

emulation of Mesopotamian cultural expression by local elites. Meanwhile, the lack of Mesopotamian influence in more humble artifacts might be viewed as conscious resistance by non-elites or simply as lack of opportunity. By the definition of "imagined ethnicity," there should be a more intense material and social expression of separate group membership when there is the greatest conflict between different groups; the reverse situation, encountered here, reinforces the theory that Elam had not yet coalesced. The situation becomes more complex with Akkadian political and bureaucratic takeover of the lowlands, contrasted by resistance in the highlands. Potts rightly points to evidence of contact with the Gulf and Indus Valley, a reminder that the well-documented domination by the west does not offer the entire story. The possibilities of a secondary state developing in the area in the Post-Akkad era, under the king Puzur-Inshushinak of Awan, are thoroughly discussed but dismissed. The local inception of "Elam" is instead identified with later kings of Shimashki, in reaction to Ur III southern Mesopotamian interference. But could it be as a delayed reaction to Akkadian meddling in the area that Elam did finally start down the road towards self-identification? Is the birth of a nation in this case the end of a trend or the result of an historic event?

The book seems to lose its thread a bit in the chapter on the late third millennium B.C. developments under the kings of Shimashki, moving from critical analysis to a more conventional recounting of political history. The Mesopotamian version of the Ur III kings' interaction with Elam is already complicated, and when the historical information from Shimashki is added, there is a slight tendency to bog down in details of conflicts and inter-dynastic marriages. Although this chapter was probably compelling to research and is meticulously written, the reader might be forgiven skipping to the conclusions and reconstructions of the political arrangement: federation, confederation, segmentary state, or Potts' own "segmentary federation." The remainder of the book moves us from Elam's political and cultural independence under the *sukkalmahs* through the Middle Elamite and Neo-Elamite periods, the Achaemenid, Seleucid and Parthian periods, and into the Sasanian era, when Elam survived as a province of the Nestorian church. Much of the discussion of the later periods also suffers from an emphasis on history at the expense of archaeology, though it is interesting to have the Elamite material filtered out from the overwhelming flood of Neo-Assyrian texts, for instance. The analysis of the tactics of Assyrian-Elamite campaigns and the opportunity to see such Elamite figures as Te-Umman in a more focussed light are very welcome. And the main themes of ethnic identity and conscious use of material culture are taken up once more in the Achaemenid section.

In contrast to the avowed purpose of the book, it is easy to come away with the feeling that Elam's assignment to a reactive periphery, rather than a pro-active core, may be correct.

This is despite strenuous argument against peripheral status in the concluding chapter and despite evidence for local manufacture and local styles in the archaeological record. Elam was certainly important, in all its many guises, and it avoided direct exploitation by the west to a great extent, but importance and even power do not rule out emulation and reaction, and the degree to which the *sukkalmahs* and later rulers modeled themselves on Mesopotamian rulers is revealing. And the generally Mesopotamian flavor of the late third through second millennium B.C. in architecture and building inscriptions through monumental art to cylinder seals is also notable, despite clearly independently derived structures at Haft Tepe and Choga Zanbil and the existence of local ceramic traditions.

Throughout, the book is provided with useful illustrations, charts, and sidebar tables bristling with facts. It succeeds in providing a useful and understandable synthesis of a large amount of complex data and begins to explore the difficult questions of presentation of ethnicity and what might be called "punctuated continuity." Despite the title and theme and some protestations in the conclusion, there is probably more discussion of textual material and political history than there is description of archaeological evidence, but the two aspects are integrated closely, and in this region we should not look at either in isolation.

AUGUSTA MCMAHON

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Introducing Tosefta: Textual, Intratextual and Intertextual Studies. Edited by HARRY FOX and TIRZAH MEACHAM. Hoboken, N.J.: KTAV PUBLISHING HOUSE, 1999. Pp. xix + 340. \$79.50.

The present volume originated in an April 1993 conference on the Tosefta held at the University of Toronto, and it has been presented as a memorial tribute to Mr. Manny Rotman, an elderly student of religion at the University of Toronto whose brief autobiographical memoir introduces the book.

The ten papers (including an introductory essay by H. Fox and a critical summary by T. Meacham) represent a cross-section of the questions that have been posed by rabbinic scholarship from at least as far back as Rav Sherira Ga'on's *Epistle* regarding such matters as: When and by whom was the Tosefta composed? What was its purpose, and how does it relate to the Mishnah? Is it the same work as the *Tosefta* that is mentioned in the Talmud (and ascribed to Rabbi Nehemiah)? Were the *Amora'im* in Palestine and Babylonia familiar with the Tosefta—and if so, why do the Talmuds so often ignore it, or cite it in different versions from the ones known to us? (This latter question has usually been directed at the Babylonian Talmud;

however, as demonstrated here by Meacham's study, it applies to the Palestinian as well.) These were questions that excited the nineteenth-century pioneers of academic Rabbinic studies, but which failed to find satisfactory answers, as becomes clear in R. Zeidman's analytical and critical survey of previous scholarship. Though a few of the essays (e.g., those by H. Bassler and P. Heger) are devoted to the exegesis of specific texts, most of the contributors to the collection have taken on larger redactional and methodological issues. As several of the authors in this volume are aware, research into the "higher criticism" of the Tosefta was put on hold pending the completion of S. Lieberman's definitive edition and commentary, which he did not complete before his death in 1983, and which did not result in any substantial programmatic conclusions relating to the questions listed above.

Reading the papers in this volume, one is constantly made aware of the changed vocabulary of the discourse, as the older conceptual terminology, largely modeled after that of classical philology, yields to the language of post-modern cultural and literary studies, with a strong dose of interdisciplinary inspiration. Thus, J. Hauptman applies feminist perspectives in comparing the Toseftan positions on women's rights of inheritance to other rabbinic treatments of the topic; H. Fox focuses on intertextuality and intratextuality; Zeidman uses a model of counterpoint; etc. Not all these methodological innovations are equally successful in shedding light on the old scholarly conundrums.

The diversity of methodological approaches sometimes serves to underscore major differences between the respective authors when dealing with similar problems. To take an extreme example, J. Neusner and S. Friedman both contribute papers that deal with the role of the Tosefta as a commentary on the Mishnah, each based on a selection of sample texts. And yet the contrast between the studies could hardly be greater. Neusner's curious essay, which lacks even minimal scholarly annotation, deals with the question in the most general terms, filling the pages with lengthy translated texts for which no philological or exegetical analysis is provided; and in the end teaching us little more than the glaringly obvious: that Tosefta follows the order of the Mishnah. On the other hand, Friedman's essay (an English adaptation of a seminal paper previously presented in Hebrew), through its meticulous examination of the content and language of his texts, arrives at the novel, but eminently persuasive, insight that the Tosefta preserves earlier forms of the sources that were subsequently rearranged and reworded by the redactor of the Mishnah. This thesis marks a major departure from the earlier scholarly consensus, which saw the Mishnah as presenting the most pristine form of the traditions. It also provides us with valuable glimpses into the "workshop" of Rabbi Judah Hannasi and what was involved in the process of redacting the Mishnah.

On the whole, Friedman's distinction between the study of the final product and the study of its individual components

provides a valuable model that can, in my opinion, be applied profitably to other questions. Thus, Y. Elman's paper deals largely with the question of the Babylonian Talmud's inconsistencies in citing the Tosefta, leading him to some intriguing differentiations between oral and written transmission processes. Insofar as his evidence for written transmission during the Talmudic period is based on linguistic typologies and the nature of the manuscript variants, his conclusions (which run contrary to virtually all of the explicit testimonies in the ancient texts themselves) are open to question. No one would deny that the Tosefta, like most ancient documents, was transmitted in manuscript form for centuries before reaching the earliest surviving manuscripts, and hence that it was subject to all the vagaries of that process. It would appear that a proper elucidation of this issue would require us to take into consideration the distinction that has become so fundamental to current Talmudic research, between the statements of the named *Amora'im* and the uses to which they were put by the anonymous redactional strata. As applied to the question of Amoraic familiarity with the Tosefta, this would suggest a hypothesis such as the following (which, of course, remains to be tested): though many *Amora'im* were familiar with the Tosefta, the later redactors no longer had access to it, and hence its traces are only implicitly suggested in the final version of Talmud.

This collection can serve as a representative summary of current research in Tosefta studies, and deserves a place in any academic library. Its usefulness is enhanced by a source index and a centralized bibliography.

ELIEZER SEGAL

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Definitely: Egyptian Literature. Proceedings of the Symposium "Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms," Los Angeles, March 24–26, 1995 Edited by GERALD MOERS. *Lingua Aegyptiaca. Studia Monographica*, vol. 2. Göttingen: SEMINAR FÜR ÄGYPTOLOGIE UND KOPTOLOGIE, 1999. Pp. x + 140. DM 72.

The authors of this volume present different characterizations of the literary character of Egyptian texts. Several earlier works provide the frame for this discussion. Posener,¹ for example, was the first to define literary texts as a coherent category. There is agreement that Fecht's² work on metrical theory

¹ G. Posener, *Littérature et politique dans l'Égypte de la XII^e dynastie* (Paris, 1956).

² G. Fecht, *Der Vorwurf an Gott in den "Mahnworten der Ipuwer"* (Berlin, 1972).