



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.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

TALMUDICAL FRAGMENTS.

קונטרסים מחלמוד בבלי כריתות ותלמוד ירושלמי ברכות. *Talmudical Fragments in the Bodleian Library.* Edited, with Introduction, by S. SCHECHTER and S. SINGER. (Cambridge, 1896. 6 and 28 pp. large 4to.)

Two prominent and representative men of the Jewish community in England have joined in presenting a festive token to the learned author of the *History of the Jewish Tradition*, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday. Under the above title they publish, in brilliant outfit, a lengthy piece from the Babylonian Talmud, and a small fragment from the Talmud of Jerusalem, taken from the most recent acquisitions of the Bodleian library. The MS. from which they edit the piece from the Babylonian Talmud, occupying as much as twenty-six pages of an ordinary pocket edition (Keritot, 4 b-6 a, 18 a-28 b), has the distinction of bearing a date. We read in a note, following the treatise of Keritot, that it was ended in the month Adar I, A. M. 4883, i. e. in the year 1123, and that the MS. was written by the scribe Joseph b. Samuel b. Ephraim from the mountain of Nefusa (in Tripoli) for R. Nissim b. R. Saadia. This date alone, which, as the editors point out in their Introduction, stamps this MS. as the oldest dated Talmudical book extant, is sufficient to commend it to the notice of scholars, now that it has thus become accessible to all. But this Talmudical text exhibits, besides, a good many peculiarities and numberless readings, which differ from those of the ordinary editions. These are all of the greater importance, because, as the editors point out, the treatise of Keritot is one of those that were less frequently read, and has, for this reason, been more corrupted by the copyists of former centuries and by the printers of later time. This present edition of almost half the treatise of Keritot constitutes an important evidence of the condition of the text at an unusually early age. It is true, six centuries had already elapsed since the conclusion of the Talmud before this text was written; it is nevertheless of great, and in some cases of a decisive value for the emendation and completion of the original. It is, however, a fact that this text itself also requires emendation

and completion, for it is as well to state that O (by which letter we shall all along designate the text of the Oxford MS.) cannot by any means be considered as an exemplary text. The editors publish the text—and with good reason—without any critical apparatus. If they had undertaken to edit the text of O with all its various readings, the size of the book would have become double what it is, since—as they observe in the Introduction—the text of O “offers in almost every line readings varying more or less widely from the editions.” I shall adduce only a few specially remarkable examples, in order to show that O, although not in equal measure as ed. (thus the text of the editions is designated), yet contains very bad omissions and errors, which prove that the same causes which made the text of the editions appear in such deformed and neglected shape, had already been at work when this MS., and perhaps its prototype also, was written. On the whole I take it for granted that the text of O has been printed with all possible accuracy; and indeed, the beautiful and clear writing of the MS., of one page of which a photographic facsimile is reproduced, puts no difficulties in the way of a correct reprint. Nevertheless, it must be assumed that some of the errors are not those of the MS., but owe their existence to the printer and the proof reader. In the following list, and also in my further remarks, I shall quote the page and line of the book.

P. 2. l. 28 זבראי r. זבראי. 3. 28 אית ביה r. איתביה. 3. 31 קפחו r. קפחו.
 4. 5 dele תניא. 4. 15 על r. כל. 4. 27 בראר' r. בדארי (ed. בדרי).
 5. 10 כתחלה r. בתחלה. 5. 23 ואילא r. ואי לא. 5. 30 ליומא r. ליומי; ואי לא.
 7. 7 מתחלקות r. מתחלקות ספק. 8. 26 והגביה r. וחתך.
 12. 9 לבלבו r. לבלב; לבלב. 12. 25 מחפי r. דהא מחפי (ed. דקא מחפי (ed. דקמחפי); in the same manner 18. 12 קא תאני r. הא תאני. 12. 25
 בהמה r. בהמה (שצמרו) צמר r. לומר. 13. 7 מיהת r. מחמת (vid. l. 28). 13. 1 לומר.
 14. 3 ר' יוחנן ו dele או לא r. אלא. 14. 3 ר' יוחנן ו dele או לא r. אלא. 14. 3 ר' יוחנן ו dele או לא r. אלא.
 17. 26 ומיעטיה r. ומעשיה. 20. 8 מאימתי r. מאי טעמיה. 18. 26 כל r. כל.
 22. 4 לחתיכה r. להיכא. 23. 2, 3 רובן r. דזבן. 23. 27 dele יוחנן r. משום ר' יוחנן.
 24. 9 אביו r. ארבעה r. ארבעה. 26. 7 אביו r. אביו twice, r. אביו.

Of the gaps in O, such have to be mentioned first as are caused by a sentence ending with the same word with which the following ends (Homoeoteleuton). Thus 9. 7 after שנ' a whole passage ending שנאמר is missing. Also 12. 11 after אי חזי לאדם a whole piece, ending with the same words. Similar, smaller or larger, gaps are to be noticed: 12. 15 after העוף המהור; 14. 6 after כל דם; 14. 15 after למחצה; 20. 9 after נינהו; 22. 10 after תקבר; 24. 17 after על החמורה. Other gaps, caused by the omission of a whole passage, are: 1. 15 before מאי; 24. 24 before איצטריך; 25. 9 before דתניא.

On 23. 11, before **תא שמע**, a piece also commencing **תא שמע** is omitted (14 lines in ed.). Of the omission of single words, spoiling the sense, may be mentioned: 2. 19 **לא** omitted before **אתי**; 2. 24 after **כרמל** insert **יוכיה**; 4. 8 after **בהן גדול** insert **בהן גדול**; 20. 9 after **נינהו** insert **מכפר**.

Much more numerous, however, than the omissions in O are those of the editions which can now be corrected from O. Here also the gaps are for the most part occasioned by the besetting evil of MSS., the Homoeoteleuton. In the following I give the smaller and greater passages from O which are wanting in the editions: 1. 22 sq. (vid. in reference to this passage Kohut's *Aruch*, III, 77 b); 3. 24 sq. (**הכרעה . . . ואי**); 6. 7 sq. (**מעילה . . . אמר רב פפא**); 8. 22 sq. (**דהאי . . . והתניא**); 9. 29-31; 12. 3 sq. (**בהמה . . . אי**); 14. 31-15. 1 (**התניא . . . רב נחמן**); 17. 3 sq. (**צריך . . . דאפרשיה**); 19. 25-30 (several pieces); 22. 16-22 (several pieces); 23. 11 sq. (**שתי . . . יפה**); 27. 20 sq. (several pieces); 23. 31-24. 2; 24. 29-31; 25. 15-26. 1.

A few examples will show how O can serve to correct errors in the editions: 2. 25 **ניחייב** more correct than **מהייב** in the editions. 2. 27 **כי קלי** (= **בקלי**), in ed. **בקלי**. 3. 16 **כל שעה**, ed. **כל עשייה**. 3. 23 **כתב רחמנא**, ed. **רחמנא כתיב**. 3. 29 **בו שולקין**, ed. **משלקו** (r. **בו שלקו**; in the parallel passage, Horajoth, 11 b **היו שולקין בו**, but cod. Munich reads there **שלקו בו**).

The editors have noticed in their clear introduction some of the idiomatical peculiarities in O, and observed that some forms and particles display the idiomatical characteristics of the Palestinian Talmud. I shall complement the editors' observation with some remarks of a general nature. O exhibits an endeavour to Hebraize. Thus: 2. 10 we find **והלא** for **והא**; 6. 2 **על קילקלי** instead of **אקילקלי**; 6. 9 **דנעשית** for **שנעשתה**; 2. 22 **שכן איתינון** for **דאיתנהון**. Compound particles are preferentially dissolved into their parts. For **לית** we find **לא אית** in 12. 10; 12. 29; 13. 9. **לא איכא** for **ליכא** in 6. 15; 25. 20. **הוא אי זה** for **איזהו** in 13. 24, 25, 28, 29. **מןלן** for **מנא לן** in 12. 5. For **ביצר** we find once (16. 21) **כאיצר** (= **כאיזה צר** in Pal. Talmud). The enclitic particle **קא** is severed from the verb; **קא תאני** (ed. **קתני**), **קא טרה** (ed. **קטרה**). Thus we find the particle of comparison **כי** separated, **כי בהמה** (12. 6) for **כבהמה**; **כי דם** (13. 26) for **כדם**; **כי זבח** (18. 18) for **כזבח**. By means of such a severance we learn the important, and probably correct, etymology of a well-known particle, namely, of the particle **הילכך**. Levy, I, 472^a, says that the word is a compound of **הי** (= **הא**) and **לכך**. In O we find **הילכך** consistently written **וכך הואיל** (2. 1, 25; 7. 2; 17. 4). This

reading is in complete accord with the meaning of הילכך "since it is thus," "since that is the case," and this etymology explains the meaning much better than Levy's derivation. Besides, it explains also the — under the ה; the — of הוֹאִיל remained behind after the ו and א had been elided. This derivation throws also a new light upon a reading which, according to Rabbinowicz (Dikduke Soferim, VI, 1) is consistently given in a certain MS., namely הוֹלֵכךְ; this is not הוֹאִ לְכךְ but another contraction of כִּךְ הוֹאִיל. For מירי O writes כִּמְדַעַם (18. 22), and that this is the original word is shown by the circumstance that in another passage of Keritot (8b) ed. have also כִּדְעַם (vid. Liebermann, *Das Pronomen und das Adverbium des babylonisch-talmudischen Dialektes*, Berlin, 1895, p. 30).

Of grammatical peculiarities it may be noticed that O has often נ for ל in the third person imperfect; the latter form being more usual in the Babylonian Talmud: נִימָא 2. 16; נִיכְתוּב 2. 17; נִירַע 5. 20; נִיבְעִי 12. 17. In 5. 28 there is נְהִי instead of יְהִי (in the parallel passage, Horajoth, 12 a, the Munich MS. has also נְהִי).

The spelling of the plural form in י with double yod is also remarkable, thus קְרָאִי 2. 11. The double yod denotes its pronunciation as a consonant; this spelling seems, therefore, to prove that the pronunciation was not יַ—, but י־—. But we also find קְרָאִי for קְרָאִי, 6. 23, 7. 18, and in that case the sounding of the י as a consonant is out of the question (קְרָאִי = קְרָאִים). But it is possible that in both words the א is quiescent, and that they ought to be read קְרָאִי and קְרָאִי. Another orthographical peculiarity of this manuscript is that the *status emphaticus* is always written with ה instead of א: גּוֹפְהָ (1. 4), תּלְתָה (1. 7, 20). The *scriptio plena* of the א is unusually frequent in O, and this has already been noticed in the editors' introduction. On the other hand, the י as *mater lectionis* is often absent in passages where ed. have it, e. g. 3. 12 וּתְהִירַר for וּתְהִירַר.

The text of O also serves to enrich the Talmudical lexicography with some interesting data. In 5. 29 sq. we find several times the word רְבוּנְכוֹן, also רְבוּנְכוֹן; רְבוּנְכוֹן in the editions; "your teacher;" רְבוּנְכוֹן with pronominal suffixes was, except in the Targum, hitherto known only as applied to God, in the expression שֶׁל עוֹלָם רְבוּנְכוֹן. המְקוּם, as a name of the Deity, always used with the article המְקוּם, is found 20. 21 and 21. 7 without the article. But 3. 24 המְקוּם occurs, where the editions read הַקְרוּשׁ ב' 2. 26 בְּמִצְעִי (ed. בְּאִמְצַע), otherwise always מִצְעָא (Levy, III, 212 b). 6. 2 we read הַרְסָנָא for גִּילְרָנָא of the editions; the Munich MS. has in the parallel passage, Horajoth, 12 a, also הַרְסָנָא. Both are names of a species of small fishes. 5. 25 תְּרַנְגוּלָא is read for תְּרַנְגוּלָא, both pronunciations are

attested. 4. 26 for ממלא מקום אבותיו we read ממולא במקום א'. The phrase does not occur elsewhere in that form; in Horajoth, 11 b we find also ממלא מקום א'. 5. 30 משולם במעשיו for שלם במעשיו. The Biblical passage, Isa. xlii. 19 (פְּכוּ שְׁלָם) seems to have exercised some influence. 13. 26 שמקליח, Hiphil for שמקלח, Piel. Levy, IV, 307, does not mention the Hiphil form of קלח. 6. 4, 5 משכה מלכותן; נמשכה מ'. The Kal of משך is only in Aramaic used intransitively (to be prolonged), vid. the instance משכו מלכותיהו in Levy, III, 276 a. 8. 4 הילך (Piel) for הלך (Kal). The common phrase דעתא דתא is abbreviated from דעתא אדעתא (= עלה על הדעת), vid. Levy, III, 536 b. In O we find once (1. 20) the complete reading, everywhere else (e. g. 1. 26; 2. 2) the abbreviated form.

There are a few noteworthy variations in the names of the authorities. The Tannaite ר' שמעון שזורי is in the Mishna (IV, 3), and the Talmudic sentences that refer to it, always called ר' ישמעאל שזורי. This reading is found in the Jerusal. Talmud (Sabbath, 12 c), and in the text of the Palestinian Mishna, edited by Lowe (*The Mishna* . . . , p. 181 a), ר' ישמעאל השיזורי. In all other passages, even of that Mishna Text, we read ר' שמעון השזוני. It is nevertheless probable, that here, as in so many other cases, ישמעאל has erroneously been put instead of שמעון. ר' זירא, which name is only in the Palestinian Talmud written ר' זעירא, is found here in that complete form, 22. 8. ר' חייא בר אבא 23. 25 רב אדי בר אבין for רב אדי בר אדא 23. 25 רב פפא for רב כהנא 5. 15 רבא for רבא 1. 5 רבא for רבא 20. 2 ר' יוחנן ר' אסי א' ר' יוחנן ר' אמי אמר ר' חנינא ר' לקיש בן שמעון ר' לקיש, usually adopted by the editions. We may add here that the abbreviation ר'ש points to the form ר'ש (= ריבי שמעון).

In the preceding remarks, I have considered only a comparatively small portion of the various readings of O. It may be assumed that a considerable part of such readings are more in accordance with the original text than those adopted in the editions. This is particularly true in respect to the phraseology of the Talmudical discussion, which has a more archaic colour in the old MS. than in the printed copies. Thus, for instance, מן הכא נפקא לי מן הדין 1. 25 מן הכא נפקא לי seems to be more original than the corresponding passage in the editions: והא מהכא נפקא מהתם נפקא דאתיא 5. 7 דאתיא ר'ש שם שם seems more original

than the corresponding *משמרת משמרת*. But enough has been said about the *variae lectiones* to recognize the characteristics of O. I only add a few remarks about its outward appearance. The editors point out that the Mishna text of the whole chapter precedes the Talmud text, as it always does in the Palestinian Talmud. The sections in the Talmud text are in several cases separated from each other by the heading פִּי' (= פִּיסקא). (3. 6; 6. 5; 14. 26, 28; 8. 18, 20; 20. 17.) It is the same mode of dividing sections as that adopted by Tobia b. Eliezer in his *Lekach Tob*. It is equivalent with the term פִּצְל, which, without further indications, is used by Arabic authors in the division of their chapters. The editors believe that in four places accents can be recognized (Introduction, p. 5, note 4). I must confess that I have a difficulty in recognizing accents in these signs, occurring as they do in this single case. If such a thing were possible at all, it would be in one passage (12. 9), where we find the interrogative וְלֹא ("is it not so?") supplied with a sign (two strokes under the word), which is assumed to draw the reader's attention to the syntactic meaning and the interrogative accentuation of the word. The sign under לְמַחְצָה (14. 17) might have some such meaning. But when in the phrase קוֹל וּמְרָאָה וְרִיחַ (6. 7) the second word has the same sign (this time over the word), or when in לֹא מִיִּחְסְרָא the word לֹא is dotted on the top, I cannot possibly see what meaning such accents can have. The reason why in these cases a sign has been put must remain undecided. On the other hand, we have a very remarkable instance of the accentuation of a Talmudical text in two fragments of the Palestinian Talmud, consisting of only two pages (Berachot, 4 b and 6 b). The first part of these fragments is for the most part supplied with accents, which had to serve as aids towards the correct reading and accentuation of the text, and corresponds with our punctuation. They are the same accents that are made use of in an old MS. in the Vatican of the Talmudical treatise Berachot (Rabbinowicz, *Dikduke Soferim*, XI, 19: מוֹנָה (פִּשְׁטָא זָקָף קָמֵן וַאֲחַנְחָתָא). As an instance of this curiosity I quote the following passage (27. 24 sq.): אֲרֵ שְׂמוּאֵל בַּר נַחֲמָן אֵ הַקָּבֵה לְדוּיָד: דוּיָד יָמִים מְלָאִים אֲנִי מוֹנָה לָךְ אֲנִי מוֹנָה לָךְ יָמִים חֲסָרִין. The accent over נַחֲמָן and לְדוּיָד corresponds with our colon, that over דוּיָד to our note of exclamation, the one under חֲסָרִין to our full stop. The sign over מוֹנָה (to which לָךְ belongs) is a comma or semicolon.

The learned editors have supplied a valuable contribution to the critique of the text of the Talmud. The present specimen, not less than collections of *variae lectiones* made by the late Rabbinowicz,

shows how infinitely difficult, or rather how absolutely impossible, it is to establish a critically correct text of the Talmud, and to gain even a partially correct reading from the many various readings. The gentlemen who are preparing the new critical edition of the Talmud that has been recently announced are, therefore, right when they confine themselves to procuring a comparatively correct text such as is offered by the Munich MS. and the *Editio princeps*. Of course, such *variae lectiones* would, above all, have to be given as are found in the more ancient Talmudical documents. Of these latter, the MS., edited in such beautiful form by Mr. Schechter and Mr. Singer, deserves particular notice. Their festive gift came *post festem*, but it is none the less welcome, not only to the scholar to whom it was offered, but to all who have the study of Talmudics at heart.

W. BACHER.

PHILONEAN LITERATURE.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Philosophie und Religion, von PAUL WENDLAND u. OTTO KERN, Berlin, 1895.

Die Therapeuten, von PAUL WENDLAND, Leipzig, 1896 (besonderer Abdruck aus dem 22ⁿ. Supplementband der Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie).

Die Philonischen Citaten im Clemens v. Alexandria (besonderer Abdruck u. s. w.), von PAUL WENDLAND, 1896.

I HAVE joined these three works because they all three deal with the same range of subjects. In the first Dr. Wendland deals with the form of moral discourse known as the Diatribé, with special reference to the *Vita Contemplativa* and the essay *Quod omnis probus liber* of Philo. He shows how this form of literature culminated in the first century A. D., and how these two essays of Philo exemplify it. The aim of such essays was to sketch out a life according to nature after the Stoic-Cynical conception of it, and to contrast its simple nobility with the life of luxury and indolence.

Incidentally Dr. Wendland shows that these two works could only have been produced in the first decades of the first century and at no later epoch.

The second of the three works is a substantive and important contribution to the controversy respecting the authorship and date of the description of the Therapeutae. In seven chapters overflowing