



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that language at all, will find here the essence of M. Kokoftsof's Russian monograph. It is scarcely necessary to mention that the text taken from unique fragments often requires emendations; these are, however, duly indicated in the notes: here we find also the references to Biblical passages explained by ibn Barûn. We hope that our young and able Semitist and excellent grammarian will give us soon, in the second part of this collection, other unique texts, grammatical as well as lexicographical, which are abundant in the second Fir-kowitz collection.

Another important essay on the well-known grammarian and commentator, Judah ben Balâm (a predecessor of ibn Barûn, who quotes him), by Dr. Solomon Fuchs, the able editor of the Hebrew monthly with the title of *החוקר*, has appeared (*Studien über Abu Zakaria Jahja (R. Jehuda) ibn Balâm*; Berlin, 1893; Part I.). We have already noticed Dr. Fuchs' just remark that many of Judah's treatises on the Particles were inscribed by a copyist into Abul Walid's lexicon (*ha-Hoqer* I., p. 121, *sqq.*). When the present essay is completed we shall gladly lay the result before our readers. At present we may only mention that Dr. Fuchs is one of the growing authorities in Hebrew-Arabic literature, and, above all, a great enthusiast for this branch of Jewish learning; he certainly deserves the attention of the Jewish public, who should try to help him to continue his monthly, to which eminent men like A. Epstein, Dr. Harkavy, Herr Halberstam, Professor Kaufmann, and others contribute.

A. NEUBAUER.

Two Monographs by Dr. M. Gaster.

I. *מגלת בני חשמונאי* *The Scroll of the Hasmonæans.* (Extract from the Transactions of the Oriental Congress, London, 1891, vol. ii.)

Besides the first and second books of the Maccabees, which are now accessible only in Greek, there exists a small chronicle in later Hebrew, usually entitled the Scroll of Antiochos (*מגלת אנטיוכוס*).

That this Hebrew text is based upon an original written in Aramaic, was long suspected; and although existing in many MSS., this text was not published before 1851, from a MS. in the British Museum. It was followed by another edition from a MS. in the Town Library of Leipzig, in 1874; and a third appeared in 1877, by Dr. Jellinek, from a MS. in his possession. We have now before us a fourth

issue by the Rev. Dr. Gaster, a most critical edition, founded on the collection of many MS., and more especially some written in Yemen. In these last MSS., the title of our chronicle is מְנֻלָּת בְּנֵי הַשְּׂמֹנָאִי, divided into verses, of which the number varies in the MSS. The first mention of such a kind of chronicle is to be found in the *Halakhoth Gedoloth* (about 850 A.D.), and as it is known that this work is an amplification of the *Halakhoth*, attributed to Yehudai Gaon, who flourished about 750, Simeon Kayara might have found the quotation of our Chronicle in the work compiled about 750. Here the title is given מְנֻלָּת בֵּית הַשְּׂמֹנָאִי, "Scroll of the Family of the Hasmonæans," and it is said that it was written by the elder of the schools of Hillel and Shammai; but it passed not on to the generations (*i.e.*, it was not received with the same authority) as the five other scrolls. So Rapoport; Dr. Gaster translates, "Until now, it has not become (canonical, for all times), till there will be again a priest who would consult the *Oorim* and *Toomim*."¹ According to Zunz (*Gott. Vortraege*, p. 131, note 2 of the new edition), it means that the scroll written 100 years B.C., was considered lost 800 years later. From the words in the *Halakhoth Gedoloth*, however, it does not result that the scroll was lost at the time. Was this scroll written in Aramaic, and was it identical with our present text? We cannot say for certain, but it is most likely the case, although there is a slight difference in the title, *i.e.*, בֵּית for בְּנֵי. About a century later, we find R. Saadiah Gaon speaking of a "Scroll of the Sons of the Hasmonæans," written in Aramaic with vowel-points and accents, and divided into verses, from which he gives quotations found in our present text. Fortunately, nearly the whole of Saadiah's text is preserved partly in the Bodleian library, and partly in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, as we shall see later on.

It has been pointed out in the edition of 1851, and it is now made much clearer by Dr. Gaster, that our scroll is not derived from either of the books of the Maccabees, and that Judah is scarcely mentioned in Jewish sources; moreover, the records concerning Antiochus and his generals are passed in silence by the Talmud and Midrashim. On the other hand, the miracle concerning the flask of oil which lasted for eight days, which is mentioned in the Talmudic literature, occurs only in our scroll, and not at all in the two books of the Maccabees. Dr. Gaster says rightly as follows: "There must, therefore, be a good reason for this paucity of records, and for the complete ignoring of Judah and his brethren in a piece that was to form part of the Liturgy. The events of the past must either have

¹ Compare Nehemiah, vii. 65.

become obscured through causes which we have to find, or their record must have been purposely preserved in a form greatly at variance with that of the books of the Makkabæans." The real cause of neglecting the glorification of the Maccabæan heroes, is, according to Dr. Gaster, the hatred of the Pharisees for the Maccabæan family who usurped the royal title whilst being priests. He says: "Considering that the Pharisee was the popular party, and that the legal prescriptions, liturgical forms, and ceremonies are mostly institutions formed by them, one part of the mystery was cleared up. The staunch upholders of the Law would not canonise, if I may use that word, men like Alexander Jannai, and others whose death they celebrated as a festival, or introduce the name and memory of the Makkabæans, as they called themselves, in the history or in the liturgy of the nation. That explains to a certain extent, why the allusions to the Makkabæans are so scarce in the Talmud and the Midrash. This literature is that of the Pharisees, and the Makkabæans were their bitterest foes. The deliverance was due to divine intervention; but the persons chosen proved afterwards unworthy of the mission intrusted to them. The result of this feeling was, that instead of having an exact record of those remarkable times, all that we have is, but with one exception (1 Makkabees), a mixture of truth and fiction."

Does Dr. Gaster mean that the liturgy beginning with על הנסים, where there is such a meagre record of the heroic deeds of the Maccabæans, was composed by the Pharisees before the Aramaic Chronicle, which he ascribes, according to the passage of the *Halakhoth Gedoloth*, to the beginning of the common era; and, according to him, that must be the case with the passages found in the Talmud and the Midrashim concerning the wonderful Maccabæan battles? That is scarcely admissible. There seems to me some contradiction in Dr. Gaster's reasoning as to the date of the composition of our Chronicle by the elder of the schools of Hillel and Shammai. At this time, he says, "when the Hasmonæans belonged to the past, and their glorification could only tell against Herod, hated by all alike. It is to that period that I ascribe now the only connected description of the rise of the Hasmonæans, of the dedication of their Temple which has survived in its primitive Semitic form." Why then did the Pharisees not give a full account of the Maccabæan heroic deeds, since the hatred against them was forgotten? And why is our Chronicle not mentioned in the Talmud and Midrashim, if it had existed as early as the schools of Hillel and Shammai? It would seem that this date was given by Simeon Kayara in connection with the dispute between Hillel and Shammai concerning the lighting of

the Hanukah lights (Bab. T., Sabbath, fol. 21*v*), where Shammai begins with eight lights and descends to one, and Hillel begins with one and ascends to eight, and here the expression חנכה is already mentioned. That it is not mentioned in our Chronicle is therefore accidental, since the school at the time knew of this name for the Maccabæan feast. If the omission of this term in our Chronicle is an argument for its early date, then we shall have to accept Saadiah's view, who says that it was written by the Maccabees in Aramaic; and if the original of our Scroll was in this dialect, it proves its late date, for the early Apocrypha in general, written in a Semitic dialect, were written in a kind of Hebrew. Jerome knows of a Hebrew text of 1 Maccabees, and the enigmatic title of it mentioned by Origen seems to be composed of later Hebrew words (J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'Histoire . . . de la Palestine*, t. I., p. 450). It is true that Dr. Gaster inclines to uphold, against the general opinion, that the I. Maccabees was written originally in Aramaic, adding "of Tobit and Judith there can be no doubt that they were written in that dialect"; and he refers to the Oxford edition of Tobit (1878), and to a quotation of Nahmanides. The Oxford Tobit, however, is not the original of the Apocryphon, but the original on which Jerome based his Latin translation; and, on the other hand, the Aramaic texts mentioned by Nahmanides, are nothing else but a transcription of the Syriac, as can be seen from Bel and the Dragon quoted in a Midrash (Tobit, Oxford, p. xviii.). At the time of Nahmanides Syriac texts, probably transcribed into Hebrew characters, were brought to Europe and more especially to Catalonia; and this dialect was then considered as holy, and that may be a reason why the Zohar was composed in Aramaic about that time. Besides, there is a kind of date at the end of our Scroll which would show that it was composed after the destruction of the Temple. It is said (v. 74 in Dr. Gaster's edition): "The sons of Hasmoni kept the kingdom, they and their sons and their sons' sons, from that time until the second destruction of the house of God for 206 years." To this Dr. Gaster makes the following remarks: "Exactly the same number of years is assigned to the Hasmonæans and Herodians in the *Seder Olam* and in the Talmud. This absolute identity of dates goes far to prove the antiquity and authority of our Scroll. These dates must undoubtedly have been taken from the Scroll as *the* Chronicle of that period. It is difficult to decide whether the last verses, with the date of the Hasmonæan Kingdom, belonged originally to the text of the Scroll or were afterwards added. If we admit them to have belonged to it, it would settle at once also the question of the *age* of the Scroll; but it seems that they have been added later on, as the *oldest* MSS. available do

not have these concluding verses. They may have been added soon after the destruction of the Temple, for it is to be noted that not a single word about the Romans is to be found in the Scroll, not even an allusion." In my opinion the fact that the date agrees with the *Seder Olam* would rather prove that our Chronicle is contemporary with it or even later, for otherwise allusion would be made to it in the *Seder Olam*. As to the addition of the last verses or not, there is no decisive fact to guide us concerning it. I can only add that the St. Petersburg MS. with vowel-points and accents has the last verses. In the Bodleian Library MS. No. 2,333 has not these verses; in No. 2,498 they are found with the following introductory words: נמצא הפסוקים: האלו בנוסחה אחרת. Both MSS. come from Yemen. The Western MSS., viz., Nos. 30, 32, 174, and 2,305, have the verses without any remark.¹ It is worth while considering that the MS. of St. Petersburg, which is provided with vowel-points and accents, and divided into verses, as Saadiah described it, has the last verses; on the other hand, would Saadiah have attributed our Scroll to the children of the Hasmonæans, if the destruction of the Temple had occurred in it? The fact that the Romans are not even alluded to in our Scroll may suggest a very early date or a late, when the Romans had already disappeared. The following words are the description which Dr. Gaster gives of the sources of the Scroll. He says: "The relation between the Scroll and the first Book of the Makkabees may be said to be akin to that of Hagada and simple text. Legendary embellishment can be traced already in the second Book of Makkabees, and still more in the Syriac translation of it. It is the same spirit, though not exactly the same tendency, in the Scroll as in the second Book of Makkabees. In the contents the Scroll approaches also more the second book than the first book, and uses often the same expressions as the Syriac paraphrase. The compiler of the second book mentions Jason of Cyrene as the author of the work from which he drew the materials for his own compilation. It is still doubtful whether Jason's work was written in Greek, or possibly in Hebrew or Aramaic. Should this latter have been the case, we could see in that work the remote source of our Scroll. It is safer, however, to consider oral tradition as the foundation of this narrative of the Scroll, which served also to embellish the narrative of the second book and the Syriac translation or paraphrase." We agree with this last hypothesis, by which the arbitrary mention of the chief *Dramatis*

¹ Dr. Gaster gives the Bodleian MSS. 30, 32, 174, and 2,305, under the rubric of the Hebrew texts of our Scroll; that is, I am sorry to say, my fault, and I ought to have stated in the catalogue that they contain the Aramaic text.

personæ, and of the most impressive facts will be explained, for, as we have said, the Pharisees could not have influenced the redaction of the Scroll written after Hillel. To me it seems that the legends found in the Talmud and Midrashim are embodied in the Scroll and not *vice versa*, for such an important document, composed in the most important school, could not have escaped the later schools, when mentioning the miraculous story of the Maccabæan deeds. And most likely our Scroll was composed in Babylonia at the time when Karaism began, and its adherents rejected the feast of Hanukah, for the purpose of inculcating the observance of this feast by reading privately, and perhaps even publicly, the Scroll, where this feast is mentioned with glorification. Hence the accents, which are found in copies not only coming from Egypt, which we know already from Saadiah, but also in copies inserted amongst the twenty-four books of Scripture, as is the case with the MS. in Paris, No. 47, according to M. Israel Lévi's communication. In Yemen MSS. our Scroll is found in the prayer-books as a part belonging to the ritual of Hanukah. We know from R. Nisim ben Jacob of Kairowan (beginning of the eleventh century) that our Scroll was known (in Hebrew or Aramaic) to everybody; ¹ it was perhaps introduced here also against Karaism which had taken root in Africa. From here our Scroll came to Spain, Italy, and finally to France and Germany; in these last countries the Hebrew text was predominant. But the Hebrew translation might have been made, as Dr. Gaster rightly says, when the knowledge of Aramaic declined, and the reading of the Targum began to be discontinued. And this was even the fact in the African congregations, as we see from the letter of Judah ben Qoreish ² to that effect. Of course, in the eighth century, when our Scroll was composed, the Romans could not be mentioned.

After having amply discussed the epoch and tendency of our Scroll, Dr. Gaster gives a full bibliographical account of both texts, Aramaic and Hebrew MS. as well as editions. He also adds an account of translations of it in non-Semitic languages, viz., into Latin, German, Spanish and Persian. Next comes the literature concerning our Scroll; both are exhaustive. For completeness' sake I may mention that Herzfeld (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel* II. p. 446), says that the statement of the *Halakhoth Gedoloth* is unauthentic (*unverbürgt*), without any reason. The same is the case with M. J. Derenbourg's statement (*Essai, etc.*, p. 57), that our Scroll, in spite of its pure language and division into verses, is a modern (what age?) composition, and

¹ Harkavy, *Saadia Gaon*, p. 208.

² רסאלה, ed., Bargès, Paris, 1857.

has for object to instruct the Jews concerning the sign of the feast, which was celebrated since the time of the Maccabees. The interesting monograph finishes with the Aramaic text of the Scroll according to the Eastern (Yemenistic) MSS., with variations from Western MSS. and Jellinek's edition. There are unfortunately some typographical mistakes at the very beginning, בִּימֵי for בְּיָמֵי, אַנְטִיּוֹכָא for אַנְטִיּוֹכָס. The vowel-points are given according to the Eastern MSS., but expressed in the western vowel-points. The variations contain also differences as to vowel-points. Finally, the English translation is given with the references to parallel passages in the Bible and in the two books of the Maccabees. To the passage (v. 3) "He (Antiochus) built a mighty town close to the shore of the sea, and he called it Antiochia after his own name," Dr. Gaster says in a note: "Probably Charax-Spasina, at the mouth of the Harum, mentioned by Pliny." This note is superfluous, since there is no reality; every great conqueror in olden time built a town after his name; the writer does not care whether it is really so or not. Besides Charax is not on or near the sea. Why does Dr. Gaster not give the name of the town which Bagras or Bagris (Bacchides) built opposite Antiochia (v. 4) after his name? Both statements are equally unhistorical, but the writer of the Scroll is far from being an historian.

Dr. Gaster's monograph will not reach many Jews, except those who were members of the Congress, and a few chosen whom our author will be good enough to remember, for the number of the extracts at his disposal are limited. There will come a time sooner or later when Dr. Gaster will be pressed for a second edition, and then he will be able to refute his critics, amongst whom I shall no doubt fall a victim. For a second edition I should advise him to take as basis the fragments of the text which were at Saadiah's disposal, of which the Bodleian Library possesses verses 25 to 35, and 48 to 66; and St. Petersburg vv. 10 to 29, and 67 to end; of the last I have the variations from Dr. Jellinek's text, sent to me by my friend Dr. Harkavy, which I shall be happy to put at Dr. Gaster's disposal. Of the Western MSS. the No. 1747, in the Bodleian Library, is an excellent one, more especially as concerning the vocalisation; it has for instance כִּתְתִיָּה and אִשְׁמוֹנָאִי.

II. Hebrew Visions of Hell and Paradise (extract from the Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1893, pp. 571 to 611). These are faithful translations of Revelations, extracted from the Talmud, Midrashim (earlier and later), and late Agadic works. "They all," says Dr. Gaster, "go back to the pre-Christian age, as is shown by the existence of those Christian visions almost verbally

identical with the Hebrew. On the other hand, one cannot doubt that they underwent some changes in the course of ages. The substance remained intact, but many passages were interpolated or omitted." There is again disputable matter concerning the age of these extracts. Dr. Gaster is perhaps inclined by nature to make everything old, more especially if it is introduced as old by an old formula or by an early name. That is no doubt awkward for comparative matter, but as everybody can form his opinion by critical method, the extract will always have its value either as original or as borrowed, for Dr. Gaster makes no mystery of the sources, and does not force a date upon the reader. Moreover, his notes give a comparative bibliography of items and parallels concerning Apocrypha. The contents are the following:—The Revelation of Moses, according to two recensions. 2. The Revelation of Joshua ben Levi, in many recensions also. Now if we accept even the personality of R. Joshua ben Levi as the hero of the Revelations, they could not be pre-Christian, since Joshua lived in the third century; and of such kind of apocryphal pieces Dr. Gaster says that they must have served as sources to that of Peter, then to that of Paul and others. There are only two ways for such communication: either to give a translation without any prefatory words except as concerning the bibliography and the parallel passages, or to prove by unquestionable data that one text of a Revelation must have preceded another. The general reader has no leisure, and not sufficient knowledge, for forming a clear opinion, unless he is guided by sound data. A hasty and vague opinion is more damaging than ignorance.

A. NEUBAUER.

חדשים גם ישנים (*New, also Old*), page 3. By Dr. A. HARKAVY.
(*Extract from a weekly, without indication of place or of date.*)

The first two numbers of this collection have appeared in the periodical with the title of *המצפה*, Warsaw, 1886; and a fourth will follow in the sixth volume of the yearly called *האסיף*. The present fasciculus contains, 1. Poetical pieces by the old Spanish poets, viz., those by Abraham ibn Ezra, which are incompletely given in the edition of the *Divan*, by the late Dr. Egers; 2. Additions to our author's edition of the poem of Samuel the Prince (see above, page 568); 3. Unknown poems by the famous Salomon ben Gabirol, two of which refer to the death of R. Haya Gaon; this makes, with the two