using later rabbinic texts only to show the development of a certain idea or is projecting into the earliest Palestinian texts ideas that only appear clearly in post-gaonic material. Generally speaking P. F. seems to consider all post-mishnaic material as a block, failing to apply to the later texts the same rigorous approach he uses for the targumic materials. But these are perhaps unavoidable pitfalls in this kind of work, and in no way diminish the value of the book, a most welcome addition to the growing field of targumic studies, that will prove as useful for NT scholars as it is for the targumic specialist).

F. García Martínez

K. E. Grözinger, Ich bin der Herr, dein Gott. Eine rabbinische Homilie zum ersten Gebot (PesR 20) (Frankfurter Judaistische Studiën, herausgegeben von A. Goldberg, Band 2), Herbert Lang, Bern - Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M 1976, x, 306 pp. (According to the introduction by the editor of the FJS, A. Goldberg, this is the first of a series of monographs on Pesiqta Rabbati; their purpose is to examine these rabbinic homilies by using the traditionsgeschichtliche method and formal analysis. In addition the monographs serve as preliminary investigations for a critical edition of Pesiqta Rabbati, including a translation and short commentaries. The subject here is PesR 20 (ed. Friedmann 94b-98b). The book consists of introductory sections, translation with notes about the text, variant readings, and other textual problems, analytic and synthetic commentaries, concluding remarks, bibliography and indexes, and a Hebrew section containing the text of the parashah and some parallel texts. The text is that of ms Casanatense 3324 (cf. Pesiqta deRav Kahana, ed. Mandelbaum, I, pp. 9*-10*) with variants from ms Parma 3122 (1240) and the editio princeps (Prague); ms Cas is dated to the second half of the fourteenth century, according to the colophons (which, however, seem to be falsifications; cf. PdRK ed. Mandelbaum, l.c.). The most interesting parallel text is a large extract from Oxford ms Bodl. Or. 135, never published before, copied from the source of this passage in PesR, if not from PesR itself.

The first section describes the method used in G's commentary and its objective, i.e. the comparison of each unit of tradition in this homily with its parallels in order to determine the original form and meaning of those units and their reuse and reinterpretation in later collections. By means of such a comprehensive inquiry into the units, one should reach a better evaluation of each motif and all the connotations it has assumed in the process of transmission; finally a better understanding of the homily as a whole and the relationship between its parts will result from this method. In the last section of the introduction G. justifies the structure of his commentary by describing the complicated composition of this homily in PesR, e.g. its use of well-known midrashim in a new context, its allusions to midrashim without citing them, and its combining of midrashim to adapt them to new trains of thought. The commentary is divided into two parts: first the analysis, which studies the traditions lying behind each part and every detail of the homily, to discover how and for what purpose these traditions are used by the composer; secondly the synthesis, which,
on the basis of this deeper understanding of the parts, aims at a better comprehension of the composition as a unity.

The description of this method of commenting upon midrashim sounds like the proclamation of a new programme, and indeed, such detailed commentaries, extended systematically to a larger unit of midrash, are to be encouraged; for that reason the series should prove to be very interesting. As for the results, it can be said that this commentary on PesR 20 is carried out very thoroughly. In fact, a commentary on these lines should be very extensive; it is not enough to indicate the parallels—these texts need a commentary to explicate their mutual relations and the significance of each of the texts for the understanding of the others. So this commentary is not merely on a treatise of eight pages from the Pesiqta Rabbati, but covers a multitude of midrashic texts, many of them fully cited in translation (so the book is useful also for those who are not familiar with rabbinic Hebrew; nevertheless more texts might have been cited in their original language, especially those from less familiar works). Of course, with the amount of material scrutinized in this book, one may easily point out details which are not satisfactory. A case in point may be mentioned here, because it bears directly on the text of PesR 20: in § 11.8 (FRIEDMANN 98a, l. 1 ff.) the commentator tries to save the text by interchanging parts of it, but even then the results are not quite convincing. The most evident solution is to assume a gloss from bShabbat 88b, starting with “am(ar) R. Nahum...” (FRIEDMANN l.c., nn. 43-44 even considers the quotation of Job 26:9 as the beginning of the gloss; but the parallel in ms Oxford might argue for the retention of this verse and the removal of the following lines).

A more serious criticism can be raised concerning the lack of diachronic differentiation. There are very few observations about the temporal relations between the parallels, or about which stage in the historical process of transmission the parallels represent. Often it will be difficult to find convincing answers; nevertheless the questions have to be asked, and the argumentation may be useful to others who are tackling the same problems. This lack of interest in historical developments is most obvious in the concluding remarks; there, some significant traits of this homily are mentioned, e.g. the absence of tradents (even midrashim that are cited elsewhere in the name of tradents, are quoted anonymously here; the only exception is found in the gloss already noted); a style that is more similar to that of midrashic narrations of a later period; much material taken from mystical traditions, as well as a conspicuous number of themes not found elsewhere. From these striking features the writer does not draw the obvious conclusion, that the final redaction of this homily is very late. This assumption may be combined with the observation (p. 11-13), that this homily has been added to the Pesiqta—collection at a later period, inserted before Par. 21-24 (Parashat Mattan Torah). These parashiot in their turn might have replaced the original homily of Shavuoth; in the Genizah there are some remnants of what seems to be a Tanhuma-like pisqa on BaHodesh haShelishi, the original reading for Shavuoth. The writer himself also states that a homily on Ex. 20:2 is more likely to belong