
Under the energetic general editorship of Dr S. C. Reif, the editorial processing of the Cambridge Genizah material is making good progress. In the slim volume under review, Professor Morag presents a clear and succinct description of 'Talmudic' documents which contain varying amounts of vocalised words. Of the 168 manuscripts in question, 116 represent parts of the Babylonian Talmud, 4 the Palestinian Talmud, 30 Alfasi’s Talmudic digest, 13 the *Halakhoth Gedoloth*, 1 Leviticus Rabba, and 4 miscellaneous Talmudic selections.

The various classes of vocalisation (Tiberian, Babylonian, Palestinian and Palestino-Tiberian) are represented, the 30 manuscripts displaying the Babylonian style being particularly significant for the Talmud. Though none of the documents are dated, those with Babylonian punctuation are thought to belong to the oldest (8th–9th century) layer of the collection.

Despite the availability of modern technology, Professor Morag’s exemplary work, the Introduction of which is dated April 1982, had to wait until August 1988 to reach the light of day. This delay, which has adversely affected the comprehensiveness of the bibliography, was caused by ‘various technical and personal difficulties’ not in Cambridge but in Jerusalem.

Oriental Institute, Oxford

GEZA VERMES


A puzzling feature of the Babylonian Talmud (with no parallel in the Palestinian Talmud) is the recording of a saying (memra) of an Amora followed by the expression: ‘Thus it is also taught’ (*tanya nami hakhi*, abbreviated to TNH in Judith Hauptman’s study) which introduces a *Baraita* in which the same teaching is given, often in identical words. How did it come about that both the Amora and the Tanna should have made virtually the same statement? If the Amora knew of the *Baraita* why did he not quote it? And if, strange though it would be, it just so happened that the Amora and the *Baraita* gave the same ruling, why did the anonymous editors (the *Stamaim* in David Halivni’s felicitous phrase) give the same ruling in the name of both the Amora and the *Baraita*? It is to this question of redundancy to which Judith Hauptman addresses herself with great skill. (I have only spotted one error: the penalty for taking the mother bird with the young is *malkut*, not ‘a sacrifice’, p. 196.)

Hauptman rightly dismisses the bizarre solution, advanced by I. H. Weiss, that the Amoraim simply made up the *Baraitot* in support of their argument. Many of the *Baraitot* (though not all) are found in parallel sources such as the Tosefta, the Halakhic Midrashim and the Palestinian Talmud. Her own hypothesis, if I understand her correctly, is as follows. It has been postulated by modern form critics that our present Talmudic text is composed of two sources: (1) the proto-sugya, the work of the Amoraim, and (2) the reworking of this material by the *Stamaim*. 
According to this theory, the TNH was added to the proto-sugya by the Stamaim. Hauptman postulates rather a three-source theory. There existed originally a series of Baraitot appended to the Mishnayot. This is the real proto-sugya. In the second stage of editing, memrot of Amoraim were added, and these were often in the nature of amplification of the Baraita material. Finally, the Stamaim reshaped the material to form the sugya as we now have it. In the process they inserted the Amoraic comment or elaboration before the Baraita to which they added TNH. Hauptman lists over 300 instances of TNH. In many of these the wording of the memra and the Baraita is not identical. Of the hundred instances where there appears to be redundancy, Hauptman has been able to show, in 27 of these, that the Baraita appears in parallel sources but there the phrase recorded in the memra is missing. Consequently, Hauptman suggests, the Amora added this phrase to the Baraita’s formulation, i.e. the Amora said that the ruling of the Baraita requires to be supplemented by his saying, and then the phrase actually found its way into the Baraita. Of the 73 instances where this does not hold, because the two are identical, Hauptman can only guess that ‘The amora, familiar with the earlier version of the baraita, and basing himself on it, originally issued a comment of significance, not a repetition of the baraita. It was only after the baraita assimilated the novel point of the memra that the memra appeared totally redundant. I suspect that many of the other sugyot containing redundancy of memra and TNH baraita can also be explained in this way, but lack of parallel versions of the baraita prevented me from demonstrating it definitively for these sugyot’ (p. 217).

Hauptman conveys her argument with full reference to all the relevant sources, but the weakest link in her chain of reasoning is this suggestion that the addition in the memra of the Amora became assimilated in so many instances to the Baraita. How did this come about not occasionally but in all the instances of TNH? Is it not more plausible to see it all as the work of the Stamaim who consciously reworded the original Baraita? It is not as if there is no evidence for the rewording and, on occasion, even the invention of Baraitot by the Stamaim (see my article, ‘Are There Fictitious Baraitot in the Babylonian Talmud?’, HUCA 42, LII (1979), pp. 185–96).

For example, in Rosh ha-Shanah 24a–b three separate versions of a Baraita are quoted in turn, each at just the right time when the progress of the argument demands it. Surely it is stretching coincidence beyond its limits to suggest that the editors conveniently managed to pull out of the hat, so to speak, a hitherto unknown Baraita, when needed to refute a position that had been advanced, at exactly the right moment. If in some instances there is evidence of either rewording or sheer invention (I. H. Weiss is not entirely wrong, even if it be granted that he is far too sweeping), why is it unreasonable to explain the TNH phenomena as a conscious literary device used by the Stamaim?

It is futile to deny that the Stamaim used earlier material, but to say this is a far cry from suggesting that they had two or even one proto-sugya, i.e. an actual formulation of sugya material.

I have argued elsewhere (The Talmudic Argument, Cambridge University Press, 1984) that the form critics go beyond the evidence in seeing the Stamaim as merely ‘editors’. On the contrary, the whole of the Bavli makes better sense if the Stamaim are seen as the creators of the Talmud, using earlier material in much the same way as Shakespeare used chronicles and the like to produce a new masterpiece. It is by no means difficult to detect, in practically every lengthy sugya in the Bavli, the ordering of the material in such a way that it leads to a dramatic climax. There is also much evidence of the use of various literary devices to give spice to the whole. Such
concentrates rather exploring the nature can influence in describe, medieval and emphasis of Jewish mysticism: how this works. Talmud is instances not invented for the purpose of dramatic effect, just as other Baraitot have been reworded or even invented for the very same purpose. I would go still further to argue that in many instances not only a Baraita but also a memra has been reworded (see my article in this journal, vol. 28, no. 1 (Spring 1977), pp. 46–59, ‘How Much of the Babylonian Talmud is Pseudepigraphic?’). Talmudic scholars may have to devote their researches not to attempting to uncover the supposed two or three sources but to consider whether the traditional single-source theory, although rejected by Haiman and other scholars, still holds good, albeit in a more sophisticated way of understanding how this works.

Leo Baeck College, London

LOUIS JACOBS


The mantle of Gershom Scholem, virtual creator of a new scholarly discipline, the scientific study of Jewish mysticism, has fallen on Moshe Idel, Associate Professor of Jewish Thought at the Hebrew University, who, in the works reviewed here and in his other writings, has indeed brought new perspectives to bear on the subject.

The term ‘Kabbalah’ originally referred to the chain of Jewish tradition: ‘Moses received (kibbel) Torah from Sinai and handed it down to Joshua; Joshua to the elders and the elders to the prophets’ (Avot 1:1). The Jewish mystics, believing, as they did, that ‘Torah’ also embraced a secret lore, going back, in some versions, to Adam the first man, adopted the term specifically for their esoteric tradition. In both medieval and modern works on the Kabbalah the term is generally applied, however, to one particular branch, the doctrine of En Sof and the Sefirot as found in the Zohar, and to the more complex system of Isaac Luria. Moshe Idel calls attention to a very different type of Kabbalah, represented, among others, by the thirteenth-century mystic Abraham Abulafia.

According to Idel’s convincing thesis, there are in fact two opposite tendencies in Jewish mysticism: the theosophical-theurgic and the prophetic-ecstatic. The first, the Kabbalah of the Zohar and Luria, is in reality a theosophical system seeking to describe, in bewildering detail, the nature of the Godhead which it is believed man can influence by his deeds for good and for ill. In these systems there is a good deal of emphasis on the precepts of the Torah in their theurgic function. The other type concentrates rather on the mystical experience of the devotee and has no interest in exploring the nature of the Deity. Abulafia, in fact, in his debate with Solomon Ibn