two Talmud baraitot at all. In any event, Dr. Rengstorf, who fills up two pages of references to New Testament literature, in connection with the passage, might at least spare space for three more words and refer to Yeb. 63b. The Talmud, it is true, is later than the New Testament. But the tannaitic sources quoted in the Talmud may be as old as the New Testament, if not older!

Similarly, the paragraph divisions follow no definite, unifying principle.

On p. 46, line 6, the phrase יִת לְעֵין is most likely a corrupt reading for יִתְנָה הַתָּה, and should come in the previous line after the word הַתָּה. Cf. Deut. 22.29.

On p. 22, line 19, for התוּחַ, read התוּחַ. Students of rabbinic literature will look forward to the appearance of the remaining installments of the work.

**TOSEFTA TOHAROT**

The work of Dr. Walter Windfuhr is an additional installment of a critical text of the Tosefta, based on the Erfurt and Vienna Mss., as well as the printed text of the first edition of Alfasi. It covers about three and a half chapters of the Hebrew text of Kelim Baba Ḳamma, and five and a half chapters of the translation.

The treatise Kelim in the Mishna and in the Tosefta deals chiefly with the rules in Lev. 11.32 et seq., Num. 19.14 et seq. and 31.20 et seq. In the Tosefta the treatise Kelim, probably because of its size, is divided into three parts (babot), comprising twenty-five chapters in all.

In the preface, Dr. Windfuhr describes briefly the important terms found in the treatise, as well as the biblical sources of the fundamental laws implied by such terms. Additional explanations are given in the footnotes to the translation. The variants are placed below the Hebrew text.

There is a very striking similarity between the Mishna and the Tosefta Kelim, which our author, however, failed to indicate. In the

---

Mishna, the first chapter gives general rules and principles of various kinds of unclean objects and uncleanliness. The discussions concerning the laws of uncleanliness of utensils start with the second chapter. In the first chapter of the Tosefta of that treatise, we have likewise a series of rules regarding the unclean in general. The second chapter starts the discussion concerning kelim. Nevertheless, the first paragraphs in the first chapter of the Tosefta, each beginning with the expression ilmn, and thus forming a layer by itself, may be older than the Mishna.

The explanation of nlrmn = נלומשא and n;wrm plirn (p. 41, note 5) is quite correct. But the author should have added the fact that the degrees of uncleanliness are sometimes extended in form of l’w mr’nl, nrKDt1, and even rDm1i ,י’in. See Mishna Toharot ch. 2, and Talmud Shab. 14a.

The second installment covers the rest of the text and translation of Kelim Baba Ḳamma and about five chapters of the Hebrew text and three chapters of the translation of Kelim Baba Mezi’a. In the Preface to the translation of Baba Mezi’a, the editor gives an interesting outline of the underlying principles of that section. The notes explain carefully the Greek terms found in the text; and contain allusions to later rabbinic sources, including corrections by Elijah Gaon of Wilna.

Dr. Windfuhr’s statement that *rnrnm, the wife of R. Meir, actually participated in academic discussions (p. 64, note 24) is questionable. In B. M. 1.6 (p. 33, Hebrew), lpsin ‘n and the ‘nn argue whether a קולומשא or מסא קולומשא speaks there of the laws of the络. For, it is well known that ר’ התרסי remembered a number of traditions from her martyred father, ר’ התרסי. She and her brother tried to transmit such traditions to the scholars of the period (see Tosefta Kelim, B. Ḳ., ch. 4, sec. 17, ed Zuckermandel; compare also Pesahim 62b).

The editor is to be congratulated on his successful work in the field of tannaitic literature.

MICHAEL HIGGER

New York