

Center for Advanced Judaic Studies, University of Pennsylvania

Once More: Jesus in the Talmud

Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung by Johann Maier

Review by: David Goldenberg

The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series, Vol. 73, No. 1 (Jul., 1982), pp. 78-86

Published by: [University of Pennsylvania Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1454463>

Accessed: 12/12/2013 10:06

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

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



University of Pennsylvania Press and Center for Advanced Judaic Studies, University of Pennsylvania are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Jewish Quarterly Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ONCE MORE: JESUS IN THE TALMUD

AT THE TURN of the century and again in the early fifties several studies were made of all the “Jesus passages” in Talmudic and Midrashic literature. Now Johann Maier has once again opened the question.* His work is potentially of great importance, for in the past thirty years not only have new manuscripts and fragments been uncovered but also major strides have been made in the various text-critical methodologies of Rabbinic literature. The latter, in fact, is the rationale for the study.

Maier’s conclusions (pp. 268–275) are that there is no authentic Tannaïc Jesus-passage. Furthermore, all the Amoraic Jesus-passages are not original but are post-Talmudic reworkings of, or interpolations into, the original material. These startling conclusions are the results of the author’s application of text-criticism (“Kontext-analyse, überlieferungs-, stoff-, motiv-, und formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen”).

Is Maier’s research sound? This reviewer thinks that it is not. Source-, form-, and redaction-criticism of Rabbinic literature is still in an embryonic stage of research. If any conclusions are to be reached they must be based, first, on the correct version of the texts, i.e. every witness must be utilized; and second, on an entire literary phenomenon, whether it be a particular tractate or a group of materials similar to each other by tradent, author, formulaic expressions, etc. One certainly cannot dissect any rabbinic pericope making up the methodological rules as one goes along.

As the following examples will show, Maier seems to be unaware of many significant textual witnesses, and more importantly, his methodology is unsystematic and seems to this reviewer to be an attempt to force the evidence to confirm Maier’s apologetic wishes.

I. Text-witnesses.

1. Maier compares P. Sanh. 6.9, 23c with P. Hag. 2.2, 77d and concludes (p. 116), *inter alia*, “dass die Fluchtgeschichte mit der Schüler/Lehrer-Geschichte keine ursprüngliche Einheit bildet,” presumably because P. Sanh. has only the “Fluchtgeschichte.” But Maier has not considered a fragment of P. Sanh. (published and annotated by M. Assis, *Tarbiz*, 46 [1977], 29–90) which reads the same as P. Hag. and has both “Geschichten” together. The omission in Ms. Leiden (and ed. pr.) is, as Assis notes, probably just a scribal error. Incidentally, this fragment with Assis’ notes would have offered Maier superior readings of the passage, e.g., not רַבּוּרָה, “Deborah,” but רַבִּיבָה, “[the mistress of the house] is to be remembered”; שֶׁנֶּבֶר

* Johann Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978. (Erträge der Forschung, Bd. 82). Pp. xvii + 367.

not “ausdruckslos” but, as the fragment has it, שור, (= Syriac) “protruding”; ואזל is not “abtrünnig werden” but “he died,” the word being a “Palestinian”¹ euphemism. The fragment has ומית.

2. Maier’s proof (p. 121) that the name Jesus was originally not in B. Soṭ. 47a and was later interpolated from B. Sanh. 107b, is that Sanh. reads אזל רבי יהושע בן פרחיה whereas Soṭ. omits וישו. The interpolation also accounts for the uncertain reading of the prefatory statement in Soṭ. תנו רבנן לעולם תהא שמאל דוחה וימין מקרבת לא כאלישע שדחפו לגחוי בשתי ידיו ולא כיהושע בן פרחיה ישו הנוצרי וישו הנוצרי בשתי ידיו—the textual witnesses vary between ישו and הנוצרי. Now, first, it is not only Soṭ. which omits Jesus’ name in the . . . אזל statement. So does Sanh. in every (not “vielen”—Maier, n. 259) extant Ms and also in the old editions. It is only in ed. pr. Secondly, the only uncertainty in the prefatory statement is whether the original text read הנוצרי. But every available ancient witness reads ישו.²

3. On p. 120 Maier translates, “er entgegnete ihm” for both B. Sanh. and B. Soṭ. Such a translation accords well with his theory that the Joshua ben Perahyah story was originally told of an anonymous disciple. Actually, “Jesus answered him” is found in Ms. Oxford to Soṭah; in the Yemenite Ms. to Sanh.; in a marginal note to a Sanh. Genizah fragment; in *Midrash ha-Gadol* to Exod. 18:6, p. 356; in *Yalqut Shimḥoni* to II Kings, #230, Ms. Parma and ed. pr. (cited from Sanh.); and in *Menorat ha-Maor* 89 (all cited from *Diq. Sof.*, Soṭah, ed. Liss). Also note the erasure in Ms. Munich.

4. On p. 126 Maier states that “In bSoṭa 47a fehlt der Schlusssatz [ישו ואמר מר ישו] nicht zufällig, er hat dort keine Funktion.”

¹ B. MQ 27b בלא בני דאזיל is probably influenced by the context; see variant reading דשכיב.

² Maier’s reference (p. 292, n. 239) to *Diquduqe Soferim* on this passage is puzzling. Rabinovicz did not compile a volume on Soṭ., and the new edition (published by the Institute for the Complete Israeli Talmud; ed. A. Liss) came out a year after Maier’s book was published. Rabinovicz on this passage in Sanh. does not refer to Soṭ.

Maier’s paraphrase (p. 110) of Rabinovicz is wrong in using the term “Textzeugen”; Rabinovicz is dealing there with only one witness, ed. Soncino. Furthermore, Maier is dealing here with Soṭ. while Rabinovicz is speaking of Sanh. (we do not have Soṭ. extant from the Soncino press). Lastly, Maier is misleading when he says that the words הנוצרי ישו “auch in Textzeugen fehlt, die vor oder ausserhalb der Zensurmassnahmen lagen.” Maier is here building his case that the textual uncertainty in regard to these words was due not to censorship but to editorial redaction. But in fact, what Rabinovicz says is that ed. Soncino, which was not censored, *sometimes* (רק מעט מוצר) lacks these words, because Soncino’s Vorlage was a Spanish Ms. and in Spain censorship was not always enforced.

In regard to Rabinovicz’s statement (cited by Maier) that *Haggadot Ha-Talmud*, ed. Constantinople, 1511, omits these words, *Diq. Sof.* to B. Soṭ. 47a (ed. Liss; p. 297) incorrectly cites this work as reading לישו.

Maier's theory is that while the context of Sanh. deals with Gehazi, that of Sot. does not, and this "Schlussatz" was said originally (without a proper name) of Gehazi. Yet, the line is found in all extant Mss to Soṭah (Munich, Oxford, and Vatican). It is missing in ed. pr., on which Maier bases himself, and he dismisses Ms. Munich with "aus Sanhedrin?" (p. 293, n. 263).

5. Maier believes (p. 66) that what is said about Pappos ben Judah's relationship with his wife in B. Giṭ. 90a gave cause for the later tradition in B. Shab. 104b identifying Pappos' wife with Jesus' mother. However, two of the parallels to B. Giṭ. read "Judah ben Pappos," and as Lieberman shows (*Tosefta ki-Fshuṭah*, VIII, 661, s.v. כגון [to Sot. 5:9]) this is the correct reading.

6. B. Sanh. 105a is discussed (pp. 70–71) because Rashi adds to the Talmudic statement כגון בלעם וישו מאן נינהו כל גויים שכחי אלהים the words *ישו בלעם*. Maier's reason for dealing with Rashi in a book on Talmudic traditions is that these words may have been in the Talmudic text before Rashi. In fact these words are found in the margin to Ms. Carlsruhe, something Maier is not aware of. It is also careless scholarship to deal with a Rashi passage without telling the readers whether there are any extant Mss for this Rashi passage, and if so, how they read.

7. On p. 73 Maier quotes Rashi to B. Sanh. 106a to support his interpretation of the Talmudic text, but does not mention that the key words in Rashi are missing in the ed. pr.

8. When dealing with P. Ta^can. 2.1, 65b (pp. 76–82), Maier is unaware of a Genizah fragment of P. haggadot (L. Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies*, I, 414).

9. The failure of ascertaining the precise reading of the text, i.e. of not presenting every available text witness, is nowhere more obvious than in the passage B. Sanh 106a: נגרי ונגרי, מסגני ושילטי הואי אייזן לגברי נגרי, for here the assumption of a Jesus reference rests entirely upon the reading אייזן (and Rashi's explanation: זינתה).³ Yet Maier presents only a few readings (p. 89) and omits Ms Florence, Ms Carlsruhe, Yemenite Ms, ed. pr., and later citations, such as three readings in Gaonic literature (*Oṣar ha-Geonim* to Sanh., ed. Taubes) and a reading in the Novellae of Meir ha-Levi Abulafia to Sanh. Each of these sources presents a variant of the problematic word (as well as other words in the statement)!

10. Maier assumes (p. 98) that דאמר מר in B. Giṭ. 57a is a quotation from B. ^cErub. 21b, and dates the former passage on that assumption. There is no mention of the fact that both Ms Munich and Ms Vat. 130 read in Giṭ. שכל in place of דאמר מר.

II. Methodology.

1. In his zeal Maier literally tries to do away with references to Jesus. When B. Sanh. 103a (uncensored texts) interprets Ps. 91:10b as "you should not have a

³ This is the sole reason why Jesus was thought of in this passage and not, as Maier says (p. 91), because Jesus was regarded as a magician (= נגרי-נגרי, "Zauberer Totenbeschwörer"). Maier has completely missed the point, a fact emphasized when he says (p. 92) how strange it is that some should see here a

son or a disciple who ruins his dish (שמקריח תבשילו) in public, as did Jesus the Nazarene," Maier claims (p. 63) that originally the text lacked the reference to Jesus. The proof? The text makes good sense without these words; in fact, better sense, since the other interpretations of this verse in B. Sanh. 103a are given in a general sense without reference to a particular person. This proof would be valid only if we knew the redaction technique of the Talmudic editor (could he have added these words to the statement?), the editorial technique of the tradent R. H̄isda (could he have added these words to R. Jeremiah ben Abba's exegesis?), the exegetical technique of the author, (could he have used in his exegesis what was perhaps a popular idiom?), and possibly the editorial technique of the author (could he have added these words to a previously existing exegesis?)

Furthermore, all this presupposes that Maier is correct in assuming that דבר אחר is part of the statement of R. H̄isda in the name of R. Jeremiah ben Abba. But is it? Perhaps this is the redactor's mark, in which case Maier's proof is even weaker, since in that case the דבר אחר interpretation is a different source and one in which there is only one general-sense statement, as opposed to our one particular-reference statement.

If Maier's argument is weak in B. Sanh. 103a, it is ineffective when he applies it to B. Ber. 17a–b (p. 64), for here all the other three exegeses refer to particular people: Ahitofel, Doeg, and Gehazi. Our text therefore would make no sense without Jesus' name.

The fact that the text does have the name of Jesus is dismissed by Maier (p. 63) with the statement that centuries separate the original text from our earliest Mss, centuries of darkness vis-à-vis the text-history. This line is used again by Maier (p. 98: "Welchen Wert haben Zensurlücken und ihre Ergänzungen, wenn die Textgeschichte für die Zeit vor dem Einsetzen der Zensur nicht durchsichtig ist?") in B. Giṭ. 57a in order to do away with another Jesus passage. With this type of reasoning one might as well say nothing at all about the original text! Such reasoning makes a mockery of the most basic premise of any textual methodology, according to which the received text is assumed to be "original" unless and until *compelling* reasons can be brought to the contrary.

The reasons which Maier brings (p. 98) to show that פושעי ישראל is the original reading in B. Giṭ. 57a and that ישו is the later substitution are far from compelling. These reasons can equally well prove that ישו is original. Furthermore, the story in B. Giṭ. 56b–57a is structured around Onqelos' interview with three specific individuals: Titus, Balaam, and Jesus; not two individuals and a general group of "sinners of Israel"!

2. Maier's proof (pp. 121–22) that originally the Joshua ben Peraḥyah story was not in B. Sanh. (and B. Sot.) is that it is patterned after the Gehazi story: Jesus and Gehazi both sin, leave their teachers, are entreated to return but refuse, citing their teachers' own statements. But how much do we today know about the

reference to Mary. Mary is here the point—there can be no Jesus-reference here without Mary!

redaction-editorial process of Rabbinic texts? Can we be sure that both stories were not simultaneously—and independently of one another—formed after another pattern, or that the pattern for both was formed during the process of redaction? Maier's implicit answer is that our texts show an "Elisha-Gehazi-Komplex," in that the preponderance of material in the sections under discussion deals with Gehazi and the context shows the Talmudic discussion to be concerned with Gehazi. This is true but it merely begs the question.

3. To give Simeon ben Laqish's exegesis of Num. 24:23 (אוי מי שמחיה עצמו בשם אל) a non-Jesus interpretation, Maier (pp. 74–75) understands it as a statement against Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, who considered himself a god. As proof of this we are told (p. 72) that since the statements following immediately after Simeon's deal with Rome and Assyria in their exegesis of Num. 24:24, Simeon's statement also belongs to an interpretation of the history-view ("Geschichtsschau") of Num. 24. Maier thus fails to differentiate between Simeon ben Laqish and the redactor of B. Sanh., who put (or found) together Simeon's statement and the two which follow it.

4. Maier's methodological arsenal would not be complete without the *argumentum e silentio*. Possible interpretations (p. 74) of the statement אוי מי שמחיה עצמו בשם אל (B. Sanh. 106a) are dismissed because such interpretations are not found elsewhere in the Jewish polemic against Christianity.

5. It is surprising that Maier tries to prove (pp. 74–76) his interpretation of an exegesis by Simeon ben Laqish (3rd cent.) by appealing to its interpretation in *Midrash Aggadah*, a 12th century work, and in Biblical commentaries of the 12th–14th centuries.

6. In the same vein Maier cites a handful of variants to a Talmudic text from Ms Munich, the *Arukh*, *Midrash ha-Gadol*, and *Yalqut Shim'oni*, and says that these variants show uncertainty in the text already since the Talmudic period (p. 90). The "Talmudic period" is separated from the earliest of these Mss by about 800 years!

7. Maier supposes that the word אריין comes from the verb ארי and translates it, "brachten sie/wandten sie sich" (p. 90). This translation is taken directly from Levy (*Wörterbuch über die Talmudim*, s.v.). But for a word with only a few attestations one cannot rely on dictionaries. In fact the meaning "to bring" is only a supposition from Syriac ארי = אריית; the root is not certain, since Mss on at least one source (B. Sanh. 7a) read ארייה; and the word ארייד, which supplies Levy's "sich wenden" is really היידא, "this very thing," see Lieberman, in *Tarbiz*, 2, 112 (also Epstein, *Introduction to Amoraic Literature*, p. 590, and Jastrow, *Dictionary*, s.v. היידא).

8. Maier does not accept the reading אריין because, whether it be a Ithpe^{el} verb (Levy) or a noun (Jastrow) "bleibt das folgende I^e schwierig." However, since this word is unattested elsewhere, how can we say anything with certainty about the following preposition? The same question may be asked about Maier's statement (p. 91) that if the root is יין, as in Jer. 5:8 Qeri "to be in heat," then "wäre . . . das folgende I^e die beste Lösung."

9. On p. 288, n. 191 read not “Ms. München” but “the margin of the Munich Ms.” There is a difference.

10. It is disconcerting to see a scholarly study refer to Steinsaltz’s Talmud (p. 288, n. 191; p. 289, n. 199) or to translations of the Talmud (p. 289, n. 199).

11. “בן אשה” as opposed to “ילוד אשה” and להטעות used in the sense of “to lead astray in religion” are said to be medieval terms (p. 88). No real proof is presented for these statements, since what is put forward as proof on p. 288, n. 183 is better left unmentioned.

12. The Aggadah, says Maier (p. 93), deduces from Num. 22:25 that Balaam was lame. This is only Maier’s own conjecture without any proof. In fact, B. Sanh. 105a makes the deduction from Num. 23:3.

13. The “Grundstruktur” of the B. Git. 56b–57a passage is stated to be of 3rd century Palestinian origin (p. 97). There are no attributions in this “Grundstruktur” to supply us with any dates. Maier’s “proof”? The third century saw the flourishing of Palestinian Aggadah!

14. Maier even cleverly re-interprets what is perhaps the most obvious unnamed reference to Jesus, א”ר אבהו אם יאמר לך ארם אל אני מכוב הוא בן ארם אני טופו (P. Ta^c.an. 2.1, 65b bottom). According to Maier this is a polemic against the 3rd century revival of the Caesarean in the Roman Empire, and Abbahu’s language is deliberately chosen to reflect Biblical verses speaking of Hiram and Nebuchadnezzar, both of whom thought of themselves as gods. This interpretation is as unnecessary as it is ingenious. Must one go so far afield to interpret an obvious reference to Jesus by a Caesarean Rabbi famous for his discussions with Christians?⁴

Once Maier has gone this far, however, he must also claim (pp. 87–89) that the *Yalqut Shim’oni* passage (#765 to Num. 23.7, in ed. Salonica), which incorporates Abbahu’s and Simeon ben Laqish’s exegeses, is also a “Polemik gegen die Weltmacht und den Weltherrscher,” even though this passage includes the words והוא עתיד להטעות ולומר שהוא מסתלק ובא לקיצים!

III. In many places Maier has misunderstood the primary sources.

1. Maier (p. 65) thinks that the dispute between the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel in Git. 9:10 depended upon their interpretation of דבר in Deut. 24:1 דבר כה מצא בה ערות דבר. The Shammaites understood דבר to mean “thing,” hence their statement לא יגרש את אשתו אלא אם כן מצא בה דבר ערה. The Hillelites, however, understood דבר to mean “word,” hence their statement אפילו הקדיחה תבשילו, which Maier interprets as “a compromising report,” such as brings one’s name into disrepute. In support of the Hillelites’ “ein schändliches Wort” Maier cites Git. 9:9, which speaks of reports or rumors (יצא שמה בעיר . . . מקודש . . . מקודש). Support for this unusual interpretation of מקדיחה תבשילו is brought from P. Ket. 4.4, 28b bottom, where the same phrase is used for the doubtful virginity of a bride.

⁴ See W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Palästinensischen Amoräer*, II, 96–97, 115–18; Hebrew tr., IIa, 90–91, 109–11.

First, the dispute between the Shammaites and the Hillelites was about whether the emphasis in Deut. 24:1 is on the word ערות or on the word דבר (which both of course understood as “thing”). This is clearly seen in B. Giṭ. 90a.

Second, to argue that Giṭ. 9:10 must deal with rumors because 9:9 does so, although there is nothing in 9:10 that points to this, is to defy logic and to deny the results of source-criticism research of the Mishnah.

Third, P. Ket reads: כתיב כי יקח איש אשה ושנאה לעולם אינו חייב עד שיכנוס: ויבעול ויטעון טענת בתולים ושם עלילות דברים יכול אפילו הקדיחה לו את התבשיל נאמר כאן עלילות דברים ולמטן מה עלילות למטן זנות אף למעלן זנות הקדיחה. Clearly הקדיחה means here “to ruin his dish.”

2. From the statement [יש לך אדם שזוכך נופל לתוך כוסו וזורקו ואינו שותהו] (B. Giṭ. 90a) Maier (pp. 65–66) understands that Pappos shut out his wife from himself after she had become the subject of some rumors. This translation is incorrect. Pappos’ wife had done nothing (see P. Qid. 4.4, 66a). Moreover, Pappos shut her out not from himself but from outsiders whenever he left his house. He did so because should his wife so much as talk to anyone he would no longer have marital relations with her (see Rashi, ad loc.).

It is only in some of the parallel sources that Maier’s translation can be accepted. In the parallels there is a fourth category: one who removes the fly and leaves the drink without drinking it or throwing it out. In P. Soṭ. 1.7, 17a and *Num. Rabbah* 9:12 it is this type which is associated with Pappos, i.e., he did shut out his wife from himself. In Tos. Soṭ. 5:9, however, the fourth category appears but is not associated with Pappos. Rather, as in B. Giṭ., Pappos is depicted as the type who throws out the drink.⁵

⁵ Lieberman, in his commentary to Tos. Soṭ. 5:9, understands this clause (זורקו) as referring to one who throws out *the fly* and does not drink his drink. But this category is already covered in the Tosefta (מניחו ואינו טועמו). Lieberman is therefore forced to differentiate between עובר ע”ג כוסו and שוכן זורקו ואינו שותהו. Three arguments against this interpretation are: a) if זורקו ואינו שותהו = מניחו ואינו טועמו, why the change in terminology? b) there is no category in the Tos. corresponding to the category of “throwing out the drink” found in the parallels; c) Tos. Ms. Erfurt reads שופכו instead of זורקו, clearly referring to the drink and not to the fly.

Lieberman apparently chose his interpretation because Pappos did not in fact divorce his wife, which would be implied if זורקו refers to the drink. It would seem, however, that the reading of Tos. is corrupt: the reading of Tos. מניחו ואינו טועמו and זורקו ואין שותהו should be interchanged.

Perhaps we can even explain the source of the confusion and also the reason for only three categories in B. Giṭ. B. Giṭ. represents the earlier version: only three categories, and Pappos is associated with him who would throw away his soiled dish. As explained above, that is why Pappos locked his door upon leaving the house (שהיה נועל בפני אשתו ויוצא)—to prevent the soiling of his dish. However, a variant reading omitted the word ויוצא (as in Tos. Ms. Erf., P. Soṭ., *Num.*

3. "Ein Weibgeborener bin ich" (p. 80) is not a question but a declarative statement.
4. How is איוון translated "ging sie" (p. 90)? (Yet Maier calls it lectio faciliior!)
5. דלא לשכחיה אלהא דיהודאי (B. Giṭ. 56b bottom) is translated "damit die Juden ihn nicht finden" (p. 96)!
7. In Babylon bricks were used "zur Kennzeichnung der Himmelsrichtung, z.B. nach bBer 61b (unten) im Zusammenhang mit Toilette-Verhalten" (p. 123). The source reads תניא אידך הנפנה ביהודה לא יפנה מזרח ומערב . . . רבי עקיבא אומר (בכל מקום . . . רבה הווי שדיין ליה לבני מזרח ומערב (רש"י : לבנים שישב עליהן לפנות) and refers to the direction facing the Temple.
8. In accordance with his theory that the line ואמר מר ישו כישף והסית והדיח את ישראל was originally said (without a proper name) of Gehazi, Maier (p. 126) interprets Gehazi's forbidding the disciples to study under Elisha as a case of leading Israel astray (מסית ומדיח)!

IV. Sometimes Maier has misunderstood the secondary sources.

1. P. 288, n. 185. Contra Maier, Lauterbach does not say that *Yalqut Shim^coni* 765 dates from the fourth century. What Lauterbach does say is that the passage cannot stem from a time before 325 C.E.
2. Ibid. Schonfield does not date the passage at all, as Maier believes.
3. P. 287, n. 169, Lauterbach does not stress the difficulties involved in accepting Abbahu's statement (. . . אם יאמר לך אדם אל אני מכוב הוא . . .) as referring to Jesus. On the contrary, Lauterbach accepts the passage as referring to Jesus.

V. Typographical Errors (excluding the more obvious)

- P. 53 "ARN Kap. XXVI" should read "ARN Kap. XXXVI".
- P. 54 "Tosefta (4.3.5)" should read "Tosefta (4.5.3)".
- PP. 61–62 "R. Jochanan (Pal. 4. Jh.)" should be "R. Jochanan (Pal. 3. Jh.)".
- P. 65 "tGiṭṭ" should be "tSoṭ".
- P. 82 "hyòs" should be "hyiòs".
- P. 82 "Pesiqta Rabbati" should be "Pesiqta deRab Kahana".
- P. 89 "ִּזְנ" should be "זִּנ".
- P. 91 "Dt 24, 14" should be "Dt 23, 14".
- P. 282, n. 93 "102 ff" should be "113 ff".
- P. 284, n. 126 "HUCA 25/1" should be "HUCA 23/1".
- P. 284, n. 133 "nišma^c" should be "mišma^c".
- P. 288, n. 191 "403" should be "463".
- P. 293, n. 271 should read "Jēsoýs christós theoy hyiòs sòtér."
- P. 328 Lachs' article, "A 'Jesus Passage' etc." is in *JQR* 59.

Rabbah), and thus implied that Pappos shut his wife out from himself. This meaning was no longer consonant with the category of "throwing away the dish" and therefore caused a fourth category to come about: one who does not throw out the dish but does not eat it either.

VI. Bibliography

This section is comprehensive and thorough. I noticed only one omission (the article by Stephen Gero, "Jewish Polemic in the Martyrium Pionii and a 'Jesus' Passage from the Talmud," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29 (1978), pp. 164–68) and one error (*Darkhe ha-ʿAggadah* and *Aggadah and Its Development* were not authored by the same person; Isaac Heinemann wrote the former and Joseph Heinemann, the latter. See Maier, p. 285, n. 14).

This review has been based upon the first eighty pages of the 200-page chapter "Die rabbinischen Quellen" which is the heart of the book. Presumably, the type of errors pointed out above are not limited to these pages alone.

Maier has seen that the topic of Jesus in Rabbinic literature must be re-examined. The manuscript discoveries during this century as well as the increased sophistication in text criticism developed in recent decades have made re-examination a necessity. In this regard Maier is to be praised. Recognition of the problems inherent in earlier studies is an important first step in the right direction. But the following steps must be based upon sound methodology.

Dropsie College

DAVID GOLDENBERG