interesting article by S. ZETLIN, *Seder shel Pesah*, *Hadoar* xxxvi, No. 21, 1956, pp. 414 f. The Karaite usage to recite the 'arami 'obhedh passage in their Passover Haggadah is merely a late adaptation to the Rabbinic custom.

² PRESSBURG, 1879; cf. also M. M. KASHER, *Haggadah Shelemah*, Jerusalem, 1955, p. 29.

Exodus and the covenant connected with it. There is certainly no allusion in any of the Biblical passages to the duty of telling the story of deliverance at night.

There are many references to the celebration of the Passover meal in *Jubilees*, *Philo*, *Josephus* and the *New Testament* which we shall discuss later. Some of them reveal interesting points of contact with later developments, but it is almost certain that apart from *Kiddush*, *Hallel* and some very elementary questions and answers in connection with the rites of the festival,⁵ no fixed Seder liturgy was in existence before the second third of the second century C.E. Even after that, the establishment and adjustment of traditions lasted for many centuries. Had there been any pre-Christian literary history of the *Haggadah*, the Hellenistic Jewish writers would have given a detailed account of its educational and "philosophical" importance to their Greek neighbours. Finkelstein's dating of the greater part of the *Haggadah* text in the second or third century B.C.E. is thus unconvincing.⁶ Neither the *Elephantine Papyrus* of 446 B.C.E., which deals with some of the laws of Passover, nor the *Pesah* passage in *Sirah*, chapter 50, mention anything about the Seder Service.

What then gave the impetus to the extension from the unspecified Biblical ordinances to the elaborate ritual of the *Haggadah* as it now stands before us? A number of explanations can be put forward: the expansion of any form of liturgy after the cessation of the Temple service, the general increase in midrashic exegesis since the beginning of the Christian era, the amalgamation and harmonization of a great variety of these rabbinic traditions, eschatological expectations side by side with the attempt to organise national resistance against Rome, and the tendency to stress the antiquity of the Jewish people. In addition to such causes which all played their part in the shaping of the statutory ritual of the Seder Night, I submit for consideration the influence of Symposia Literature on the literary form of the *Haggadah*.

I. Lewy, E. Baneth, S. Krauss and D. Goldschmidt have already drawn attention to the fact that the forms of the Seder meal pre-

⁵ The tenth chapter of *Mishnah* and *Tosefta Pesahim*, for instance, records early controversies regarding *Kiddush* and *Hallel* between Hillel and Shammai. The mishnaic *mah nishtanah*, and possibly the saying of Rabban Gamaliel presuppose the existence of the Temple. See, however, below pp. 25ff, 32f, 41f.

⁶ Cf. *The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah*, *Harvard Theological Review*, xxxi, pp. 291 ff. *Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah*, *ibid.*, xxxv, pp. 291 ff and xxxvi, pp. 1 ff.

suppose acquaintance with, and dependence on, Graeco-Roman table manners and dietary habits.⁷ There is—apart from the old constituent parts of the paschal festivities—the washing of hands, the *hors d'oeuvre*, the wine before, in the middle and after the meal, and the reclining on beds or couches at supper time. Not one of these items is in any way restricted to the Seder Night, not one to a specific sacred occasion. Examples illustrating such affinities between the Jewish and non-Jewish way of life could be multiplied to fill a small volume of comparative study. The scarcity of Biblical and especially of Pentateuchal data and their setting in a relatively primitive form of society leave little doubt as to who borrowed from whom, though allowances must be made for transformation from the profane to the sacred, from pagan to Jewish religiosity and for a certain natural development of each civilization within its own sphere.

A random selection of additional evidence must here suffice. In the course of a lexicographical enquiry, Athenaeus⁸ quotes a number of passages from Homer to the poets of the Old and New Comedy in which the terminus technicus *didonai hudōr kata cheirōn* is used. Such pouring of water over the hands was done before and after meals. Socrates in Plato's *Symposium* (175 A) is washed by a servant to make him ready for reclining. The elliptic נטל לידים, or נטל ונתן לידים (*Tosefta Berakhot*, iv: 8) which stands for על מים לידים is the aramaizing equivalent for the Greek phrase.

Athenaeus alone refers to lettuce seven times in his *Deipnosophists*,⁹ describing the variety of its kind and its usefulness at table. As to *haroseth*—made of nuts and fruits pounded together and mixed with spices, wine or vinegar—similar though not identical dishes are described at length by the same author,¹⁰ and the question is raised whether they should be served before or after dinner. Heracleides of Tarentum, a physician of the first century B.C.E., is said to have recommended these appetizers as an *hors d'oeuvre* rather than a dessert. It is interesting that the *Mishnah Pesahim* x: 3 does not consider *haroseth* as a *mišwah*.¹¹ Only a *Baraita*, quoted in the *Gemara*

⁷ For a detailed bibliography cf. D. GOLDSCHMIDT, *Sedher Haggadah shel Pesah*, Jerusalem 1947.

⁸ *Deipnosophists* ix: 408c ff. cf. also Index s.v. Washing of Hands. More about Athenaeus on p. 19. If not stated otherwise Greek and Roman authors are quoted from the *Loeb Classical Library*; its translations have been used with occasional modification.

⁹ See Index s.v. Lettuce.

Continued at foot of next page

ad loc., attaches the well-known symbolism to it, whilst Abaye, an Amora of the fourth century, could still suggest a different interpretation of this "fruit salad" (*Pesahim* 116a).

Even the custom of Hillel to eat Maṣṣah and Maror together with the paschal lamb¹² need not be based on a literal interpretation of *Exodus* xii: 8 and *Numbers* ix: 11. Sandwich bread eaten with lettuce belongs to the Graeco-Roman menu. Bread attached by skewers to the meat was also common.¹³ The habit was apparently *en vogue*, before it was linked with a scriptural commandment.

That wine, mixed or unmixed, belongs to most festive occasions, Gentile, Jewish, secular and sacred, is natural and needs no stress. Biblical and Rabbinic references have been assembled in every work dealing with the ancient Jewish meal in general and with the Seder in particular.¹⁴ Of the comparable Greek source material Antiphanes' saying that one should honour the gods to the extent of three cups might perhaps be quoted,¹⁵ though nobody would claim any direct influence on the four cups of the *Haggadah*.

In Homer's time "men still feasted sitting, but gradually they slid from chairs to couches, taking as their ally relaxation and ease,"¹⁶ leaning on their left arm whilst they were eating.¹⁷ In Biblical times, a similar development took place and has been traced by E. Baneth in his *Commentary on the Mishnah Pesahim*. Yet it is clear that those Biblical records which refer to reclining do so only in connection with royal circles and a degenerate aristocracy.¹⁸ The *Haggadah*, on the other hand, and its tannaitic sources reflect general social changes of the time and allow, nay, command ex-

¹² *Pesahim* 115a.

¹³ Athenaeus iv.: 151a.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. *Strack-Billerbeck* iv.: 1 Exkurs: Das Passahmahl, pp. 41 ff. and iv: 2 Exkurs: Ein Altjüdisches Gastmahl, pp. 611 ff.

¹⁵ Antiphanes was a poet of the fourth century B.C.E. Cf. Athenaeus x: 441c and Index s.v. Wine. Plutarch singles out wine, bread, meat, couches and tables which must be provided for every entertainment. Other things are brought in not for necessity but pleasure. (*Quaestiones Conviviales*, ed. G. C. BERNADAKIS, Leipzig 1892, 629c). Cf. also K. KIRCHER, *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum*, Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, ix: 2, 1910.

¹⁶ Athenaeus i: 11 f; viii: 363 f; x: 428b, and Index s.v. Reclining.

¹⁷ Cf. A. FRICKENHAUS, *Griechische Bankethäuser*, Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich-Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, xxxii, p. 115, and *Pesahim*, 108a.

¹⁸ Cf. *Amos* ii: 8, vi: 4; *Esther* i: 6, vii: 8; *Canticles* i: 12.

¹⁹ ii: 53c and Index s.v. Nuts.

¹¹ Rabbi Šadoq, who does not share this view, speaks only for himself. Cf. also *Tosefta Pesahim* x: 9f.

tension of upper-class prerogatives even to the poorest in Israel.¹⁹

Moreover, words like *tragema*, *parpereth* and *'epikomion*, mentioned in the tenth section of *Pesahim*, betray their foreign origin at once and lead back to the contemporary environment out of which they grew.²⁰

But more than words and dinner habits are here involved. Since Plato, a literary species, the so-called Symposia, had developed, in which a description was given of a banquet held by a few learned men who had met at a friend's house to discuss scientific, philosophical, ethical, aesthetical, grammatical, dietetic and religious themes over a glass, and very often over a barrel of wine, after they had dined together. Plutarch, one of the most famous contributors to sympotic literature, and a younger contemporary of Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Joshua, Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah, Rabbi Akiba and Rabbi Tarfon, summarizes earlier practice and theory in the following manner: *Koinōnia gar esti kai spoudēs kai paidiās kai logōn kai praxeōn to symposion*. "A symposium is a communion of serious and mirthful entertainment, discourse and actions."²¹ It is meant to further "a deeper insight into those points that were debated at table, for the remembrance of those pleasures which arise from meat and drink is ungentle and short-lived . . . but the subjects of philosophical queries and discussions remain always fresh after they have been imparted . . . and they are relished by those who were absent as well as by those who were present at dinner."²²

Occasions for such meetings varied from ordinary desire for pleasant company to birthday, victory, or religious celebrations. A full discussion of dietetic questions is not to be found in the earlier Symposia of Plato and Xenophon. Plutarch, however, covering the whole range of human knowledge of his time, includes a number of table talks which deal at length with the peculiarities of all kinds of fish, meat, vegetables and wine (iii: 7-9). There is even one *Tischgespräch* which centres round the question whether

¹⁹ For reclining at ordinary meals in tannaitic times cf. *Tosefta Berakhoth* iv: 8 f.

²⁰ *Parpereth* has been derived by JACOB LEVY, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim*, from Hebrew *parar*. BANETH, however, in his *Die Sechs Ordnungen der Mischna, Pesachim*, Berlin 1927, p. 240, is certainly right in connecting the word with the Greek *perifora*. For *'epikomion* cf. S. LIEBERMAN, *Ha-Yerushalmi Kifshuto*, Jerusalem 1934, p. 521.

²¹ Cf. *Quaestiones Convivales*, l.c., 708 D.

²² Plutarch, l.c., 686 C f.

the Jews abstain from pork, because they worship the pig, or because they have an antipathy against it (iv: 5). Since the days of Pythagoras, considerable interest had been taken in dietetic problems. Hellenistic, Gnostic, Neo-Platonic and Patristic writings make relevant, though dispersed, observations on them²³. Athenaeus, who lived in Rome at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century C.E., gives a fantastic list of dishes and drinks in his 15 books entitled *The Deipnosophists*. One of the various banquets described in them is said to have taken place on the holiday of the Parilia, an April feast instituted in commemoration of Hadrian's erection of the Temple of the Fortune of Rome (viii: 361f).

The *Deipnosophists* contain an encyclopaedic summary of similar older compilations, valuable for their traditions and methods of approach. Heavy dependence on earlier authors is also conspicuous with the last representative of this type of literature, Macrobius, whose *Saturnalia* belong to the early fifth century.²⁴

Statements made in sympotic writings are often traced back to their classical sources. *Eipe gar Homēros* appears over and over again. He is "the wisest", and to quote him is almost identical with the midrashic and haggadic *she-ne'emar* or *ka-kathubb*. Yet there is no restriction of authorities²⁵ or subject matter in the arguments of these authors, whilst the Rabbis, in spite of all their diversity of opinion, have only one Bible to confirm their views.

No hard and fast rules for the talk are observed in Greek and Roman literature. "Even Plato," we are told by Plutarch, "did not prepare himself for the contest like a wrestler, that he may take the faster hold of his adversary . . . Questions should be easy, the problems known, the interrogations plain and familiar, not intricate and dark, so that they may neither vex the unlearned nor frighten them from the disquisition . . . The discourse should be like

²³ Cf. e.g. *Pseudo-Aristeas*, 132 ff; PHILO, *De Specialibus Legibus*, iv: 97, and the author's *Dietary Laws in Rabbinic and Patristic Literature*, *Studia Patristica*, Vol. II, Berlin 1957, pp. 141-154.

²⁴ Edited by H. BORNEQUE and F. RICHARD, Paris 1937. The object of the whole work is *colloqui, interrogare, respondere* (i, ii, 4, 5). Almost all sources of Macrobius have been traced to the second century C.E. if not to an earlier period; cf. the articles Macrobius and Gavius Bassus in *Pauly-Wissowa*. For the connection of earlier symposia with religious occasions see XENOPHON'S *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*, 146 d.

²⁵ A random selection from Athenaeus yields *theios Homēros*, v: 185a; *kalos Xenofōn*, xi: 504 e; *sofos Platōn*, iv: 155 f; *polumathestatos Aristotelēs*, xi: 505 c.

our wine, common to all, of which everyone may equally partake."²⁶ Classical scholars have described the literary development of sympotic writings from their masterly beginnings to their degenerate end.²⁷

B. *Pre-Haggadic Traces of Symposia Literature in Jewish Hellenistic Writings*

There are some traces of such table talks in early Jewish-Hellenistic literature. In the pseudepigraphic *Letter of Aristeas*,²⁸ for instance, we learn that the Palestinian emissaries who had come to Alexandria to translate the Hebrew Bible into Greek were invited by the king to inaugurate their mission with a "party" in their honour. It is emphasized that the day coincides with the anniversary of the king's victory which would have at any rate demanded a special celebration of a sympotic character. During the meal all participants recline. A prayer over the specially prepared food is pronounced, and after a suitable time has passed, a table talk on the art of good and just government ensues.²⁹ Following the examples of classical Symposia literature every one of those invited participates in the discussion. For a full week the festive meals are repeated, the talks too are continued. It is not their contents, but their apparent dependence on a fixed literary pattern which is relevant for our enquiry.

No direct or indirect information about the origin of the Haggadah can be gained from the long section on Pesah in the *Book of Jubilees* (chapter 49). It merely follows its general trend of presupposing Rabbinic observances in Patriarchal times, if it projects the drinking of wine and the praise of the God of the Fathers into the time of the Exodus.

Philo deals directly with the celebration of Pesah in a number of passages, particularly in his *De Specialibus Legibus*, ii: 145ff. Nevertheless, he does not mention any form of a fixed liturgy for the Seder night, though he describes in great detail how "on this festival many myriads of victims were offered by the whole people, old and young alike, raised for that particular day to the dignity of priesthood." Only in its broadest outline can his interpretation

²⁶ *Quaestiones Conviviales*, 614 Cf.

²⁷ I am particularly indebted to JOSEPH MARTIN, *Symposion, die Geschichte einer literarischen Form*, Paderborn 1931.

²⁸ About 100 B.C.E. according to STAEHLIN, *Die Hellenistisch-Jüdische Literatur*, Munich 1921, p. 621.

²⁹ Cf. XENOPHON, *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*, 147a ff.

of the religious, historical, and agricultural meaning of the festival rites—and still less his allegorizations—be compared with the later Rabbinical records. All he has to say about domestic celebrations is comprised in one paragraph (148). "On this day every dwelling house is invested with the outward semblance and dignity of the Temple. The guests assembled for the banquet (*sussitia*)... are there not as in other festive gatherings (*eis ta alla sumposia*) to indulge the belly with wine and viands, but to fulfill with prayers and hymns (*met' euchōn te kai humnōn*) the custom handed down by their fathers." I have shown elsewhere that the term *humnos* stands for *Hallel* since the days of the Maccabees.³⁰

In his *De Vita Contemplativa* (48ff), Philo gives further details about pagan banquets and the luxury, ostentatiousness and immorality prevailing at them. He describes the elaborate couches (*triklina* and *poluklina*) on which the guests used to recline, and a great variety of precious cups and goblets from which they drank as well as baked meats and savoury dishes which they ate. The performances of flute-girls, dancers and jugglers are contemptuously referred to as accompaniments to unrestrained merry-making.³¹ Even the table talk itself is denounced as leading to effeminacy and vulgarity. The criticism includes the famous *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon. In contrast, the simplicity of dining habits amongst the Therapeutae is recommended to the reader. Philo,³² for reasons unknown, singles out their celebration of *Shabhu'oth*³³ and praises the utmost seriousness with which it was conducted: their sincerity in prayer, their orderly reclining for dinner, the chastity of their women who sit apart, and their contentment in all things, which does not even allow slaves to serve upon them. In his own words, "When the guests have laid them-

³⁰ *Journal of Jewish Studies*, v: 4 (1954), p. 154, "The Liturgy of Hanukkah and the First Two Books of Maccabees". Cf. also *Matthew xxvi: 30* and *Mark xiv: 26*, where *humnēin* stands for *Hallel* in connection with the celebration of the Passover Night.

³¹ Musicians and dancers were considered the dregs of society in the Septuagint, the New Testament, Rabbinic, and Patristic literature. Cf. S. LIEBERMAN, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York, 1942, pp. 31 ff.

³² *Ibid.* 64-90 and Appendix p. 522.

³³ F. H. COLSON in the Loeb edition *ad locum* and H. LEWY, *Philo*, Oxford 1946, p. 45, refer *di hepta hebdomadōn* to Pentecost. I. HEINEMANN, in his article on the Therapeutai in PAULY-WISSOWA, and J. VAN DE PLOEG in "Meals of the Essenes," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, II, April 1957, p. 174, prefer earlier interpretations according to which the phrase must mean "every seven weeks." Some exegetical difficulties remain on either side, though they have no bearing on our enquiry.

selves down . . . and the attendants have taken their stand . . . the President of the company (*prohedros*)³⁴ discusses (*tsētei*) some question arising in the Holy Scriptures, or solves one that has been propounded by someone else. His instruction proceeds in a leisurely manner, he lingers over it and spins it out . . . , thus permanently imprinting the (sacred) thoughts in the souls of his hearers."³⁵ After the discourse, disciplined antiphonal community singing concludes the festive but simple meal.

No such "Haggadah" of the Therapeutae is left, but it needs no sagacity to recognize in Philo's description of this vigil the general background out of which the related Seder ritual must have grown as well.

The community singing is comparable to that of the *Hallel* at the Seder as described in Mishnah, Tosefta and Gemara.³⁶ The *prohedros* becomes in a way the *'omer ha-haggadah* or the *maggidh*,³⁷ the *lector* of Latin Symposia literature, and *tsētein* is identical with *darash*.³⁸ The questions come from the audience and the answers are to be given in a simple manner. Even the leavened bread of which the community partakes seems related to the unleavened bread to be eaten on the Seder night, though the circumstances of, and the reasons for such practice, are not identical. Like the scholars of B'ne B'rak in the Haggadah or like those in Lud mentioned in the *Tosefta*, x: 12, "they continue till dawn . . . not with heavy heads or drowsy eyes but more alert and wakeful than when they came to the banquet (*eis to sumposion*). . . . When they see the sun rising, they stretch their hands up to heaven. . . ." It is interesting that such habits originated in sectarian circles, or rather that our first information comes from them. More one cannot say at the moment.

Josephus has little if anything to report about the domestic festivities on Pesah, though he refers to the Pesah sacrifices offered

³⁴ A few Greek words are here filled up from the Armenian, cf. p. 158, note 1 in the Loeb edition.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 75.

³⁶ Cf. *Mishnah Pesahim* x: 5 f and references by J. N. EPSTEIN, *Introduction to Tannaitic Literature*, Jerusalem 1957, p. 334; *Tosefta Pesahim* x: 6-9 and observations by S. LIEBERMAN, *Tosefeth Rishonim*, I, Jerusalem 1937, p. 177 f, *Gemara Pesahim*, 85b, *Yerushalmi*, *ibid.* 35b.

³⁷ Cf. *Pesahim*, 115b. For a discussion of seating arrangements at a banquet cf. PLUTARCH, *Quaestiones Conviviales* i: 3 and M. BURROWS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, II, Manual of Discipline*, 1951, Plate 6.

³⁸ Cf. WALTER BAUER, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Berlin, 1952, s.v. *tsēte*, p. 614.

by the multitudes in Jerusalem on many occasions, both in his *Antiquities* and in his *Jewish War*.

From the New Testament we can learn little more about the Seder arrangements in the first century than that Jesus formed a *Habburah* with his disciples to partake of the Paschal meal. It was arranged well in advance,³⁹ cushions were prepared on which they reclined while eating, at least once herbs were dipped in the dish of sauce, at least three cups passed round, and the *Hallel* completed the festive ordinances.⁴⁰ Investigations into the literary criticism of the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline documents need not concern us here. It falls equally outside the scope of our present enquiry that the night-long discussion between Jesus and his disciples gave an entirely new meaning to an ancient and hallowed tradition. In the Haggadah, the re-enactment of the delivery from the land of bondage remains a historical reminiscence: "as if everyone had come out of Egypt." There is comparison and not identification. Faith in the new redemption is bound up with certainty of belief in the miracles of the past, e.g. the *Mekhilla* on *Exodus* xiii: 3 (Ben Zoma and the sages), now incorporated into the Haggadah, has also a Messianic and possibly anti-Christian implication, according to which the Exodus from Egypt gains an importance which includes the days of the future Messiah.⁴¹ For Jesus, the Jewish elements of his last supper are eclipsed in spite of the traditional setting. His body replaces the maṣṣah, or better still perhaps the paschal lamb (*touto estin to sōma mou*)⁴², his blood the wine (*touto estin to halma mou*).⁴³

Finally, attention may be drawn to two *Mishnayoth* in *Abhoth* which are connected with our theme. One, iii: 4, reads thus: "Rabbi Simeon (ben Yoḥai, c. 100-170 C.E.) says, 'If three have eaten at one table and have not spoken over it words of the Law, it is as though they have eaten of the sacrifices of the dead. For it is written (*Isaiah* xxviii: 8) "All tables are full of vomit without

³⁹ Cf. *Mekhilla* on *Exodus* xii: 4, *Mishnah Zebhaḥim* v: 8, *Pesahim* 61a.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Matthew* xxxvi: 17 ff, *Mark* xiv: 13 ff, *Luke* xxii: 10 ff, *I Corinthians* xi: 23 ff, and J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharist Words of Jesus*, 2nd ed., Oxford 1955, pp. 139 ff.

⁴¹ For a fuller discussion of such tendencies in the Haggadah see D. DAUBE, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London 1956, pp. 278 f.

⁴² It may be that *sōma* equals *gufo shel pesah*, especially in view of the fragmentary character of the Synoptic records. Cf. however, JEREMIAS, l.c. p. 140 and G. DALMANN, *Jesus-Yeshua*, London 1929, pp. 141 ff.

⁴³ For references to red wine in biblical, apocryphal and rabbinic literature, see JEREMIAS, l.c., p. 145.

Maḳom;" but if three have eaten at one table and have spoken over it words of the Law, it is as if they have eaten from the table of *Maḳom*, for it is written, "And He said unto me, this is the table that is before the Lord" (Ezekiel xli: 22)." Such a statement should not be seen in isolation but in the framework of the contemporary cultural habits of the wise, both Jewish and Gentile. It is noteworthy, that Hellenistic influence is also apparent from the exegesis of *Maḳom* in the Isaiah passage. None of the ancient versions understood it to mean God. Only since the identification of *topos* with God, Rabbi Simeon's interpretation became possible.⁴⁴

Rabbi Jacob's well-known ethical exhortation "This world is like a vestibule before the World to Come. Prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayest enter into the reclining hall" (*Abhoth* iv: 16) provides another incidental example of Rabbinic familiarity with Graeco-Roman dining habits in the second century C.E. One used to assemble in the *prosta*⁴⁵ for the *hors d'oeuvre* before entering the *triklinion* for the main meal.

C. The Haggadah

The Haggadah itself has come down to us in a very fragmentary state, and it is often more complicated to unravel its original component parts than those of the sympotic talks of Graeco-Roman antiquity. Of the *Four Questions*, for instance, only the first two are briefly answered in the present Seder liturgy. Regarding the last, discussions or even a simple statement like that of Rabban Gamaliel towards the end are replaced by *praxeis*, the partaking of food and dinner habits "so that the children should watch and ask" (*Pesahim* 115b). Occasionally, unauthorised compilations of the ritual such as Palestinian traditions, Genizah fragments or the collections and comments of well-known medieval scholars can throw light on a passage otherwise unrelated to its context or setting in life.

In some cases, one can hardly decide whether a halakhic *Midrash*, a *Mishnah*, *Baraita* or *Tosefta* existed prior to the Haggadah or whether certain practices and exegetical remarks of famous Rabbinic

⁴⁴ Cf. PHILO, *De Somniis*, I, 63, and *Genesis Rabbah*, section 68, 9, on *Genesis* xxviii: 11. Even if *Maḳom* is a substitute for *ha-shamayim*=*ouranos*, the new epithet, so often recurring in our Haggadah text and in Genizah fragments of the Seder liturgy, reflects environmental, and not Biblical terminology.

⁴⁵ Thus *Strack-Billerbeck*, IV, 2, pp. 617 ff., against J. LEVY, *Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, who derives the word from *prosodos* or *prostōn*.

scholars at the Seder table have found their way into the statutory ordinances of the legal codes. The shifting of traditional material from one place to another is such a common feature in this type of literature that it needs no emphasis. We also know little of what happened at the "Symposium" at B'ne B'rak in which five of the great teachers of the first half of the second century participated. Only Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah's contribution to the discussion—if it belonged to it at all from the outset—has been handed down to us in the name of Ben Zoma.⁴⁶ Neither can it be assumed without reservation that the Midrashim on the Ten Plagues formed part of the discussion at B'ne B'rak. The contemporary Rabbis Yehudah and Jose ha-Gelili who appear later on in the Haggadah liturgy are not mentioned as original members of the B'ne B'rak assembly, though one might argue that it happens occasionally in sympotic literature that only four or five people are enumerated at the beginning of a banquet whilst some arrived later or are anonymously described as "others."

A detailed comparison between Symposia literature and the Seder liturgy must distinguish between a general similarity of dining habits—such as foods and drinks, the attendants who serve them, tables and couches and the reclining at dinner—and specific affinities of literary form—such as religious services and the statutory talk woven around the meal. An occasional overlapping will be unavoidable, and here and there an analysis of the tannaitic sources of the Haggadah will be necessary for the elucidation of the main purpose of our enquiry.

*Kiddush, Hallel and Nishmath*⁴⁷

Even these prayers must, in some way at least, be understood against the background of classical and Hellenistic Symposia literature, though differences are again obvious, and fundamental transformations cannot be ignored.

Plato's *Symposium* takes place within the framework of a secular

⁴⁶ The *Sifre*, 130, on *Deuteronomy* xvi: 3 has the full text of the Haggadah from Rabbi Eleazar to "the days of the Messiah." The Midrash is here introduced by *וְהָיָה שְׂמֵרָה רַבִּי אֱלֵעָזָר בֶּן עֲזַרְיָה*. Only Ben Zoma and the sages are referred to in the *Mekhilta* on *Exodus* xiii: 3. The *Mishnah Berakhoth* i: 5, has again the full text of the Haggadah, whilst the corresponding *Mishnah* of the *Yerushalmi* i: 9, has *אָמַר לֵהֶם*, a version which is also found in the text of Maimonides' Haggadah. The word *לֵהֶם* might thus be linked up with some lost statement of the scholars who spent the night in B'ne B'rak (Dr. Rosenwasser). The story of the banquet itself does not appear in any other source.

⁴⁷ According to R. Yohanan, referred to as *birkhath ha-shir* in *Mishnah Pesahim*, x: 7, *Gemara* and *Tosafoth* a.l. 118a. Cf. also *Berakhoth* 59b.

to the One King alone, to Him swears every tongue." A king of flesh and blood had long ceased to be the focus of Jewish admiration.

כל דכפין ייתי ויכל.

We have already touched upon the sociological importance of the first Mishnah of the tenth section in *Pesaḥim*, according to which even the poorest in Israel may not eat until he reclines and be offered not less than four cups of wine. The habits of a higher stratum of society which could afford to be served upon at dinner are here shared by everybody. The verbs *מזגו*, *הביאו*, *מזגו* are used impersonally not less than six times in this section. Yet it appears from the *Mishnah Pesaḥim*, vii: 13 that the word *shammashim*⁶⁷ is the implied subject of these sentences. The *Tosefta Pesaḥim*, x: 5 is still more explicit: "The *shammash* minces the entrails and puts them (as a kind of appetizer) before the guests, and though there is no proof for this (from the Bible), there is a hint, as it says: 'Break up for you a fallow ground, and sow not among thorns'" (*Jeremiah*, iv: 3). Athenaeus mentions sweetbreads, paunches and liver some twenty times in his *Deipnosophists*, and quotations from the whole range of Greek literature accentuate their common use and excellence. One poem, *The Banquet*, by Philoxenes of Cythera (fifth to fourth century) describes the arrangements of a dinner in the following manner: "And the slave set before us . . . meats of kid and lamb, boiled and roasted, and sweetest morsel of . . . entrails . . . , as the gods love" (iv: 146f-147a). Hillel and Shammai knew already of a *shammash talmid ḥakham* and a *shammash 'am ha'ares*, though not in connexion with Passover (*Berakhoth* 52b). The Exilarch with whom Rabbi Yehudah ben Bathyra II (c.200) dined on the eve of the Day of Atonement also had an attendant (*yalya*) to wait upon them.⁶⁸ Another passage in P. *Shabbath* 3a, refers to a *mazogha*,⁶⁹ a wine mixer who functioned at a banquet of Rabb.

⁶⁷ These *shammashim* were under obligation to fulfill all commandments appertaining to the Seder night. Cf. *Pesaḥim* 108a. For a similar linguistic usage on an ordinary occasion, see *Mishnah Berakhoth* vi: 6; *Tosefta*, *ibid.* iv: 8, 12 and *Gemara Berakhoth* 40a, 43a, *Yerushalmi*, *ibid.* 10d. Attendants (*diakonoi*) are also referred to in the above-mentioned description of the Therapeutic Meal: *De Vita Contemplativa*, 75.

⁶⁸ *Ekhah Rabbathi* (BUBER) on iii: 17.

⁶⁹ For occurrences of the term in the *Targumim*, cf. J. LEVY, *Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, s.v. *mazogha*.

Athenaeus provides again the wider background by referring to table-makers, *trapetsopoioi*, who would "wash the dishes, get the lamps ready, prepare the libations and do everything else which it is their business to do." He also mentions table servers, *trapetsokomoi*, or as the Romans called them *structores* (iv: 170d f). Elsewhere one comes across wine inspectors and wine pourers, *oinoptai* and *oinochouantes* (x: 425a). Some of these attendants, at least, were not slaves but young men, the sons of freemen (*hoi neoi tōn eleutherōn*, v: 192b).

There was, moreover, a special code for the Saturnalia (*nomoi prōtoi* and *nomoi deuterōi*)⁶⁰ which has come down to us in Lucian's *Kronosolon*⁶¹ (about 120-180). It was meant to further the idea of freedom and equality amongst men. "During these days the same honour should be bestowed upon all, the slaves and the free, the poor and the rich . . . nobody should count his money . . . nobody should write on this festival . . ." Presents consisting of clothes, domestic utensils and silverware should be given to all friends. It is interesting that the *Tosefta Pesaḥim*, x: 4 includes a similar exhortation. "It is a commandment to please one's children and the members of one's household . . . with wine. Rabbi Yehudah says, women with what is befitting them and children with what is befitting them." The P. Talmud (*Pes.* 37b) explains: Women with garments made of fine linen (*bussina*) and with belts, and children with nuts and almonds.⁶²

The First and Second Laws in Lucian's *Kronosolon* are immediately followed by the *nomoi sumptōikoi* which deal specifically with the festive meal held on the Saturnalia. At least some of these laws have strong structural affinities with the relevant section of the *Mishnah* and *Tosefta Pesaḥim*. We read, for instance, "as soon as the shadow of the sun-dial is six feet long one should go to the bath. Before it, one may play with nuts,⁶³ one may recline every-

⁶⁰ Cf. *Luciani Samosatensis Opera*, iii, ed. C. JACOBITZ, Leipzig 1813, pp. 308-11, section 396-401.

⁶¹ The combined word depicts Solon as the law-giver for these festive days which were devoted to the memory of Kronos, the father of Zeus, who ruled the world in its golden days.

⁶² Cf. S. LIEBERMAN, *Ha-Yerushalmi Kifshuto*, l.c. i, pp. 516 f, and with slight alterations *Pesaḥim* 109a. Wine is excluded from Lucian's list of suitable gifts. The poor scholar should reciprocate with an old book of sacred or sympotic contents. Presents are distributed to the guests at a dinner in Athenaeus iv: 128d-e. Two late Biblical books, *Esther*, ix: 19, 22 and *Nehemiah*, viii: 10, 12, seem to refer to presents of foodstuff only.

Continued at foot of next page

where, i.e., without paying attention to status, family or wealth . . . all should drink of the same wine, all should have the same ration of meat. Equality for all should prevail . . . every rich man should inscribe these laws on a pillar of brass in his courtyard and take it to heart."⁶⁴

It is possible that the introductory passage of the Haggadah⁶⁵ כל דכפין ייתי ויכל כל דצריך ייתי ויפסח is to be interpreted in a way similar to the last paragraph of Lucian's *nomoi sumptikoi*.

Such unqualified general invitation would serve as a kind of motto set over the whole Haggadah. Scholars have drawn attention to the fact that Rabh Huna (3rd century) used almost the same phrase when inviting the needy. כל מאן דצריך ליתי וליכול (*Ta'anith*, 20b). But the Aramaic of Rabh Huna's saying is of the Babylonian variety (ייתי instead of ייתי), whilst the Haggadah passage is written in Palestinian Aramaic. Moreover, Rabh Huna does not refer to Passover or any other holiday.

The second chapter of the *Book of Tobit* offers perhaps a nearer comparison to our Haggadah text. It speaks of the festival of *Shabhu'oth*. On that occasion a fine meal is prepared, and Tobit asks his son to go out and bring along any of their poor brethren who is mindful of the Lord. Co-ordination in liturgy and law is common in those early centuries of halakhic consolidation, and can be observed for the three festivals of pilgrimage, the awe-inspiring days, and even for Hanukkah and Purim.⁶⁶ Yet there is no mentioning of instruction or talk in the quotation from Tobit or in Rabh Huna's formula. The *ha lahma 'anya* passage, on the other hand, seems to present a fragmentary recollection of a *Seder* once held. The *theamaton*, the *maṣṣah*, is explained to the participants of the sacred meal; messianic expectations, or at least hopes for political freedom, are expressed, and a summary invitation is extended to the needy.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* section 399-401.

⁶⁵ The verb *pasah* is used in a unique sense in this text. It may mean either to partake of the paschal lamb, which would presuppose a practice in the Diaspora, such as described in *Tosefta Beṣah* ii: 15, *Pesahim* 53a, *Yerushalmi Mo'ed Kaṭan* 81d and *Yerushalmi Beṣah* 61c, or it may simply stand for the participation in the Seder festivities. For the halakhic difficulties involved, cf. M. M. KASHER, l.c. pp. 106 ff and p. 99 (Hebrew numbering).

⁶⁶ Cf. *The Liturgy of Hanukkah*, l.c., pp. 105 f., 151.

⁶⁷ The playing with nuts on the festival of the Saturnalia is also mentioned by LUCIAN, l.c., sections 391 f and 400. It is not confined to children, however, as in Rabbinic sources.

Plato dined and had discourse with the élite of his time. In Xenophon's *Banquet*, Socrates and Antisthenes figure prominently. Archestratus of Syracuse, a contemporary of Aristotle and author of a book entitled *Gastronomia*, suggests that there should be three or four people in all, or at most not more than five.⁶⁷ This is also the approximate number of the learned guests enumerated in the sympotic writings of Plutarch. The Haggadah thus combines a scholarly and a popular element. On the one hand we have the assembly of sages in B'ne B'rak, which seems to exclude even the pupils, on the other the wide opening of doors as expressed in כל דכפין ייתי ויכל. It is tempting to construct a gradual development, which started—as in Greece—with the secluded activity of the wise and ended—so differently—with the imitation of their practices by the whole people. Prior to the example set by the learned, the festive gatherings of ordinary folk lacked an elaborate setting.

Women take no part in the Seder liturgy. Apparently they did not even serve upon their guests and the members of their household. The Mishnah knows only of the paschal lamb prepared by husband or father for wife or daughter respectively.⁶⁸ On the other hand, no *Ḥabhura* may be made up of women, slaves and minors.⁶⁹ Only one Baraita reckons with the possibility of women partaking in the table talk: "The wise son asks his father (about the laws of Passover), and if he is not wise, the wife asks her husband."⁷⁰ An Amora of the first generation, Joshua ben Levi, finds it necessary to state that women too are under obligation to drink the four cups, because they participated in the miracle of the Exodus (*Pesahim* 108b). Even reclining is not considered indispensable for a woman at her husband's side, only an *אשה חשובה*, a lady of high standing, is required to recline (*ibid.*).⁷¹

Women took no share in the serious talk of the Symposia of Plato, Xenophon and Plutarch, even if their admissibility was under discussion,⁷² or if they appeared at the beginning to attend to the guests.⁷³ In Lucian's *Symposium*⁷⁴ men and women are

⁶⁷ As recorded in *Athenaeus* i: 4e.

⁶⁸ *Pesahim*, viii: 1, cf. also the *Baraita*, quoted in *Pesahim* 88a.

⁶⁹ *Mishnah Pesahim*, viii: 7, *Tosefta*, *ibid.* viii: 6, and *Gemara* thereon.

⁷⁰ *Pesahim* 116a.

⁷¹ *Yerushalmi Pesahim* 37b allows for no social distinction, and makes reclining obligatory for an ordinary housewife as well.

⁷² Cf. PLUTARCH, *Quaestiones Convivales* i: 1 and *Macrobius*, vii: 1.

Continued at foot of next page

seated separately, and Athenaeus, at least on one occasion, refers to the same arrangement as described in the work of an earlier poet.⁷⁵

Sympotic writers of a later period depict on the whole a mixed society. Invitations were issued indiscriminately to men and women alike, coarse talk became predominant, and vulgar ostentatiousness prevailed.⁷⁶ A comparison between the ethical level of this type of literature and the Haggadah is impossible.⁷⁷ Yet the Seder liturgy and its tannaitic sources reflect a lesser degree of asceticism and a higher measure of upper class urbanity than the description of the Therapeutic meal in Philo, or the synoptic records of Jesus' Last Supper.

מה נשתנה.

Early and late formulations of this passage, and its adaptation to changed circumstances have been sufficiently dealt with by a number of scholars. We are here only concerned with its setting in life. It appears to be an introductory question once raised at a Seder Symposium of the early tannaitic period, after which it became statutory for well nigh two millennia.

Plutarch's view on the essence of a sympotic talk has been quoted in the general introduction. According to Gellius, questions were not to be too serious. They may deal with a point touching on ancient history.⁷⁸ Macrobius too follows classical rules when he suggests that he who wishes to be a pleasant questioner should ask what can be easily answered,⁷⁹ and he should be sure that the subject had been thoroughly studied by the other person (vii: II, 3). The questions of the *mah nishtanah*, particularly in their *Urform*, are quite simple and meant to appeal to all participants of the festive meal.

It will be remembered that in Plutarch many questions are concerned with dietetic problems. Some should here be added which form the theme of a symposium and appear as an interrogative

⁷⁵ Cf. PLUTARCH, *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*, 148c.

⁷⁶ Ed. A. HARMON, p. 420.

⁷⁷ *Athenaeus*, xiv: 644d.

⁷⁸ For a specifically religious occasion, however, cf. MACROBIUS' *Saturnalia* ii: 1, *Nos honorem Dei . . . nullo admixtu voluptatis augemus*.

⁷⁹ Even in PLATO'S *Symposium* Alcibiades is so drunk that he can hardly stand (214a).

⁷⁸ Vol. II, Book vii: 13, Vol. III, Book xviii: 2.

⁷⁹ Cf. the mishnaic rule למי רעתו של בן אביו מלמדו (*Pesahim* x: 4).

sentence at the beginning of the relevant section: "Are different sorts of food or one single dish eaten at one meal more easily digestible?", "Does the sea or land afford better food?", "Why is hunger allayed by drinking but thirst increased by eating?", "Why do the Pythagoreans forbid to eat fish more strictly than other animals?"⁸⁰ In the *Attic Nights* of Gellius the question is once raised why oil congeals often and readily, wine seldom, vinegar hardly ever.⁸¹

If one were to translate these interrogative sentences into Hebrew, the tannaitic term *mah nishtanah* could be used for almost every question. The close connection between the *theamaton*, the food served and looked upon, and the conversation which centres around it can perhaps best be illustrated from a passage in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*. "Whilst Furius was still speaking, the dessert was brought in and gave rise to a new conversation."⁸² The dish itself became the *isētēma*, the subject of enquiry. The Haggadah thus borrowed with extraordinary discrimination the external pattern of sympotic literature but remained single-minded in the pursuit of its sole aim, the religio-historical celebration of the Exodus from Egypt.

מעשה ברבי אליעזר.

The specific literary form of this fragment calls for a comparative investigation. As in the case of the *mah nishtanah* we seem to have before us a rudiment of a full record of a Seder gathering once held.

Athenaeus—or rather Masurius, a participant at one of his banquets—takes Epicurus to task because he did not specify place and time of the Symposium, and because he did not write a kind of foreword. Homer, on the other hand, is praised for his accuracy. He never fails to tell us about times, persons and occasions of the talk (*chronous, prosōpa kai aittias*).⁸³ Plutarch adheres to these generic rules with greatest accuracy almost throughout. The names of the leading participants of the banquet, its time and place are given at the beginning of each section. Macrobius offers an excellent parallel to our Haggadah passage, "During the Saturnalia,

⁸⁰ *Quaestiones Conviviales* iv: 1; iv: 4; vi: 3; viii: 8.

⁸¹ Vol. III, Book xvii: 8.

⁸² Book III, 18.1. Cf. also *ibid.* iii: 19, p. 400: "Because we see apples mixed with a dessert, we must now . . . discuss the different kinds of apples."

⁸³ v: 186c.

distinguished members of the aristocracy and other scholars (*nobilitatis proceres doctique alii*), assembled at the house of Vettius Praetextatus to celebrate the festive time solemnly by a discourse befitting freemen . . .” The host proceeds to explain “the origin of the cult and the cause of the festival,” thus doing homage to religion by “devoting sacred study to the sacred days.”⁸⁴

Sometimes the talk lasted until dawn. As early as in Plato's *Symposium* the crowing of the cock reminds the guests to go home.⁸⁵ Socrates on that occasion went on to the Lyceum.

All these features of sympotic literature occur in the Haggadah's assembly of the sages. The people's names, the place, the time and occasion are stated. Moreover, the reclining scholars were *talking*⁸⁶ about the Exodus from Egypt, they were not yet midrashically *explaining* the passage in *Deuteronomy*, xxvi: 5ff, as demanded in the *Mishnah Pesahim*, x:4. The *Tosefta a.l.* records another “Symposium” of a similar type. There too the people and the place are designated by name, and the occasion is described. Rabban Gamaliel II and the elders stand for the five scholars of the Haggadah, Lud replaces B'ne B'rak. As in Macrobius' *Saturnalia* even the name of the person in whose house the Seder was held has been handed down.⁸⁷ The time for the reading of the *Shema* replaces the crowing of the cock. As if to emphasise the sympotic setting, the *Tosefta* adds that the participants of the Seder removed the remnants of the food and cleared the table,⁸⁸ before they went to the *Beth ha-Midrash*. The statutory Midrash on *Deuteronomy* xxvi is not known to the *Tosefta* either. By its reference to the scholars' discussion of the laws of Passover, it steers

⁸⁴ i, vii, 8, 17. It belonged to these explanations to define the exact beginning of the *Saturnalia*: *Quando Saturnalia incipere dicamus, id est, quando crastinum diem initium sumere existimemus* (i, ii, 18). Without maintaining direct influence, one is reminded of the similar question of the Haggadah and the *Mekhilta* on *Exodus* xiii: 8 . . . יכול מבעור יום . . .

⁸⁵ 223c. In MACROBIUS' *Saturnalia* we read: *nec discedentes a se nisi ad nocturnam quietem* (i, i, 1). Cf., however, MARTIN, l.c., pp. 145-148. The crowing of the cock re-occurs as a *topos* in the relevant sections of the Synoptic Gospels.

⁸⁶ מסיחין according to some versions. The passage is missing in SAADYA'S *Siddur* and in some *Genizah* fragments.

⁸⁷ The passages in *Pesahim* 100a and *Yerushalmi Pesahim* 37b differ in form and contents from our texts. Cf., however, *Kiddushin* 40b for a secular symposium: וכבר היה ר' שרפון וקנים מאובין בעליה בית נחום בלוד נשאלה שאלה ונכר היה ר' שרפון וקנים מאובין בעליה בית נחום בלוד נשאלה שאלה מעשה גדול או מעשה גדול?
⁸⁸ Sifre, FRIEDMANN, para. 41 adds the names of R. Jose ha-Gelili and R. Akiba. For further variants and parallel passages see *ibid.*

⁸⁹ We read ועורו ונעורו against ZUCKERMANDEL'S ועורו . . . following S. LIEBERMAN'S *Tosefeth Rishonim*, i: Jerusalem 1937, p. 178. For the context cf. PLUTARCH'S *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*, 150d, and *Berakhoth* 52a.

a middle course between the free form of discussion which took place in B'ne B'rak and the apparently later requirements of the *Mishnah*.⁸⁹

כנגד ארבעה בנים דברה תורה.

Some sympotic writers would not admit the layman to the table of the learned. Others would be less exclusive. Athenaeus suggests all sorts of suitable combinations of those invited in order to create the right atmosphere at a dinner party, and refers again to Homer as a guide for the decision on such questions. In his epic he is said to have introduced guests “who differ in their ages and their views of life—Nestor, Ajax, Odysseus—all of whom . . . strive after excellence but have set out in specifically diverse paths to find it.”⁹⁰ Gellius speaks of a banquet on the occasion of the *Saturnalia*, at which as many questions were asked as guests were invited.⁹¹ Sometimes sons joined their fathers for pleasant entertainment and scientific debate.⁹² Macrobius dedicates his *Saturnalia* to his son and finds nothing better than to instruct him.⁹³

According to Philo, there are four types of children. The best follow both parents, the father, who is representative of perfect Reason (*orthos logos*), and the mother, who stands for education (*paideia*). The wise should thus be furnished with the invisible ornaments of the soul and with those elements of knowledge which appear to the outside world.⁹⁴ Children who consider neither their father nor their mother are, we might say, *resha'im*. Intermediate are those who follow either father or mother (*filopatores* and *filomētores*). Bousset has drawn attention to the fact that Philo's *De Ebrietate* has come down to us in a very fragmentary condition.⁹⁵ One might add that even if we possessed the full text of this treatise, we could not hope to find an exact parallel between the philosophical distinctions of Philo and the popular Torah-centred divisions of the Rabbis. Yet it appears that we have to reckon with some form of influence which found its way from Alexandria to Jerusalem. Through Philo or some other Hellenistic

⁸⁹ Cf. also *Mekhilta* on *Exodus* xiii: 14.

⁹⁰ v: 187a f. and 177a f.

⁹¹ iii, xviii: 2.

⁹² XENOPHON'S *Banquet* iii: 12, and PLUTARCH'S *Quaestiones Convivales*, viii: 6.

⁹³ i, p. 2 (Preface).

⁹⁴ Cf. *De Ebrietate*, paras. 30-33, 35 and 68, and *De Congressu Eruditionis*, paras. 63-68.

⁹⁵ *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Göttingen 1915, pp. 85-92. He does not refer to the Haggadah, however.

or Hellenistic-Jewish author the psychologizing typology of the four sons became widely known, was then linked with the relevant Pentateuchal exhortations and transformed, consciously or unconsciously, to serve the specific purpose of the Seder Night.

The transmission of the tannaitic sources⁹⁶ of this Haggadic passage show a significant uncertainty in the choice of their Biblical proof-texts. In addition, one quotation of the *Mekhilta* presupposes the text of the *Septuagint* and not that of the Masoretic Text.⁹⁷ The *Epikomion* leads back to the sympotic background. There is no doubt that this Greek word signifies originally the revelry which used to take place after the end of a banquet. The mishnaic ruling forbids the imitation of such practices.

Sometimes a heated discussion, an *agōn sofias*, took place between the participants of a banquet. It provided a vulgar kind of amusement and became a literary pattern in later Symposia literature. It seems that the phrase "blunt his teeth" which occurs in the answer to the wicked is reminiscent of such *topoi*. Some old versions, including the *Mekhilta*, still reflect a more direct attack on the *rasha'*: If you had been there, you would not have been redeemed. Our texts have usually the third person. Such reading weakens the immediate appeal of the original.

מתחיל בגנות ומסיים בשבח.

"One begins with rebuke and concludes with praise." The meaning of this mishnaic passage and its relation to the following Midrash on *Deuteronomy*, xxvi: 5ff has hitherto perplexed many scholars. A solution of the problem involved is, I think, to be found in connection with the *genus laudativum* with which we are already familiar.

There were public orations which did not call for a tempered measure of glorification, such as certain *logoi basilikoi* or the *ברכת השיר*, but on the whole this literary species consists almost invariably of both *egkōmion* and *psogos, laus* and *contumelia*,⁹⁸ praise and rebuke. Excellence or perfection can after all best be judged against a background of adverse environmental circum-

⁹⁶ *Mekhilta* on *Exodus* xiii: 14 and *Yerushalmi Pesahim* 37d.

⁹⁷ *Deuteronomy* vi: 20 has אהבם, the *Septuagint* *hēmin*.

⁹⁸ Thus QUINTILIAN (b. 35 C.E.) *Institutio Oratoria*, iii: 4.11: *Isocrates in omni genere (demonstrativo) inesse laudem ac vituperationem existimavit*. Isocrates, who was a distinguished teacher of rhetoric in the fourth century B.C.E., wrote a well known Panegyric on Athens. He developed, in fact, the theory of the *genos epideiktikon*.

stances or some fault or dubious quality⁹⁹ in the character of the person or people whose fame is to be extolled. In the words of Sopatros, "If we wish to express doubtful matters in the eulogy as definitely honourable, we mention by way of contrast those facts which seem worthy of detraction, and thus convert them into an encomium, so that our speech becomes entirely one of praise."¹⁰⁰

A shorter, yet not less straightforward comparison to the Mishnaic abstraction מתחיל בגנות ומסיים בשבח can be quoted from Pliny the Younger (about 100 C.E.) who exclaims in his *Epistolarum ad Traianum Liber Panegyricus: Quam utile est ad usum secundorum per adversa venisse*.¹⁰¹

On discussing the great variety which is required in the praise of men, Quintilian, the teacher of Pliny the Younger, is even more explicit and more to the point. He has this to say: "Regarding things preceding a man's birth there are his country . . . and his ancestors . . . (*Patria et parentes*) . . . It will be either creditable [to the object of a eulogy] not to have fallen short of the ancient fame [of his family] . . . or to have ennobled a humble origin by the glory of his achievements. Other topics to be drawn from the period preceding his birth will have reference to omens and prophecies foretelling his future greatness . . . At times weakness may contribute largely to our admiration . . ." ¹⁰² In the oldest as well as in the latest *Encomia, genos, ethnos, to kalon, ischus* and *praxeis* are concomitant features of the species,¹⁰³ whether the oration was given in praise of an Emperor, a public figure or—with slight adaptations—a city or a people. Moreover, panegyrics were often closely connected with the cult of a god in whose honour the festive assembly was held.

We now more readily understand the choice of *Deuteronomy*, xxvi: 5ff as the central passage of the Seder liturgy. By itself it has little to do with the three or four specific questions of the *mah nishtanah*. As a matter of fact, these sentences were normally recited in connection with the bringing of First Fruits to the Temple.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ Literally *adoxon* or *anfidoxon*. Cf. VOLKMANN, l.c. pp. 320 f.

¹⁰⁰ Quoted *ibid*. According to Pauly-Wissowa, this rhetorician and the time during which he lived cannot be identified with certainty.

¹⁰¹ Ed. M. SCHUSTER, Leipzig 1952, p. 404, para. 44.

¹⁰² *Institutio Oratoria*, l.c. iii, 7, 10-12.

¹⁰³ Additional characteristics of the *genus* such as education, study, wealth, and ethical virtues are left out in the Haggadah, because it is ultimately concerned with the praise of God. For practical examples cf. THEOCRITUS, *Encomium for Ptolemy*, l.c., and W. BARR, *The Panegyrics of Claudian*, l.c. pp. 40-45.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Mishnah Bikkurim*, iii, 5-7.

But there no *Midrash* was required.

In the Haggadah, however, the detailed exegesis of the Biblical sentences follows the pattern of the *genus laudativum*, applied here to a people, but viewed under the aspect of *Heilsgeschichte*. In a kind of *proem* starting with שומר הבטחתו ברוך שומר we have the required reference to what Quintilian calls *responsa et auguria*. The Midrash then proceeds to juxtapose detraction and praise.

The first sentence deals with the humble origin of the Jewish people. In the midrashic interpretation of *Deuteronomy*, xxvi: 5, the sufferings of Jacob under Laban are accentuated. A literal exegesis of the verse, "A wandering Aramean was my father," would have achieved the same purpose, but Jewish tradition in both *Targumim* and in the *Sifre a.l.* stresses the adverse circumstances which forced Jacob to emigrate into a foreign country (*genos kai ethnos*).

Only few were those that went down to Egypt, but there they became a nation. The Midrash adds: a *distinct* nation. On גדול ועצום the proof-text is taken from *Exodus*, i: 7: "And the Children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and waxed exceedingly mighty" (*ischus*).

Israel's physical beauty is emphasised by the quotation from *Ezekiel*, xvi: 7: ". . . and thou hast become adorned with precious ornaments . . ." ¹⁰⁵ (*to kalon*).

From ויוציאנו ה' ממצרים up to וירעו אותנו המצרים every reference to the people's early distinction in Egypt is dropped, and God alone becomes the object of the Encomium. The greater the people's misery, the greater His achievement. "He brought us out of Egypt, not by the hands of an angel, not by the hands of a seraph, and not by the hands of a messenger, but the Holy One, blessed be He, in His glory and by Himself." ¹⁰⁶

L. Prijs and P. Winter ¹⁰⁷ have independently drawn attention to the significance of this passage in the light of the *Septuagint* rendering of *Isaiah*, lxiii: 8, the former to stress midrashic influence

¹⁰⁵ The end of the verse וירעו אותנו המצרים may not have belonged to the original proof-text.

¹⁰⁶ SAADYA and a number of *Gentzah* fragments add לא על ידי הרב which must stand for targumic *memra*. Cf. I. ABRAHAMS, *Some Egyptian Fragments* . . . J.Q.R., x, 1898, pp. 41 ff.

¹⁰⁷ L. PRIJS, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*, Leiden 1948, pp. 106 f. P. WINTER, *Isaiah* lxiii: 9 (GK) and the *Passover Haggadah*, *Vetus Testamentum*, iv: 4, 1954, pp. 439-441. For earlier observations in the same direction see E. D. GOLDSCHMIDT, *Die Pessach Haggadah*, Berlin 1937, p. 54. M.T.: אאל ויהי להם לטושע בכל צרתם לא ער וטלאך פניו הושיעם *oude angelos all' autos esōsen autous*.

on the Greek version, the latter to suggest an original Hebrew text which has not survived (ציר instead of צר). ¹⁰⁸

The expression בכבודו ובעצמו is also related to the *Septuagint* on *Deuteronomy*, iv: 37. The Masoretic Text reads בפינו ויוציאך בפניו בכחך הגדול ממצרים. The Greek version renders this verse in the following manner: *kai exēgase se autos en tē ischui autou tē megalē ex Aiguptou*. ¹⁰⁹ *Onkelos*, *Pseudo-Jonathan* and the *Peshitta* translate בפניו with באפי רעותיה, במימריה, and בפריצופיה, but it is possible that the Haggadah and the *Septuagint* followed an earlier Hebrew tradition.

Of further interest are the Greek terms *sēmeion* or *notarikon* ¹¹⁰ as employed by R. Yehudah.

According to the *genos dikanikon* ¹¹¹ which is closely connected with the *genos epideiktikon* and which deals with the technique of defence before a Court of Law, it was customary to conclude with a summary of the main facts of the case. The judge should thus be able to form his opinion without delay. This was called *anamnēsis*, *anakefalaiōsis* or in Latin *rerum repetitio*. Until now the word *notarikon* has been connected with a kind of shorthand used in the offices of lawyers. ¹¹² It gains a more precise meaning in our context. Rabbi Yehudah offers a mnemo-technical help to the participants of the Seder so that they should remember the salient points hitherto made in praise of God.

If any doubt is left about the connection between the *genos epideiktikon* and the statutory Midrash of the Haggadah liturgy, the argument can be clinched by reference to the peculiar augmentation of the plagues from 10 to 50 and eventually to 250. Quintilian has it that the proper function of a panegyric is to amplify and embellish its themes: "*Proprium laudis est res amplificare et ornare*". ¹¹³ Such *auxēsis*—as the Greeks call it—applies again to the eulogy of gods and men as well as to forensic oratory. ¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁸ WINTER, l.c., compares *inter alia Jubilees* xv: 30-32 with our passage. See, however, *Jubilees* ii: 4. For a contrast to the theology of the Haggadah, cf. particularly *The Wisdom of Solomon*, xviii: 15 (ed. CHARLES). "Thine all powerful word leaped from heaven down from the royal throne, a stern warrior into the midst of the doomed land."

¹⁰⁹ In the same way the *Septuagint* add *autos* to their translation of *Deuteronomy* xxvi: 8. Cf. PRIJS, l.c. The Midrash on במצורא גדול has been dealt with by GEIGER, *Urschrift* (2nd ed.), Frankfurt 1928, pp. 339 f. In this case, the Greek, Samaritan and Aramaic versions seem to presuppose במצורא in the original Hebrew. Only *Aquila* corresponds to במצורא.

¹¹⁰ *Tanhumā*, BUBER, וראי, 8 reads נופריקון in a related passage.

¹¹¹ Cf. VOLKMANN, l.c. pp. 21 ff. and 264 ff.

Continued at foot of next page

Rabbi Jose ha-Gelili, Rabbi Eliezer, and Rabbi Akibah followed the literary fashion of their time to their own end. It is not so much the *quantitas verborum* as the *qualitas structuræ* which is decisive. They made use of the midrashic method, where their classical antecedents and the compiler of the *ברכת השיר* followed the more formal demands of rhetoric: *euruthmia* and *poikilia*. Philo, in describing the meal of the Therapeutæ, emphasises the fact that their *maggidh* or president, "has no thought of making a display, for he has no ambition to get a reputation for clever oratory."¹¹⁵ It is interesting that the very word he uses for "display" is *epideixis*. The Rabbis had—in their own way—overcome sectarian scrupulosity.

The Midrash occurs in at least four collections, in the *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yishmael*, in the *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Simeon b. Yoḥai* (on *Exodus* xiv: 31),¹¹⁶ in *Exodus Rabbah* v: 14 and xxiii: 9 and in *Midrash Tehillim*, ed. Buber, on *Psalms* lxxviii, section 15.¹¹⁷

The words *מטריגון*, fourfold, and *פנמיגון*, fivefold, used in the last-named version, betray formal Greek influence to such an extent that their occurrence in this context must be co-ordinated with the distinct aim of the whole Haggadah passage, viz.: *auxēsis* or exaggeration.

Buber's view, according to which the editor of *Midrash Tehillim* added these Greek words, cannot be accepted. Why should he have included them in a tannaitic text which would be perfectly understandable without them? Had they not been there, nobody would have missed them. On the contrary, the editor finds it necessary to explain the Greek words contained in the original text: *מטריגון שהוא מרובע*.

It is not inconsistent with its high purpose that the tone of the Midrash is light, especially as the "play" is of no halakhic con-

¹¹⁵ *De Vita Contemplativa*, l.c., 75.

¹¹⁶ Ed. J. N. EPSTEIN, Jerusalem 1955.

¹¹⁷ *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on *Genesis* xv: 14 and the *Targum* on *Psalms* lxxviii: have also a reference to the 250 plagues.

¹¹⁸ Cf. e.g. BACHER, *Die Exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditions-literatur*, II, Leipzig 1905, p. 124.

¹¹⁹ *Institutio Oratoria*, l.c., iii, vii, 6.

¹²⁰ Cornificius, one of the first Roman rhetoricians before Cicero, expresses himself as follows: "*Conclusiones constant ex enumeratione, amplificatio (et commiseratione)*." Quoted by VOLKMANN, l.c., p. 263. A considerable number of Greek and Latin Encomia illustrate their relation to the theoretical requirements.

sequence. The more mirthful aspects of the sympotic pattern, *paidia* and *geloion*, are thus reflected. The interrogative particle *מנין* which introduces the multiplied account of God's miracles may well be more than a mere tannaitic *terminus technicus*, as which it appears at first sight. We know from Plutarch that riddles played their part in making the theme of the table talk interesting for all participants. He recommends the habits of simple people who "set one another a-guessing at names comprised and hid under such and such numbers."¹¹⁸ Athenæus too has a long section in his *Deipnosophists*, covering some 25 pages, in which the propriety of proposing riddles at table is proved by an abundance of literary examples.¹¹⁹ One quotation must suffice: "The solution of riddles is not alien to 'philosophy,' and the ancients used to make a display of their knowledge by means of them. . . . Answering the first guest who recited an epic or iambic line, each one in turn capped it with the next verse, or if one recited the gist of a passage, another answered with one from some other poet to show that he had spoken to the same effect" (x: 457c-e).

The Rabbis did not philosophize at the Seder table, but they had their *isētēmata* with which they entertained themselves, their guests—if there were any—and those who came after them. That the learned sometimes proposed riddles and solved them at the same time is again not unusual. For this we have the authority of Macrobius: "*Quæstiones convivales vel proponas vel ipse dissolvas*" (vii, iii, 24). The rest of the *amplificatio* consists of a specification of miracles, chosen at random and not without variants in the different Haggadah versions and in midrashic sources. It ends in the glorification of God, the performer of all these marvellous deeds.¹²⁰

ר'גמליאל היה אומר

Because of the reference to the paschal lamb, many scholars assume that R. Gamaliel I is the author of this passage, though he is usually described as R. Gamaliel *ha-zaken*. According to their opinion, the words *שהיו אבותינו אוכלים בזמן שבית המקדש קים* represent a later adjustment which became necessary after the

¹¹⁸ *Quæstiones Convivales*, Introduction to Book V.

¹¹⁹ x, 448b-459c.

¹²⁰ *Psalms* cxxxvi, which is generally considered to be very late, is recited in the second part of the Seder Service. It was apparently included in the liturgy, because it shares the function of *enumeratio* with the *dayyenu* passage and the *nishmath* eulogy.

destruction of the Temple. Brief explanatory references to the meaning of the ritual performed are familiar to students of Comparative Religion.

Yet in view of the fact that all Tannaim mentioned in the Haggadah belong to the second rather than to the first century, it becomes likely that the author of this saying was R. Gamaliel II. He was responsible for the redaction of the 'Amidah and for the inclusion of the ולמלשינים section in it.¹²¹ He was, moreover, well acquainted with Graeco-Roman civilisation,¹²² and we have special references to the almost humanistic atmosphere which prevailed in his circle: "Permission was given to the House of R. Gamaliel to teach its pupils Greek, because they had a close relation with the (Roman) Government." His son, R. Simeon, confirms: "that there were a thousand young men in his father's House or Academy, five hundred of whom studied the Law, while the other five hundred studied Greek Wisdom."¹²³

In the light of such personal background and in connexion with our former findings, we may expect sympotic traces in the peculiar saying of R. Gamaliel as well. We have indeed fragments of grammatical compilations like those of the Alexandrian Herodian (second part of the second century C.E.), in which the various foods and drinks are used as catchwords, in order to classify them after the fashion of the glossographers. In this side-branch of Symposia Literature, which had its antecedents in some medico-dietetic writings of the first century B.C.E.,¹²⁴ one finds hardly any dialogue. Persons and actions appear only as a means to demonstrate learning. Usually only the name of the author of a statement is transmitted.

Macrobius makes interesting use of such philological and dietetic enquiries on the occasion of the banquet which he describes in his *Saturnalia*.¹²⁵ "Symmachus takes some nuts into his hands, and asks Servius about the cause and origin of the variety of names

¹²¹ In an oral communication, Dr. ROSENWASSER suggested to me that R. Gamaliel's utterance may be directed against the transformation of the Jewish Seder Meal by Judaeo-Christians into what later became the *deipnon kuriakon*. Cf. I, *Corinthians*, v: 6ff and xi: 23ff.

¹²² This applies equally to the other members of the assembly of the sages, with the possible exception of R. Tarfon. We know, e.g., that R. Gamaliel II, R. Joshua, R. Eleazar b. Azariah, R. Akiba and R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos went to Rome and had discussions with various Gentile scholars and philosophers (*Gen. Rabbah*, xx: 6, *Ex. Rabbah* xxx: 6, *Mishnah 'Abhodhah Zarah* iv: 7, and *Gemara ad locum, Tosefta, ibid.* vi: 7). R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos was famous for his knowledge of foreign languages (*Sanhedrin* 17b).

Continued at foot of next page

given to them. Servius answers that according to one school of scholars the walnut, *juglans*, derives its name *a juvando et a glande*. Gavius Bassus, however, is said to have connected *juglans* with Jupiter: *Juglans arbor proinde dicta est ac Jovis glans*. The nut is as it were worthy of the god."¹²⁶ Gavius Bassus lived in the first century B.C.E. and wrote a book *De Significatione Verborum*.¹²⁷ It is of special significance that most etymologies of this kind belong to the sacred sphere.¹²⁸

The Amora Rabha (fourth century) also required the lifting up of *Maṣṣah* and *Maror* for the reciting of R. Gamaliel's statement, though its mishnaic formulation does not yet indicate the necessity of an accompanying gesture. This does not mean that it was unknown. The Haggadah text מוצה זו שאנו אוכלים as well as the above-quoted New Testament passages imply a general acceptance of this custom at an early stage of the development.

R. Gamaliel's etymology is sounder than that of Gavius Bassus, and, in fact, at least in two cases backed by pentateuchal proof-texts. It is nevertheless hardly accidental that he chose the glossographical method to impress the central message of the festival on the participants of the Seder. Goldschmidt has already sensed some formal inconsistency in the words מוצה על שום שנגאלו אבותינו ממצרים. Without being aware of possible affinities with sympotic literature, he proposes an implied connexion between מוצה and מוציאה, which would be quite possible in the realm of this sort of *Volksetymologien*. The fuller text of the statutory Haggadah allows for the suggestion that R. Gamaliel based his original saying on the Greek *to atsumon* for Hebrew מוצה. The proof-text would then employ the Septuagint rendering of *Exodus* xii: 39f . . . *ou gar atsumēthē*.¹²⁹ Professor

¹²⁶ Cf. also PLUTARCH, *Quaestiones Convivales*, l.c., VIII, quest. 6 and 7. Athenaeus, i: 12 d ff., iii: 106 bc. vii: 278a, etc.

¹²⁷ Cf. *Pauly-Wissowa*, s.v. Gavius Bassus.

¹²⁸ Cf. *Pauly-Wissowa*, s.v. Cloatius Verus. Early neo-Pythagorean influence may have played its part in the symbolism which was attached to the hallowed traditions of the Passover celebrations by way of "philology": "*Symbola sunt compendia, quae brevissima forma (dia brachutatōn fōnōn) largam doctrinam vel praeceptum morale continent*." Cf. O. CASEL, *De philosophorum Graecorum silentio mystico*, Giessen 1919, pp. 58 f, and PHILO, *De vita contemplativa* 78.

¹²⁹ Cf. also PHILO, *De Specialibus Legibus*, ii: 158. As an alternative, a pun between the Aramaic noun for *Maṣṣah*, *paṭira*, and the Aramaic verb, *peṭar*, to free, may be suggested.

¹²³ Cf. S. LIEBERMANN, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York, 1942, p. 20, for the relevant sources.

¹²⁴ Cf. MARTIN, l.c., pp. 26 and 185-188.

¹²⁵ iii, xviii, 1-3.

Liebermann has assembled so many examples of Greek phrases¹³⁰ which remained in the context of Hebrew or Aramaic passages that such a device may have been used here as well, though there is no proof of it.

Should it then be said that form and content condition one another and that there is little difference between the Jewish and Greek legacies as far as Symposia literature is concerned? Such an evaluation cannot be expected after what has been said. It would do less than justice to either side.

There is with the classical authors a curiosity and vividness, an attempt to observe life and natural phenomena, above all a freedom of the enquiring mind which cannot be found in the Haggadah. On the other hand, there is on the Jewish side a singlemindedness of purpose and a deep faith which is both simple and moving. שׂרשׂ in contrast to *tsētein* is only a means to an ever-deepening confirmation of a certainty which was there before the search was started. The history of human efforts is concluded. Divine redemption at the End of Time, which may come tomorrow, is expected. Exactness of scientific endeavour is replaced by a precision of rules for the intermediate order of things. *Theamata* and *pragmata* are concentrated in the unchangeable and obligatory (פסח) מצה and מרור. Neither jugglers nor dancers are allowed to defile the "guarded night." Flute accompaniment is relegated to the public sacrifice of the קרבן פסח.

The compilers of the Haggadah have made their own contribution to sympotic writings. It is, in fact, in all its fragmentary and perhaps clumsy state an unanswered challenge to its models.

London.

S. STEIN.

¹³⁰ Cf. S. LIEBERMANN, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York 1942, pp. 21 ff.

A Problematic Passage in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*

CHAPTER XXIII of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, in which the scene of the Fall is described, has been touched upon by several writers. L. Ginzberg, writing in volume I of the Jewish Encyclopedia, says the following: "Adam and Eve are led to commit (sexual) sin by Azazel (Satana-El in the Book of Baruch; Sama-El in Pirke R. Eliezer) through his causing them to eat from the forbidden fruit, a grape from the vine . . . God informs Abraham that, notwithstanding *yeşer ha-ra'* ("the lustful desire") and זוהמא של נחש ("the pollution of the serpent"), with which man from that time has been possessed, he has a free will of his own and may choose to abstain from sin."¹ A little further on Ginzberg adds that "the emphasis laid on the freedom of will, notwithstanding the fall of man, presupposes a knowledge of the Christian doctrine of sin, against which the passage seems to be directed."² H. Maldwyn Hughes asserts tersely that the answer given by God to Abraham's question why God permits moral evil, is that man's will is free.³ F. R. Tennant writes with less assurance. After remarking that the description of the Fall is a curious one he goes on to say that the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* "seems to have been somewhat concerned with the problem of evil and theodicy,"⁴ but Tennant hesitates to commit himself, it would seem, beyond saying that the author "diverges from some of the older apocalyptic writers in making the Fall the starting point for his history of the race."⁵

What is overlooked by the writers mentioned above is the striking fact that Abraham is *not* satisfied with God's answer, namely, that Azazel was given power over those who will (to do) evil—in this case Adam and Eve—and proceeds to pose a second question in the

¹ P. 92a; GINZBERG's statements about the grape from the vine and the *zohama shel nahash* are imported from Midrashim and are not warranted by the Slavonic texts.

² P. 92b.

³ *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (London, 1913), p. 138.

⁴ *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge, 1903), p. 193.

⁵ *Ibid.*