York University, 1974), J. R. Miller (Boston University, 1979, on the language of the marginalia), and by the present author, whose Harvard dissertation of 1978 is published here in an expanded and revised form. Golomb's description of the grammar of Neofiti I is confined to the main text, and does not cover the interlinear and marginal materials.

The chapters are set out as follows: Introduction, Orthography, Prepositions, Conjunctions, Adverbials, Pronouns, Nouns and Adjectives, Verbs, Syntax. In the Introduction, Golomb argues that the extant text of the Palestinian Targum in Neofiti I is not 'connected in any way with the activities of ... the meturgeman, or indeed with the lectionary practices of the Jewish community, except that all three are concerned with the notion of "translation"' (p. 5). He goes on to explain that his aim is to 'write a synchronic model of the language of one MS'. As a result of this decision no use is made of other extant Palestinian Targum materials, even where this evidence could confirm the correctness of Golomb's identifications of textual corruptions in Neofiti I (e.g. on p. 147 he rightly sees ydynwn, Gen. 31:53, as 'due to w/y confusion': Kahle's Geniza fragment C indeed has the expected form ydwnwn). This excessive self-denial accounts for the surprising character of the chapter on orthography: this in fact turns out primarily to be a discussion of erroneous spellings, and not of such features as the occurrence of s/s, d/dy etc., as one might have expected. Many of these topics do nevertheless receive mention at various subsequent points in the grammar (e.g. d/dy in the chapter on prepositions).

In each chapter the materials (always given in consonantal transcription) are set out clearly and a good selection of examples is regularly provided (often with attention paid to the Hebrew). The chapter on nouns and adjectives is especially valuable for its collection of data on different types of noun formation; that on verbs concludes with handy tables of verbal paradigms.

The decision to limit the discussion of syntax to a few specific topics, rather than attempt a wider, but superficial, coverage, is to be applauded. As a result we are presented with helpful and detailed studies of the following four phenomena: compound verbal forms with hwh, the expression of the direct object, the use of the predicate adjective, and the expression of the genitive relationship. Expanded versions of the last two sections have previously been published in JNES 1983 and JAOS 1982, respectively.

The value of the book is enhanced by the presence of an index to the passages of Neofiti I adduced in the grammar. This work will undoubtedly serve, not only as a handy tool for the study of Neofiti I, but also as a useful source of information for those interested in comparative studies of Aramaic grammar.

SEBASTIAN BROCK


Holladay has provided for those who wish to work closely with these texts a most useful collection. The book includes in accessible form Greek texts with critical apparatus, English translations with detailed notes, introductory material for each author, and very full bibliographies. Holladay has made it much easier for students
get to grips with the Greek, which is otherwise most easily available either in Denis's *Fragmenta*, which only provides a bald text without justification for particular readings, or, for the historical texts dealt with in this volume, in Jacoby's rebarbable *Fragmente*. The lazy may still prefer to rely on the translations of the same texts in the *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* series or in Charlesworth's *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, but they will now have less excuse for ignoring the Greek. The editor deserves thanks for undertaking a useful task.

One suspects, however, that he has made heavier weather of this project than was really necessary. Seven introductory pages introduce Hellenistic Jewish literature as a whole—not entirely satisfactorily, since Ps.-Hystaspes, for instance, was not 'certainly Jewish' (p. 6) but probably Iranian. But then fifty-three pages deal laboriously with the transmission of the text. Much of this material consists of lists of the manuscripts in which the patristic and other writings, in which the fragments of Hellenistic Jewish authors are quoted, are preserved. Such lists are of little use without discussion of the comparative worth of the manuscripts; Holladay, for no good reason, gives such a discussion only for Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, ignoring even the equally important tradition behind Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*. Just as odd are the detailed lists of the titles, with brief descriptions, of the editions of Eusebius, Clement and so on since the renaissance. All this information is not really helpful for understanding the Hellenistic Jewish fragments. More significantly, the attitude which leads Holladay to include such material in the introduction leads to confusion in the compilation of the texts themselves. As he rightly notes, Freudenthal and Jacoby were interested in reconstructing the texts written by the Jewish authors whereas Mras was only concerned with the text of Eusebius (p. 15). But, since Eusebius may well have misquoted his source or used an already corrupt version of the Jewish writings, it would make better sense for Holladay in this collection to follow and build on Jacoby's text rather than, as he does, printing Mras's text and just noting Jacoby's suggested emendations. His criteria for inclusion of Mras's variants in the apparatus ('all except insignificant ones but more, though not all, of the peculiar tendencies of the thirteenth-century manuscript B', cf. p. 14) are anyway so arbitrary as to be useless for serious study of the textual tradition of Eusebius' text, for which it remains necessary to go back to Mras.

The main value of the collection lies in the introductions to the individual authors and the extremely detailed notes, which discuss almost every conceivable problem in the texts. Holladay has read exhaustively and is erudite and careful in his approach to major problems, of which there are many. When he commits himself his decision is almost always judicious. Sometimes he remains agnostic, which can be less useful when he simply cites the proponents of different views without explaining why they disagree. He has missed very little of the modern literature, but if he had seen the brief remarks made independently by W. G. Lambert, *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (1978), p. 14, and F. G. B. Millar in *JJS* 29 (1978), p. 6, n. 12, he might have reconsidered the assumption, almost universal since Freudenthal, that Ps.-Eupolemus was a Samaritan.

*Martin Goodman*