

absent both from these pages and from the text as well is Y. R. Chao's essential 1930 monograph, already cited *supra*; perhaps this silence reflects the fact that the Chao analysis carefully documents phonetic and phonological details that, in turn, refute D's allegation that the language he is writing about is Lhasa Tibetan.

But there are many other less easily explained omissions as well, notably of works that D does cite in his text. Of the eight sources he cites by author and year of publication in note 3, p. 19, five (Clouston and Yoshitake 1929; Uray 1955a; Hoernle 1916; Laufer 1918; Thomas 1951) are missing from the bibliography; missing also is Nishida 1970, frequently cited in the text (e.g., p. 23) but never further identified. Japanese scholarship on Tibetan is treated especially shabbily. Inaba 1955 (p. 323) and Kitamura 1955b (p. 325) are both simply bogus; no such works have ever been published. Similarly bogus but in a different fashion is Satō 1963 (p. 340), a study of the history of a Ming-period ecclesiastical lineage not remotely concerned with the Tibetan language; and far too many of the romanizations of Japanese book- and article titles are garbled to admit of correction here, even in the cases where the works cited do actually exist.

European-language citations fare almost as badly: for *slokas* and *Sambhota* (p. 308) read *ślokas* and *Sambhoṭa*; for de Kőrös (pp. 313, 331) read de Kőrös; for *a l'histoire* (p. 308) read *à l'histoire*; for *missionnaires* (p. 315) read *missionaries*; for Soren (p. 316) read Søren; for Andras (pp. 338–39) read András; for *Tibetskago* (p. 340) read *Tibetskogo*; for *Graf* (p. 349) read *Gróf*; etc., etc. A curious scrambling of the dialect-names in the title (p. 324) of Chin P'eng 1958 ("Lhasa, Chamdo, Shigatse," where the monograph has "Lhasa, Shigatse, Chamdo") makes one doubt that the study in question was actually placed under contribution. So also for the abruptly truncated listing (p. 345) of Simonsson 1957: D might have avoided his embarrassingly naïve morpheme-by-morpheme glossing of *sangs.rgyas* 'Bud-dha' as 'purify-vast' (p. 90) by consulting pp. 265–66 of Simonsson, who there demonstrated how, ever since its ninth-century coinage, this compound has been understood as meaning 'der Erwachte-Aufgeblühte'. And even when earlier literature is correctly identified, the way it is cited in the text generally makes it clear that it is mostly only being cited but has not been read, since the citations are often alleged to support just the opposite of what the earlier author says (e.g., pp. 35, 44 with note 16).

The SOAS series editors boast that this volume is "reliable and up-to-date"; the publisher claims that it has "a comprehensive bibliography." Neither allegation is true. Had General Motors put out a product like this, the company would now be busy issuing a general recall for repairs. SOAS and Benjamins ought to do the same.

ROY ANDREW MILLER

HONOLULU

Mishnah and Tosefta: A Synoptic Comparison of the Tractates Berakhot and Shebiit. By ALBERDINA HOUTMAN. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, vol. 59. Tübingen: J. C. B. MOHR (PAUL SIEBECK), 1997. Pp. xv + 255, illustrations. DM 198.

Mishnah and Tosefta: A Synoptic Comparison of the Tractates Berakhot and Shebiit. Appendix Volume, Synopsis of Tosefta and Mishnah Berakhot and Shebiit. By ALBERDINA HOUTMAN. Tübingen: J. C. B. MOHR (PAUL SIEBECK), 1996. Pp. iv + 92.

Very few critical problems in the study of Tannaitic literature have elicited so many differing and contradictory conclusions as that of the relationship between Mishna and Tosefta. It almost seems a natural assumption that a truly critical study of this relationship depends, first of all, upon at least a representative, if not complete, synopsis of Mishna and Tosefta. It is surprising that scholars who have worked on this problem have hardly attempted to present such a synopsis. Alberdina Houtman has indeed made a most welcome contribution by presenting us with a complete synoptic comparison of two unrelated tractates of the First Order: Berakhot and Shebiit. This indeed is a breakthrough, for only scattered discussions have appeared heretofore. What is more, she gives the Hebrew text according to the best available manuscripts, that of Kaufman for the Mishna and that of Vienna for the Tosefta. Most important of all, she has done something entirely new, and only possible in our age, developing a user-friendly and multi-functional computer program for the preparation of her synopsis.

As the preparation of a computerized synopsis is what is completely new here, a short description of how it was organized is in place. It goes without saying that high intelligence and versatility are the prerequisites for such a program. Houtman devotes an entire chapter of her work to the role of the computer in the preparation of the texts. Although her work was made easier by use of the ChiWriter Hebrew word-processing program and the digitalized data from work already done at the Hebrew Language Academy in Jerusalem, there was a tremendous amount of original input, the details of which cannot be elaborated on here, all carefully thought out before the synopsis reached completion. This took a tremendous amount of time, perhaps even more than that required for preparing a synopsis without the use of a computer. Was it worthwhile?

Houtman argues that the time invested in entering the material in the computer and the development of appropriate programs was indeed justified when one considers the ultimate gain. The material can be used for other purposes as well, especially in the preparation of a critical edition. The system designed for these two tractates of Mishna and Tosefta can also be reused for other tractates and possibly even for the halakhic midrashim. Certainly, such a program has opened up new vistas, especially as it permits several approaches to a problem if one changes the parameters and reprograms.

In addition to the computer angle, other aspects of Houtman's attempt to break fresh ground in comparative Mishna-Tosefta study are also refreshingly innovative. She feels that it is important to examine the Mishna and Tosefta as autonomous literary productions (p. 6). To emphasize this approach she discusses the Tosefta before the Mishna "to avoid the impression that I join the majority in their preferential treatment of the Mishnah" (n. 22). Almost all scholars, with the well-known exception of Zuckerman, have taken the Mishna as the starting point in their study of the Tosefta. Houtman's aim is "to look at the relationship from both sides" (p. 220). Her procedure "consists of a detailed literary and topical analysis of the tractates in both corpora on the assumption that they are independent literary productions." The role of the computer at this stage is invaluable, not only in the analysis of word frequency and the like, but in the actual compilation of the synopsis.

Houtman presents the full corpora, without change, in parallel columns in the order of the mishnayot and halakhot. Where parallelism is not in accord because of different arrangements in the corpora, Houtman indicates this by adding the parallel in small type opposite the Mishna or Tosefta in their running order. These repetitions create a double synopsis—one with the Mishna as running text and one with the Tosefta. This works out well in tractates like Berakhot and Shebiit where the arrangement of topics in Mishna and Tosefta is similar. In the great majority of tractates, however, the arrangement of topics may differ sharply, and it seems questionable whether this type of presentation is the best.

Why this attempt to present the Tosefta as a possible autonomous compilation? A review of past critical research will help make this clear. A very interesting and important part of Houtman's book is in the introductory chapter, "Methodology," where she takes up the "History of Research." In a concise but full exposition she traces the various theories which have emerged, beginning with the historical inquiry of Sherira Gaon, continuing with the literary approaches of later medieval writers, and concluding with the critical approach of the "moderns" over the past two centuries: Frankel, I. H. Weiss, Zuckerman, Hoffman, Schwartz, Alexander Guttman, De Vries, Epstein, Albeck, and several contemporary scholars. Her summaries of the hypotheses of each individual are perhaps the best I have seen in such concise form.

Although critical, she highlights those elements in each approach which might fit in the work of modern scholars. In this respect, I found most interesting her very sympathetic exposition of the bold thesis expounded by Moses Samuel Zuckerman, who argued that the Tosefta was the original Palestinian Mishna, whereas what we call the Mishna is a consequence of a modified Babylonian tradition. According to Zuckerman, this resulted in a Babylonian substitution of parallel passages in the original Palestinian Mishna. What was left of the original Palestinian Mishna came to be called the Tosefta. At the time it was

proposed, this revolutionary theory took the dilettante literary world, including the great Hebrew poet Bialik, by storm. Today this theory and Zuckerman's "proofs" have been entirely discarded. Yet this man of "ideas" has a particular fascination for Houtman. She seems to have read most of what he wrote and succeeds, in my opinion, in justifying a more positive appraisal of the work of Zuckerman than is now current.

It is this fascination, I believe, that has spurred Houtman's attempt to see the Tosefta as an autonomous compilation. What Zuckerman succeeded in doing, although this was not his primary intention, was to show the importance of the Palestinian Talmud in any discussion of the Tosefta. This is a most natural conclusion. When one opens the Palestinian Talmud one often finds the complete Tosefta parallel placed in the Gemara right after the Mishna. This may be seen in a tractate like Berakhot, and especially in the "Three Gates" in the Order Nizikin, where almost four-fifths of the "Gemara" is Tosefta, the sugya hardly playing a role. One begins to view the Mishna and Tosefta as a unified compilation, with no special priority given to the Mishna.

Moreover, J. N. Epstein, the outstanding talmudic scholar of the past generation, sees in the different arrangement of the halakhot in the Tosefta a remnant of the arrangement of a prior Mishna, "an arrangement more primary and more logical" than that of the mishnayot in our present Mishna (*Introduction to Tannaitic Literature*, p. 257). More recently, the first-rate contemporary scholar S. Friedman has tried to show that the Tosefta preserves the original formulation of many a Mishna. No wonder then that Houtman considers the possibility that the Tosefta is an autonomous compilation. Does she succeed in demonstrating this?

Although Houtman prefers to see the Tosefta as an autonomous compilation, possibly even preserving more primary formulations, she admits that no absolute proof exists. My own view as expressed in much of my writing over the past half-century is that the Tosefta may be considered autonomous only as far as principles of editing are concerned. Its basic character, however, is that of a companion to the Mishna, partly as a commentary but more importantly as a supplement. Its function is essentially similar to that of later layers of the Mishna with references to earlier ones. Just as secondary and tertiary layers of the Mishna comment on and supplement earlier layers, so does the Tosefta, except that it comments on and supplements the last layer of the Mishna itself. Tosefta halakhot which comment on the first layer of the Mishna (first-generation teaching) could just as easily have found their way into the Mishna, but limitations on the size of the Mishna forced them into a companion compilation. "Tosefta" additions to the Mishna do not necessarily have to be in the same tractate. I have shown that "Tosefta" additions to the early historical tractate Tamid are to be found in Mishna Yoma, as well as in Tosefta Yoma ("Tosefta to the Tractate Tamid," *De Vries Memorial Volume* [Jerusalem, 1969], 18–42). Historical tractates like Tamid which have a great amount of first-generation teaching hardly have room in the

Mishna tractate itself for supplementary layers. These, therefore, find their way to other related tractates and to the Tosefta. Other tractates of the Mishna, often consisting only of the teachings of Rabbi Akiba and his pupils, will of necessity find their supplements in the Tosefta of the same tractate. This helps to explain, incidentally, why different tractates of the Mishna may seem to reflect differing Mishna-Tosefta relationships, and puts paid to attempts to theorize on essential differences between tractates.

In essence, there is no substantial difference between Mishna and Tosefta. What is Mishna could be Tosefta, and what is Tosefta could be Mishna. The difference is a matter of editing, as decided by the patriarch of each generation, whose prerogative it was to formulate the official Mishna for his time. It is uncritical to claim, as has been done, that the Tosefta consists of material unknown to the compiler of the Mishna, who would otherwise have included it. From the very beginning the Tosefta existed alongside the Mishna. The first layer of the Tosefta corresponds to the second layer of the Mishna, and the second layer of the Tosefta corresponds to the third layer of the Mishna.

This is the basic character of the Tosefta, but for the arrangement of the halakhot and the chapters of the tractate, the editor of the Tosefta is entirely independent, and the Tosefta takes on the appearance of an autonomous document. Editing a work carrying a great amount of material related only parenthetically to the Mishna requires its own rules of arrangement. Entirely different topics that have similar language formulations are placed together (a phenomenon not absent in the Mishna itself). Different topics in a single chapter of the Mishna may be divided into two separate chapters in the Tosefta.

Nor do parallel sentences in Mishna and Tosefta indicate a common earlier source upon which both drew, as posited by some scholars. These are almost always headings of a topic that the Tosefta takes over word for word from the Mishna.

The preceding paragraphs are not meant to minimize the great contribution that Houtman has made to the understanding of the Mishna-Tosefta relationship, even where one may differ with her conclusions. This is a praiseworthy critical work. In addition to her own competence, she rightfully acknowledges the help given by her teachers and "promoters" who, although not necessarily working in the field of rabbinic study, are recognized for their contribution to critical research, especially where substance cannot be separated from form. A correct understanding of substance depends upon a proper understanding of form.

I conclude with Houtman's own words on her research, that "the computer must be clearly instructed (programmed) on what to search for and how to find it. In other words, one must develop heuristics appropriate to the desired selection" (p. 23).

ABRAHAM GOLDBERG

HEBREW UNIVERSITY

Syntax and Semantics: Studies in Biblical and Modern Hebrew.

By ELIEZER RUBINSTEIN. Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects, vol. 9. Tel-Aviv: THE CHAIM ROSENBERG SCHOOL OF JEWISH STUDIES, 1998. Pp. xvi + 287 + 59.

From his graduation as a Ph.D. in 1968 until his premature death in 1989, Eliezer Rubinstein taught at the Department of Hebrew Linguistics in Tel-Aviv University. He was one of the most prominent Hebraists in Israel and mentored many students. He wrote three books and thirty-six articles, some of which were not published until after his death.¹ His contributions as a scholar and a teacher have been recognized by a 1995 *Festschrift* edited by his colleagues, Aron Dotan and Abraham Tal,² and now by this memorial volume, edited by two of his prominent students, Esther Borochofsky and Penina Trommer.

Borochofsky and Trommer have collected all of Rubinstein's articles and gathered them into one volume. This work had been scattered among various journals and books. The English articles, four in number, are presented in a separate section. The articles in Hebrew, thirty-two in number, are arranged according to four topics: (a) transparency of syntactic structure; (b) syntactic-semantic study of verb groups; (c) syntactic-semantic study of certain verbs; and (d) methodological discussions. The articles contain abundant information and meticulous insightful analyses of biblical and modern Hebrew expressions, especially verbs and verb phrases, which makes the book an asset for Hebraists interested in the Hebrew verb, whether or not they share Rubinstein's theoretical viewpoint.

In a Hebrew preface to this memorial collection, Aron Dotan, the editor of the series, indicates that the aim of gathering Rubinstein's articles together was twofold. First, the goal was to set a memorial to the man and his work, and second, to facilitate access to his work for scholars, teachers, and students of Hebrew, who might want to study it more profoundly and continue working within its framework.

The traditional study of the Hebrew language, especially biblical Hebrew, in Israeli universities is mainly philological, ignoring modern approaches to linguistics. Although Rubinstein was trained within the Israeli educational system, he was open to new approaches in general linguistics. The revolutionary "generative

¹ Eliezer Rubinstein. *The Nominal Sentence: A Study in the Syntax of Contemporary Hebrew* (Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House, 1968), *The Verb Phrase: A Study in the Syntax of Contemporary Hebrew* (Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House, 1971), *Contemporary Hebrew and Ancient Hebrew* (Tel-Aviv: Ministry of Defence, 1980), all in Hebrew.

² *Studies in Hebrew Language in Memory of Eliezer Rubinstein* (Tel-Aviv: The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, 1995).