priest. "The preeminent concern expressed in this tithing procedure, then, is not to violate the taboo against eating a priestly offering. The tithing and purity preoccupations of the haber are thus seen to be complementary, and priestly in focus. On the one hand, only priests may eat consecrated food. On the other, non-priests are to eat their unconsecrated food in conditions of cleanness, i.e., as if they were priests eating priestly gifts" (p. 10). This brief pointer to the tractate's deeper significance shows the direction in which the subject of the second volume is to move and one awaits its appearance with keen interest.

The tractate itself, as the writer vividly demonstrates, is arranged clearly. Around the nucleus (chapters 2-4), which turns on the question of trustworthiness ("commercial and commensal relations between those who are and are not trustworthy in the matter of tithing"), are grouped an introductory chapter (ch. 1), "which delimits the liability to tithing of demai-produce", and a final chapter (ch. 5), which formulates "details of the tithing procedure". An appendix is added (chs. 6 and 7) in "which the principles of the preceding two units are taken up and illustrated in a series of secondary more complicated cases" (p. 11).

The major part of the work, the commentary, begins in each case with a careful introduction of the text. Commendably, the commentary itself lays great value on a form critical and redaction critical analysis of the tractate: "The correct isolation and characterization of M.'s formal-literary units, together with a thorough understanding of M.'s formulary patterns and the way they function contextually, are our most important tools for the decipherment of M.'s rulings. Formal-literary analysis therefore precedes substantive exegesis throughout my commentary . . . Formal criteria also allow me to separate out the various autonomous units which redaction has brought together . . . Formal analysis is therefore the proper route into redaction-criticism of M." (p. 20). The interpretation of the tractate's substance correctly lays great weight on its own literary and chronological context and of course takes into consideration traditional exegetical literature, but is aware that in each case it pursues its own very different ends.

A commentary such as this can only be assessed for its real value after one has worked with it for some time. A few random tests, however, and the carefully considered stand regarding method adopted in the Introduction, make it apparent that the author offers a thorough and attentive study belonging among the best examples of its kind. The second volume is awaited eagerly.

Martin Buber Institut für Judaistik der Universität zu Köln

Peter Schäfer


The subject of this work, originally a dissertation at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem under the supervision of David Flusser and Shmuel Safrai, is the notion of Israel's mutual solidarity and adherence with, and to, one another as it was expressed already in early times in the well-known saying, kol Yisra'el 'arevin zeh la-zeh ("All Israel adheres to, or stands surety for, one another"); cf. the sources,
p. 3 with note 1b). This concept, a basic one for Judaism, is developed in three stages.

The first part of the work (pp. 9-84) is concerned with the suffering nation, with an attitude towards the suffering individual, and with an approach towards suffering mankind. As might be expected, the suffering nation occupies the centre of the attention; the suffering individual receives negligible treatment and suffering mankind plays almost no role at all.

The second section discusses the "doctrine of solidarity" (pp. 85-154) and deals, among other subjects, with God's solidarity with Israel (here the work touches on the monograph by Peter Kuhn, Gottes Trauer und Klage in der rabbinischen Überlieferung, Leiden, 1978); with the concepts "adherence — solidarity — responsibility"; and with "the explicit rabbinic doctrine on solidarity", with the community as well as with individuals. Several statements on the so-called commandment or love (Lev. 19:18) in rabbinic tradition are worth noting here. In the author's opinion, it is not so much a matter of love as of the motivation of loving behaviour. "It is not love for the other that is required, but identification with him, awareness that the other is as you are yourself, suffers as you do, sins as you do. 'Love' can only be one of the possible consequences of identification" (p. 154).

Under the heading, "Solidarity and Responsibility", the third part is concerned finally with the solidarity of the outstanding man (Rosenzweig calls him, after shalih tzibbur, "envoy", or also "representative") who takes upon himself responsibility for the community (including the sinners). It is therefore not a question of "representative suffering", but of the "envoy" being "conscious of the misbehaviour of his people and suffering under it because he foresees the results of unrighteousness and folly, namely misfortune and suffering. In most cases, he is unable to take on himself, as a representative, the actual misfortune" (p. 223). The teaching on solidarity and on identification with the sinner also makes it quite improbable that the Jews would have surrendered Jesus of Nazareth to the Roman occupying authorities (pp. 218 ff.). Where solidarity with the sufferer and the sinner is concerned, Christianity is the legitimate daughter of Judaism, even though the principle of solidarity very soon became focused on the Messiah and was "transplanted from the real historical world wholly into metaphysical and apocalyptic ideology" (p. 246). The "anti-solidary" sect from Qumran forms, by contrast, the absolute counterpart of legitimate solidarity Judaism (pp. 226 ff.).

The book contains also "Preliminary Notes for German readers" (p. VII), a chronological table (pp. XVIff) and an appendix with bibliography and index (pp. 263ff).

The author's merit is, without a doubt, that she has taken up the idea of solidarity with the sufferer and the sinner as Judaism's central theme and has differentiated it from familiar Christian prejudices and clichés. A highly aggravating drawback is firstly that she develops, or rather sets fire to, her theme of solidarity with an ideological rigour which transforms positive statements into almost their reverse. Thus no historical or literary-critical analyses determine her assessment of individual sources but exclusively her own standard of solidarity, by which she pronounces on historical processes and literary sources as on good and evil. The book of Job is a "milestone in the process of de-solidarisation" (p. 226); apocalyptic with its individualistic ideology is the permanent opponent of pure biblical-rabbinical teaching on solidarity (on p. 224 it is even "invented" to annul the "law of adherence"; cf. also pp. 7, 59, 262); the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch renounced the
law of adherence and mutual dependence (p. 206; in 4 Ezra, Ezra, unlike the angel, comes off better); and the summit of anti-solidarity is the “sect” of Qumran.

Here it pays to look more closely into the author’s style and reasoning. The sect clung to the “grotesque idea” that there can be “separatist (privatisierende) just men” (p. 227). It carried out a “sort of intellectual acrobatics in order to . . . drag into the mud . . . the people of Israel” (p. 228); its “ideologists” “thought up . . . predestination” and “falsified” not only the concept of yahad but also that of tzibbur (p. 229). The God of the sect turned out to be a “divine monster” (p. 230) and was like “one of the most dreadful dictators known to human history” (p. 231; who this dictator was, is not revealed). The “yahad-people . . . were not ashamed” “to claim for themselves the name ‘Yisrael’” (p. 231) and “under the disguise of the arrogant name, ‘Together’, a pedantic class society was concealed and an education in corpse-like obedience” (Kadavergehorsam) (p. 232). It is therefore not surprising that this “individualistic” and “egocentric” sect was overtaken by the fate it deserved: “The ‘Together’ disappeared, the dreams dispersed, and not a trace is preserved in Israel’s literature of the doctrine of yahad. That was the end of their solicitude for their purity and their separation from evildoers, that was what they now had from erecting these dividing-walls . . .” (p. 233). These quotations speak for themselves.

A further more fundamental drawback is the book’s method. Texts and quotations are jumbled together without historical or source-critical differentiation; the guiding criteria are not historical or literary vantage-points but the higher systematic reflections of the author. Rabbinic literature is continually and without further substantiation divided into “earlier” and “later”. Thus “an unknown midrash from a later collection” is cited on p. 95 without reference to the source; and Seder Eliyahu Rabba is said to be not only “particularly near to the heartbeat of Jewish thought” (p. 96; i.e., because it develops a marked teaching on solidarity) but to originate from the third century (because, according to S. Safrai, it quotes no Amoraim; p. 123 with note 23a). Texts which are analysed more precisely bristle with subjective and unfounded opinions. In the legend of Zechariah — an exhaustive analysis of which was published in 1974, (Josef Heinemann, Aggadot we-Toledotehen, Jerusalem, pp. 31ff.), but is not taken into consideration here, Zechariah is identified as Jesus. And the Babylonian version of the story of the suffering of R. Eleazar is unmasked as “a striking process of falsification” (pp. 181 ff), in which the redactor’s intention is to debase, “for undiscoverable reasons”, the merit of R. Jehuda ha-Nasi: the anti-Palestinian tendencies of the Babylonian Talmud seem not to occur to the author.

It is therefore not surprising that in addition Dr. Rosenzweig’s historical judgements reflect a fundamentalist-traditionalist standpoint (a first taste of it is provided in the chronological table, pp. XVIff). For her, the rabbis are firmly outlined historical personalities (frequently characterized as “thinkers”) whose biographical dates are moreover known. The tradition of the schoolchildren of Bethar, narrated by R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, is needless to say an “autobiographical story” (p. 40); and R. Akiba not only lent Bar Kokhba the “prestige of the title of Messiah”; he thereby bore “the chief responsibility for the horrible catastrophe of Bethar” (p. 161). Finally, for the biography of Yohanan b. Zakkai, “instead of all the evidence” (p. 50) a quotation is taken from J. Neusner’s “Life of Rabban Yohanan Ben Zakkai” in the first edition of 1962, which has in the meantime not only been fully revised, but from which Neusner has explicitly dissociated himself (cf. J. Neusner,

This should be enough by way of illustration: and I forgo mention of the numerous inaccuracies and oddities in the bibliographical references, to say nothing of the many printing errors. It is very difficult to do justice to a book such as this, but with all the author's positive knowledge and insight, a negative impression dominates. Much is intuitively correct, but taken as a whole the work is not a scholarly contribution but a very arbitrary, frequently irrelevant, and methodically unconsidered, philosophical-theological treatment of the problem of solidarity in Judaism.

Peter Schäfer


The *Cave of Treasures*, a Christianized retelling of biblical history from Creation to Pentecost somewhat in the style of Jubilees, is one of the more intriguing products of early Syriac literature. Preserved in Syriac only in late East Syrian manuscripts (often falsely attributed to Ephrem), its comparatively early date is assured by the fact that it is quoted by a number of West Syrian writers from the sixth century onwards. According to Götze, the only scholar to have made a detailed study of the work and its transmission, its core probably goes back to the fourth century and represents the product of a Jewish Christian, perhaps with Ebionite connections; among its main sources must have been the Jewish Adam and Eve literature, now largely lost.

The authors of the present work are primarily interested in the *Cave of Treasures* in view of the traditions it contains concerning Golgotha and its identification with Moriah. For reasons never stated, the two authors have preferred to work, not from the Syriac original, but from the secondary Arabic translation of the book and related derivative literature. Their study thus offers the following amalgam:

1. An introduction concerning the Golgotha traditions in the *Cave of Treasures*, the *Gadla Adam* or *Conflict of Adam and Eve* (surviving only in Ethiopic), and the Ethiopic translation of the Arabic form of the *Cave of Treasures* which is incorporated into Book 1 of the *Qlementos*, in this chapter entitled *Il libro delle rivelazioni*.

2. A translation of the *Book of the Rolls* (the older recension of the Arabic translation of the *Cave of Treasures*, edited by M. D. Gibson in *Studia Sinaitica* VIII, 1901); the work is here rather confusingly also given the title *Il libro delle rivelazioni*.

3. A translation of the end of Bezold's edition of another recension of the Arabic translation of the *Cave of Treasures*.

4. Translations of various short extracts: the beginning of a Cambridge manuscript of the Arabic translation of the *Cave of Treasures* (also published by Gibson), excerpts attributed to Hippolytus taken from the Arabic Pentateuch Catena edited by de Lagarde, and excerpts from the Arabic chroniclers Eutychius and Agapius.

5. 27 pages of notes on the translations.

6. Indices.