
After an analysis of the text of Ex. 15:22–27, its place in beshallah and its relationship with other biblical passages, the author finds that these six verses evolved in three stages. The second added the authority of Moses, while the third obscured it.

The most striking feature of this second redaction is not so much the introduction or emphasis of the authority of Moses as its structure, which is chiastic. Usually when chiastic structures have been found they appear in the final version of a text, encouraging claims that there is no mixture of sources. Also noteworthy is the use of the parasha, not the chapter, as a unit, and the possibility that these verses were at one time part of the same document as Num. 21.

I hope the publisher is able to give this explication de texte the distribution it deserves.

RICHARD WHITE


Since Gershom Seholem opened up the field of early Jewish mysticism nearly fifty years ago, interest in the subject has grown apace. Heikhalot literature has become a well-defined subject of research (comparable to apocalyptic or the Qabbalah) which engages the attention of a small but significant band of scholars world-wide. Some of the most fundamental and original work on the subject is emanating from the Institut für Judaistik in Berlin, where Professor Schäfer and his collaborators have undertaken an ambitious programme to edit the original texts, to provide them with a concordance, and to translate them into German (and, it seems, ultimately into English). Much of that programme has already been achieved. The Geniza-Fragmente is a supplement to the Synopse zur Hekhalot Literatur of 1981 (reviewed in JJS 34 (1983), pp. 102–6) and incorporates twenty-three texts, mainly from the Taylor–Schechter collection, which could not be accommodated within the
framework of the *Synopse*. These fragments are particularly important for the history of Heikhalot literature because they are the earliest extant manuscripts and their provenance is known. *Geniza-Fragmente* is the ultimate text-edition: it offers clear photographs, transcriptions, notes and variants from other manuscripts presented in stave.

The *Konkordanz* indexes not only the content of the *Synopse* and *Geniza-Fragmente*, but includes texts (e.g. Massekhet Heikhalot and Re’uyyot Yehezqel) not found in either work. A thorough analysis of the Hebrew of the Heikhalot literature is an urgent desideratum. Though Mishnaic in type, it has numerous peculiarities, particularly in vocabulary. Hitherto the most useful attempt to analyse the language of any Heikhalot text was the Hebrew index of Odeberg's *3 Enoch* (Professor Jonas Greenfield’s study of the language of Heikhalot Rabbati has, unfortunately, never been published.) The *Konkordanz* will at last put the analysis of Heikhalot Hebrew on a sound basis.

The Übersetzung II covers §§81–334 of the *Synopse*, which comprises essentially the material traditionally known as Heikhalot Rabbati. Only portions of this text have been available previously in translation. Morton Smith's unpublished English version is (to judge from extensive quotations) stylish, but not very accurate or close to the original. L. Grodner and D. Blumenthal's rendering of the grand séance passage (*Understanding Jewish Mysticism*, 1978) can be ignored as neither stylish nor accurate (cf. Alexander, *Textual Sources for the Study of Judaism* [1984], pp. 120–25).¹ Professor Schäfer's translation is based on Ms Oxford 1531 (a surprising choice, though see p. xxxiv). Its underlying principles are stated thus: 'Die Übersetzung ist bestrebt, dem Stil und Duktus des hebräischen Originals zu folgen; Brüche, Unebenheiten und syntaktische Inkonsequenzen werden nicht verschleiert, sondern auch im Deutschen kenntlich gemacht. Es ist ausdrücklich nicht die Absicht der Übersetzung, einen glatten und »bereinigten« Text zu bieten. Soweit möglich wird versucht, gleiche Termini auch in der Übersetzung durch gleiche deutsche Äquivalente wiederzugeben' (p. xxxii). The translation is very literal and, not surprisingly, at times awkward and hard to follow. The reviewer found it worked best if read side by side with the original. Used in this way it provides an illuminating reading of the original which shows profound understanding and sympathy with what can be very difficult Hebrew. Übersetzung I, covering *Synopse* §§1–80 (= 3 Enoch), and a Register volume are in active preparation, as are a separate edition and translation of Massekhet Heikhalot by K. Herrmann.

In the introduction to Übersetzung II, Professor Schäfer presents in a typically incisive way his challenging views on the nature and history of Heikhalot literature. The following points deserve particular notice.

(1) Professor Schäfer favours a pragmatic, maximalist approach to the definition of Heikhalot literature: 'Die Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur hat die Hekhalot-Texte in einem bestimmten, durch die verwendeten Handschriften vorgegebenen, Masse zugänglich gemacht; es war nicht die Absicht der Synopse, das Corpus der Hekhalot-Literatur damit zu definieren. Bestimmendes Kriterium für die Synopse war der Duktus der Handschriften, nicht von abgegrenzt, redigierten »Werken«' (p. vii). It becomes clear, however, that the 'Duktus' of the manuscripts is not quite enough, and so Professor Schäfer is obliged on pp. vii–xii to discuss at length what

---

¹ It is perhaps worth noting that on p. ix Professor Schäfer does not mention the useful English translation of Re’uyyot Yehezqel in Louis Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (Schocken, New York, 1977), pp. 26–34.
individual 'works' do or do not belong to the 'corpus'. In this discussion certain criteria (relating presumably to content, not form) have been applied to determine what constitutes a Heikhalot text. It would be good to see those criteria made explicit. From one point of view it matters little if Professor Schäfer includes a few non-Heikhalot texts in his 'corpus': any text is bound to benefit from his editorial attention. From another point of view—Professor Schäfer's own—there are important issues at stake, since, having dispensed with 'bounded, redacted works' (see below), he has nothing to interpose between the smallest units of tradition and the outer limits of the corpus. It is, therefore, necessary for him to be able to draw a rather firm line around Heikhalot literature.

(2) Professor Schäfer develops his view (expounded more fully elsewhere) that the extreme fluidity of the Heikhalot traditions as attested in the various manuscripts indicates that the so-called Heikhalot texts (e.g. Heikhalot Rabbati, Heikhalot Zutarti, 3 Enoch) have no meaningful redactional identity. Consequently to talk about an 'Urtext' or 'core' for any given work, or to date the works absolutely or relatively, is problematic if not meaningless. He deliberately avoids using the word 'Schrift' (presumably because it has overtones of authorship), preferring the more neutral term 'Makroform'. The issues raised are important. Put within the context of current study of rabbinic literature, Professor Schäfer's position stands in marked contrast to that of Professor Neusner vis-à-vis the midrashim (which text-critically have similarities to Heikhalot literature). In recent years Professor Neusner has argued with increasing assurance that the midrashim are authored works with an overall plan and programme. Clearly, some hard thinking needs to be done on what constitutes 'text' and what constitutes 'authorship' in rabbinic literature—thinking which would do well to take account of discussion of these questions in structuralist and post-structuralist literary criticism. The reviewer still remains unpersuaded by Professor Schäfer's arguments. He notes that Professor Schäfer detects within the flux of tradition portions that are 'relatively stable' (p. xiii). It is not clear what is wrong with taking such a stable portion (e.g. 3 Enoch as represented by Ms Vatican 228) and asking when this stability came about, who brought it about, and how it came about (i.e. are there traces of earlier stages of development). Metaphors of 'flux' and 'crystallization' imply a linear concept of time. It seems reasonable to freeze the flux at any given moment and to consider the relationship of that moment to moments both before and after. In contrast to the Makroform 3 Enoch attested in Ms Vatican 228 is the Mikroform attested in T.-S. K 21.95.L (Geniza-Fragmente no. 12). This comprises a version of 3 Enoch 1 followed without a break by 3 Enoch 43-44 and a physiognomic passage unparalleled in the Vatican manuscript version of 3 Enoch. This Geniza fragment might be the seed from which the Vatican Makroform grew. It could equally be a scrap from someone's notebook into which, for reasons known to himself, he chose to copy passages extracted from a longer version of 3 Enoch.

(3) It has long been noted that the Hasidei Ashkenaz had an interest in the Heikhalot texts and that many of the manuscripts emanate from their circle. The common view is to see the German Hasidim mainly as transmitters of the material. Professor Schäfer assigns them a much more aggressive role as editors and composers: 'Die meisten erhalten gebliebenen Handschriften sind dem italienisch-askenazischen Überlieferungszweig zuzuordnen. In diesem besonderen kulturellen Klima der deutschen »Frommen« des 12./frühen 13.Jh. wurden die Texte offensichtlich nicht nur kopiert, sondern in einer Weise transformiert, daß Deutschland neben Babylonien als ein weiterer geographischer Fixpunkt in der Entwicklung der
Hekhalot-Literatur zu würdigen ist’ (p. xxyv). More concretely: ‘Der von P. Alexander erwogene »core« des 3. Henoch [chaps. 3–15] hat sich als die Ende des 12./Anfang des 13. Jahrhunderts von den haside ashkenaz tradiert und sehr wahrscheinlich auch produziert wurde’ (p. xiii). The role of the Hasidei Ashkenaz in the transmission of the Heikhalot literature has never been properly investigated and Professor Schäfer is clearly right to raise the issue, which could have important repercussions for the history and dating of the texts. The argument has still clearly a long way to go. Against the view that 3 Enoch 3–15 was ‘produced’ by the Hasidei Ashkenaz is the parallelism with the Metatron piece in the Alphabet of Rabbi Aqiva. The Alphabet of Aqiva version of the elevation of Metatron appears to be a summary of the account in 3 Enoch 3–15. But the Alphabet of Aqiva piece is quoted by the Qaraite Jacob al-Qirqisani (Kitab al-Anwar I.4.2). So the 3 Enoch 3–15 was probably in existence before his time.

The achievement of Professor Schäfer and his co-workers is by any standards impressive. The world of scholarship will undoubtedly salute what has appeared and await with interest what is to come.

University of Manchester

PHILIP S. ALEXANDER


The study of events that occurred long ago is based on the sources that have survived. These impose their own pattern of understanding upon those events which cannot but influence subsequent generations in their own attempts to incorporate them into their Weltanschauung and to make use of their varying interpretations for their own experience. The modern historian therefore has inter alia two problems to consider and resolve. The first is to understand the post-event traditions and the ways in which they have coloured the original data both in terms of emphasizing certain interpretations and of obfuscating the original reality. The second is to re-read the sources—and the more modern the historian, the more and varied will be the evidence included in the study—in order to analyse what they say and do not say about the occurrence. Finally, the task of the historian is to impose a reasonable pattern of cause and result upon what happened and to relate this pattern in a literary and compelling fashion. The more successful the latter, the more likely it is that that interpretation will be entered into the canon of the discipline and become for some time the authoritative ‘history’ for a new generation or more of readers. This is not to say, however, that either the original sources or other interpretations, both of which will continue to serve other purposes, will be superseded. Rather, the intellectual net will have been cast a little wider to enlighten a subsequent generation of students.

Chazan has chosen the period of the First Crusade to illustrate this lesson. Having investigated both the periods anterior and subsequent to it in a number of specialized articles, he here pulls it all together in what may be called an introductory history for students of that phenomenon. Since both have been lacking in Jewish historical writing, the appearance of this book is a welcome addition to the library of Jewish scholarship. It marks a break from the older varieties of Jewish historiography, whether of the lacrymose or anti-lacrymose types, both of which were written more for colleagues and advanced students rather than for the