



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.

clearly call for emendation, but have received no treatment : xiv. 2, 20, 22—33 ; xx. 2, 6 ; xxi. 5 ; xxii. 9 ; xxiii. 4 ; xxvii. 5 ; xxviii. 2 ; xxxi. 2.

It might appear from the above criticism that the Ethiopic text must compare very unfavourably with that preserved in the Gizeh MS. But this is by no means the case ; and herein I can agree heartily with Prof. Dillmann, my master in these studies. From an exhaustive comparison of the two texts, I have arrived at the following conclusion, that *the Ethiopic preserves a more ancient and trustworthy form of text than the Gizeh MS. ; that it has fewer additions, fewer omissions, and fewer and less serious corruptions than that text.* This conclusion I hope to substantiate at some length in my work on Enoch, which will appear in May.

This result, in conclusion, is in perfect harmony with the external history of the Gizeh Greek text and the Eth. version. The former cannot be earlier than the eighth century, and may be as late as the twelfth. It is possible, therefore, that it is a descendant of the third or still remoter degree from the common Greek parent of the two texts. This of itself would account for some of the corruptions ; but the real explanation of its vicious orthography and syntax and of its very numerous and serious corruptions is that the Book of Enoch was from the fifth century onward practically a proscribed book, and under the ban of the Greek and Latin Churches. Accordingly, it was copied without care, and the way was opened for every kind of depravation of the text. The Eth. version (circ. 500 A.D.), on the other hand, was, so far as we know, regarded from the first as a canonical book of the Old Testament in the Ethiopic Church, and thus it was transmitted with the greatest care and accuracy through successive copies till the sixteenth century. After this date the text suffered much from ignorant corrections.

R. H. CHARLES.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bibelexegese. Heft 1 des Gregorius Abulfarag, gen. Bar-Hebräus, Scholien zum Buche Daniel. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen, von Dr. JACOB FREIMANN. Brünn, 1892. Epstein & Co., pp. 74.

Zur Geschichte der Exegese. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Philos. Doctorwürde, etc., von IMMANUEL PLATO. Halle, 1892, pp. 54.

THE two little books form a welcome contribution to the history of Biblical exegesis, although they refer to the comparatively late period of the 13th and 14th centuries. These two men were even to some

extent contemporaries, as Immanuel seems to have been in his teens when Abul-Farag died, in the year 1286. The commentaries of the Jacobite author are distinguished from most of his Christian predecessors by his more independent and altogether scientific method. The Syriac literature was indeed already on the decline when Abul-Farag composed his *Magazine of Mysteries*, as his Biblical commentaries are styled. Even if it is not his most important work, still it has its significant grammatical and lexicographical features, and also otherwise furnishes interesting matter. To those volumes of the *Magazin*, already existing in print, Dr. Freimann has added the edition of the scholia to [the Syriac version of] Daniel. Although B. H. was ignorant of the Hebrew language, in the present instance this was of less consequence, as the largest part of the book is written in Aramaic. He seems, however, to have been unaware of this fact, otherwise he might perhaps have left us some interesting information. Thus the exegetical value of these scholia is comparatively small. On the other hand, we find here again notable remarks on the orthography, especially the differences between the Jacobite and Nestorian spelling. Almost at the beginning, *e.g.*, he draws attention to the difference between Jacobite *qyānthā* and Nestorian *qyāmtā* (cp. Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriacque*, p. 117). Similar remarks, also referring to the vocalisation, are appended to many other verses. In II., v. 4, B. H. observes the difference made by the Jacobites between *ārāmāyē*, "Aramæans" and *armāyē*, "heathens," which the Nestorians neglect (Duval, p. vi.). In other places he notices *varia lectio* of the Syriac versions, *e.g.*, II. 40, כַּדְקַק for כַּדְקַק, etc., etc. References to Christianity which he finds in some verses we must take *cum grano salis*. As appendix to his commentary B. H. gives a chronological table, representing the "seventy weeks of years." Beginning with Nebukadnezzar, B. H. gives in one column the number of the years of the government of each king, in a second the dates according to the Seleucide era, and in a third a summary of the events of each ruler down to Vespasian.

Dr. Freimann's edition is carefully prepared, and the translation, which is accompanied by annotations, shows that he thoroughly mastered his subject.

The treatise of Dr. Plato, although dealing with a kindred subject, is of entirely different character. He endeavours to introduce as Biblical interpreter a man with whom we are familiar as a graceful, though often frivolous, Hebrew poet and imitator of Dante. Through De Rossi and later scholars, such as Zunz and Steinschneider, we have received much information concerning Immanuel's comprehensive exegetical labours, of which, however, only his commentary on the Proverbs and a few other fragments exist in print. Although the

author of this Commentary on the Proverbs is, according to the title-page, Immanuel b. Jacob, Dr. Plato proves that it belongs to our Immanuel (b. Salomo). The little book, which as yet does not give any specimen of Immanuel's exegesis, is a forerunner of a longer work which is to contain his Commentary on Lamentations, accompanied by expositions on his attitude to Biblical interpretation and by remarks on the various ways of treating the holy text in the Talmudical and post-Talmudical epochs. Dr. Plato thus confines himself for the present to giving a sketch of Immanuel's life, in which many points still require elucidation. The author shows sound judgment in not drawing hasty conclusions from the uncertain data which exist with regard to Immanuel's birth. With reference to Immanuel's widely discussed personal relations to Dante, I am, with Dr. Plato, of opinion that the mysterious words in the 28th maqāmah do not refer to the poet of the *Divine Comedy*. Neither can I follow the opinion of those who see in the words *my brother Daniel* a real brother or kinsman; nor that of Dr. Plato, who refers them to the Prophet Daniel, from the passage:—אשר הנחני בדרך אמת ויִישַׁר אֶת אֲרָחִי • וְאִשֶׁר קָרַב אֵלַי בְּבִרְחִי— צִיֵּן נֹזֵר הַקֹּדֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר עַל מִצְחִי • חַי בְּשָׂרִי וְנִשְׁמַת רוּחִי • וּפְרַשְׁתָּ גְדוּלְתוֹ וְנִדְיַבְוֹתוֹ וּמַעֲלָתוֹ, it seems rather that the poet alludes to a person of the name of Daniel who had acted as his benefactor, and had given him protection and material help. It well suits the poet to express himself in such overflowing words as in the passage referred to.

Both books give evidence of industry and the honest endeavour to work scientifically, and we are justified in expecting that the further productions of their authors will be useful for students.

H. HIRSCHFELD.