

the basic correlations and their interpretations are convincing, there is a built-in bias towards eliminating most apparent exceptions. Considerations of ambiguity and free order enter in here as well as the need for restraint in view of the probability that further investigation will both extend and refine the understandings achieved.

The potential of the model to deal with higher structural units as well as with cultural context raises the critical question of the relationship of the linguistic approach to form and style criticism (e.g., W. Richter's studies of Judges). The problem is implicit in Andersen's discussion of many individual texts where his interpretations differ from those given in form-critical or stylistic studies. We must resort neither to reductionism nor to a hierarchism which declares one approach to be most highly valued. The model of T. Parsons (e.g., in *Societies*) and J. Greenberg's comments on "higher level explanations" (in *Anthropological Linguistics*) may provide insights for dealing with problems encountered when different levels of explanation are applied to common subject matter.

W. MALCOLM CLARK

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY, 08540

Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, by Jacob Ben Chajim Ibn Adonijah, and *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, by Elias Levita; Hebrew texts, with English translation and explanatory notes by C. D. Ginsburg; with a prolegomenon by Norman H. Snaith. New York: KTAV, 1968. Pp. xxxvi+91; viii+307. \$14.95.

Our cumulative knowledge of masoretic traditions has grown considerably since the publication of Ben Ḥayyim's (ca. 1470–1537) *Introduction* in 1525 and Levita's (1469–1549) *Massoreth* in 1538. Yet almost 450 years after the appearance of their first editions, both studies retain much of their freshness and provide useful information for the modern scholar. While portions of these treatises are now mostly of historical interest, the issues they raise (e.g., the canonization of Hebrew Scripture; the origin of the *qere-kethib*; the introduction of the vowel points; and the rise of the masorettes) are sober reminders of the numerous historical problems which remain unresolved despite the efforts of modern scholarship. Ktav's judicious decision to reissue in one volume Christian D. Ginsburg's annotated editions of the two classics (they appeared separately in 1867) is especially welcome. A rarity in most biblical libraries, scholars perforce neglected to consult the volumes. Indeed, during the last decade at least two biblical scholars have misrepresented Levita's *Massoreth* (see A. C. Sundberg, Jr., *The Old Testament of the Early Church* [1964], p. 12, who has confused the *Massoreth* with a grammatical treatise revised and annotated by Levita; cf. S. Sandmel, "A Symposium on the Canon of Scripture," *CBQ*, 28 [1966], p. 204, who designated the *Massoreth* a "work on canon," which it certainly is not).

Professor Snaith's prolegomenon, somewhat surprisingly, does not treat the more substantive issues raised by Ben Ḥayyim and Levita. Instead, it is primarily concerned with masoretic activity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. After broadly

(and wisely) defining "the Masorah" as "the whole corpus of masoretic notes found in the various manuscripts with all the contradictions and discrepancies" (p. xv), Snaith posits that Levita and Ben Ḥayyim initiated two distinct approaches to the masorah. The former's efforts culminated in the work of Heidenheim, Baer, and Wickes, while the latter's efforts culminated in the Kahle-Snaith-Hebrew University approach to the masorah. As Snaith sees it, the dichotomy is one of grammar vs. mss. The grammarians (Levita et al.) evaluate the mss in the light of previously established rules of grammar; the non-grammarians (Ben Ḥayyim et al.) are more concerned with mss than with grammatical rules. The goal of the non-grammarians is to identify authentic Ben Asher manuscripts and to use them as a "basis for the reconstruction of the true text of Ben Asher" (*sic*, p. xxxvi).

While it is true that Levita was primarily a grammarian and that Ben Ḥayyim collated numerous masoretic mss, Snaith too easily identifies these scholars with schools of thought they neither originated nor espoused. Who is to judge how Levita or Ben Ḥayyim would have resolved a discrepancy between the דקדוקי הטעמים or Mishael b. Uzziel's חילופים and the mss? Nor is it at all certain that the Kahle-Snaith-Hebrew University approach is as uniform as Snaith makes it out to be (see, for example, M. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text," in A. Altmann, ed., *Biblical and Other Studies* [1963], pp. 79–122).

A discussion of the *cause célèbre* initiated by Levita's *Massoreth*, to wit, the Christian and Jewish debates concerning the antiquity of the vowel points, would have enhanced the prolegomenon. The Jewish debate peaked in the latter half of the nineteenth century with the appearance of S. D. Luzzatto's *ויכוח על חכמת הקבלה* (Gorice, 1852); S. Pinsker's *מבוא אל הנקוד האשורי* (Vienna, 1863); and J. Bachrach's *היחש לכתב האשורי* (Warsaw, 1854) and *אשחורלות עם שד"ל* (2 vols., Warsaw, 1896). For the Christian debate, see Ginsburg's discussion in his preface to the *Massoreth*, pp. 44–61. Despite the summaries in recent encyclopedias, the last word has not been said; a definitive study of the rabbinic and extra-rabbinic evidence bearing on the date of introduction of the vowel points remains a scholarly desideratum.

Mention might also have been made of G. E. Weil's *Élie Lévi Humaniste et Massorète* (Leiden, 1963) which now supersedes C. D. Ginsburg's biographical study of Levita included in his preface to the *Massoreth*.

SHNAYER Z. LEIMAN

YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, 06520

Early Travels in Palestine, ed. by Thomas Wright. New York: KTAV, 1968. Pp. xxxi + 517. \$10.

Here we have another useful reprint from the house of KTAV. The book was originally published in 1848; it has long been out of print, but is still needed because