The book concludes with two Appendices, the first devoted to the Literary Form of the Halakhah, the second to traditional responses to the problem of the mamzer.

Within the scholarly community, those who are open to an historical approach to Jewish law will not find much that is new in this book, and those outside the scholarly community who are resistant to such an approach will not be convinced by it.

B. S. Jackson


Unlike the Babylonian Talmud, the Palestinian Talmud never attained a continuing tradition of interpretation over the generations. Nor did it come down to us in more than one fairly complete manuscript, that at Leyden which formed the basis of the first printed edition, Venice, 1524. Neither of these is free from frequent corruptions of text, which make for added difficulty in fathoming the concise and often abstruse language of this Talmud. It is only in fairly recent times that the Palestinian Talmud has begun to come into its own again, and in our own day especially through the remarkable contributions made to its understanding by the great Saul Lieberman, thoroughly knowledgeable in every aspect of Talmudic and Rabbinic literature as well as in the Hellenistic literature of the period. For expositors and scholars who do not have a complete recall of this Talmud, this concordance will be an invaluable blessing.

What is essentially "modern" in this concordance is its use of the computer. The particular system was worked out by Moshe Kosovsky himself, consulting, however, with Dr. Kenneth M. King of the Watson Laboratory at Columbia University. It is not all computer work, however. The computer indeed arranged close to a million cards in alphabetical order of roots and key-words. But these had to be arranged in their grammatical order within the individual entries by hand, with the addition of definitions based on the different meanings and usages of a word according to context. Where there is a corrupt text, however, no computer can really help, and here the compiler of the concordance has to use his own resources—which in this case he has done exceedingly well—to try to establish a correct reading, albeit not eliminating the corrupt form from the concordance itself.

Although more than two decades have elapsed since Kosovsky applied himself exclusively to this work, the completion of the envisaged ten-
volume compilation is not very far away, since most of the content has already been arranged. Upon completion, the concordance will have three sections. The first, of which the first three volumes are a part, is a thesaurus of language—a complete vocabulary of the text, together with citations from all the relevant passages. The lexical units are indexed in alphabetical and grammatical order of radicals (verbs and pseudo-verbs). One of the prime contributions of Kosovsky here is his wide range of definition. His arrangement of main lemmas and subsidiary entries sharply marked make reference easy. Proper contexts are easily noted and these are often enough for providing a proper understanding of a particular word or phrase.

The second section of the completed concordance—already in the final stages of press—will be a thesaurus of proper names, an onomasticon comprising all names of individuals and localities occurring in the Palestinian Talmud. The third section will be a thesaurus of biblical midrashim containing all the verses and even single words of the Bible to be found in the Palestinian Talmud connected to both halakhic and aggadic midrashim. Where these differ from the Masoretic text, an asterisk will denote such. The arrangement will be according to the biblical order (book, chapter, verse) with the corresponding talmudic reference. This section will prove to be a real boon to biblical scholars as well.

The language of the Palestinian Talmud is primarily a phonetic transcription of Galilean Aramaic. Thus words and phrases are sometimes hard to fathom. For example, the phrase lama lenan marin is really only a shortened phonetic form of lama leth anan amrin ("why do we not say?"). Often two separate words have been wrongly printed as one word, and ingenuity is often required to make the separation, although, admittedly, this may be subjective. For example, with reference to the story of the Babylonian exilarch Huna brought for burial in Palestine, the explanation for his being placed in the same burial cave with the great rabbi Hiyya is thus put in the Palestinian Talmud: De-hu min didhon ("that he is of them"), Kilayim 32b). Or alternatively: De-hu min dorhon "that he is of their generation", as in Ketuboth 35a. This is usually interpreted to mean that since both the exilarch and Rabbi Hiyya were native Babylonians, their burial together seems proper. Kosovsky here feels that this explanation is not convincing and attempts to find the original phrase by seeing two separate words in didhon. Kosovsky reads therefore De-hu min David ("for he is of David"), since Davidic descent is attributed to both. Hon, according to Kosovsky, belongs to the following phrase havon amrin ("They were saying").

The importance of this concordance cannot be exaggerated. The concordance is based upon the first edition (Venice, 1524) only. This edition is primarily that of the Leiden manuscript, the only complete ms. to the Palestinian Talmud. The concordance would have been enhanced by