



## 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](mailto:support@jstor.org).

NIESE ON THE TWO BOOKS OF THE MACCABEES<sup>1</sup>.

*Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher, nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung, von BENEDICTUS NIESE (Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1900).*

THE chips from some workshops are bigger than the blocks in others. Merely as a side-study, to clear a little ground for the third volume of his *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten*, Niese has felt it necessary to make perhaps the most thorough examination of the two Books of the Maccabees that has been attempted since Grimm's day. In fulfilment of this incidental purpose, he contributed to *Hermes* (XXXV, 1900, pp. 268-307, and pp. 453-527) two exhaustive articles on the Books of the Maccabees, and these articles have been republished together in a separate form, under the title given above. This "Kritik" is the most important addition to recent criticism of its fascinating subject. The subject is fascinating because it is elusive, certainty is unattainable. Hence interest attaches to all new investigations in this field, and there have been many of late years. Niese, however, is not an ordinary investigator. His edition of Josephus has placed him in the front rank of authorities on Judeo-Greek literature, and anything that he has to say on the Books of the Maccabees is assured of a respectful hearing. His examination of the material is so fresh and so thorough, his learning so full, his style so clear, that even if his conclusions were old, the method by which he reaches them would be worthy of consideration. But his conclusions are not old. He would reverse the views commonly held. Niese has a lower opinion than most critics of the value of the First Maccabees, and a higher opinion than is current of the trustworthiness of the Second Maccabees. Before, however, coming to closer quarters with these opinions, it must be mentioned that in one direction Niese renders a conspicuous service to the First Book, by vindicating the historical

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Jews' College Literary Society, London, on March 11, 1901.

character of the embassy of Judas to Rome (p. 88). Willrich altogether denies the reality of any such embassy. Wellhausen asserts this denial with dogmatic certainty in the third edition of his *Geschichte*, though in a previous edition he had expressed some belief in the report that Judas established friendly relation with Rome. Josephus cites the fact (*War*, I. i. 4), Justin reports it (XXXVI. 3, 9). Whether Niese himself would so strongly have maintained a belief in the embassy had it not been incidentally and strikingly confirmed by his favourite authority, the Second Maccabees (iv. 11), may perhaps be doubted, but as things stand he claims that, though the details in 1 Macc. are incredible, "the fact that Judas contracted a friendship with the Romans is proven as firmly as possible." As Niese argues, the embassy comes just at the natural place, for Judas approaches the Senate for protection against Demetrius, whose accession to the throne of Syria was, as Polybius relates, unfavourably viewed at Rome. Judas sent the embassy immediately after his victory over Nicanor, but he did not live long enough to receive a reply. Demetrius seems to have hastened his preparations so as to anticipate Roman intervention, and dispatched an overwhelming force under which Judas's resistance was crushed. Wellhausen and others have questioned whether the Romans would enter into negotiation with rebels such as Judas and his party were. But we know (Diodorus, XXXI. 27 a) that the Senate returned a friendly answer to Timarchus, a satrap in arms against the same Demetrius. One fails to understand the distinction suggested by Wellhausen in his fourth edition (1901, p. 266) between the cases of Timarchus and Judas.

This instance of Niese's independence as against Wellhausen helps to illustrate the unsettled condition of many important aspects of the Maccabean history. The disturbance is comparatively recent. Since the middle of the eighteenth century, when the Wernsdorffs assailed the authenticity of both Books of the Maccabees, there had grown up a general confidence in Book I, except in so far as some of the cited official documents are concerned. Almost absolute reliance was placed in it as a sober, though not completely impartial, record; and it was made the basis of all histories of the period. Of the Second Book the judgement was entirely the reverse. While Book I was pronounced true on the whole and inaccurate in details, Book II was credited with truth in details and inaccuracy on the whole. The letters with which Book II opens were condemned as fabrications, and the only use to which the body of the book was turned was as a supplement to Book I, especially with regard to the account of the incidents in Judea which preceded the Maccabean revolt. Roman Catholic theologians have always refused, however, to assent to this

verdict. The curious narrative of the sacrifices ordered on behalf of the dead by Judas—a narrative seemingly accepted by Niese, yet unparalleled in Jewish history, and without a trace of support in Rabbinic literature; further, the spirited descriptions of the martyrdoms of the aged Eleazar and the seven brothers—martyrdoms which became the exemplar of Christian courage, and were made the motive for an annual church festival with its appropriate homilies and hymns;—these features endeared the Second Book to the Roman Church. Raphael's picture of Heliodorus, the only notable artistic illustration of the Maccabean story, was inspired by the same Second Book. The antagonistic attitude towards the two Books of the Maccabees was, and remains, a standing division between Catholic and Protestant critics. This intrusion of theology into a literary question is no novelty in the criticism of the Maccabean history. Geiger, in that remarkable work (*Urschrift*), which is year by year receiving more justice, maintained that the very Books of the Maccabees themselves were the outcome of a theological rivalry. The First Book was, according to Geiger, Sadducean, the Second Book a Pharisaic counterblast. It is unfortunate that it cannot be said that, even apart from the inter-Christian differences just alluded to, theology nowadays plays no part in the literary criticism of the Maccabean history. Willrich, in particular, seems possessed by theological animus against everything, or almost everything, Jewish; even when the thing Jewish is dressed in Greek. Josephus is treated by him with scorn, and though he holds that the original author of 1 Macc. was a trustworthy historian, he has some very hard things to say about the unfortunate person who gave to the book the form which it now presents, and in which we can alone judge it. Willrich appears to apply as his first canon of criticism the principle that no Jewish historian told the truth except by accident, and that such lucky accidents were rare.

A critic of a very different type is Niese. Willrich disbelieves his authorities unless he is compelled to trust them; Niese believes them unless he is compelled to distrust them. Niese has thus struck a blow for genuine criticism. It was high time, for instance, that a strong word was uttered against those who think that because an ancient narrative contains legendary embellishments it is therefore untrustworthy. A great deal has been made of the mythical elements in 2 Macc. But these can mostly be detached without difficulty from the genuine narrative. Yet, even here, the superiority of the First Book is already manifest. If the Second Book resembles Polybius in language, the First Book resembles the great historian of the second century B. C. in restraint. But the rhetorical flights of the Second

Book, its fondness for the intervention of direct angelic aid to the Jews (already announced in the Prologue, ii. 21, *καὶ τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας*), all this does not justify critics in discrediting the whole book. Niese in vindicating 2 Macc. in such matters is vindicating criticism. He is restoring one's wavering confidence in the common sense of historical investigators. There is no doubt that in the main the two Books of the Maccabees tell the same story, in so far as they cover the same ground. The persecution, the character of Antiochus, the revolt, the steadfastness of the faithful kernel of the nation, the nature of the campaigns, the triumph of the party of Judas, the absence of self-seeking in the Jewish leaders, the dedication festival in 165 B. C., the victory celebrated as Nicanor's day—in all these and other chief elements of the story the two Books have, indeed, very much in common. It may even be that they have a common origin in the history written by Jason of Cyrene. The Second Book is ostensibly an epitome of Jason's larger history, and there are now several critics who maintain that the author of Book I also relied on Jason. In modern times Schlatter is the most prominent advocate of this theory, his *Jason von Kyrene* (1891) being devoted to that theme. Koster, on the other hand, leads the band of those who perceive in Jason of Cyrene what Kamphausen calls a mask, assumed in disguise of his own identity by the writer of 2 Macc., assumed one knows not why. Willrich believes in Jason, but is confident that he did not live before the Christian era. Now, while there is absolutely no reason to doubt the existence of Jason, though Niese may well be right, as we shall see, in placing him in the middle of the second century B. C., and in regarding Jason as a personal friend of Judas who went to Egypt after Judas's fall, this unfortunately proves little that is relevant. The epitome known to us as the Second Maccabees was not written by Jason, and we know very little of the treatment meted out to Jason by his epitomizer. The best attempt to analyse this "editing" of Jason by the epitomizer is that of Prof. Büchler, in the latter part of his brilliant work *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden*. Niese refers to this work, but he has made insufficient use of it.

The relation of 2 Macc. to Jason is of the utmost importance, but it does not entirely dispose of the question. For Niese is convinced that the Second Book, even in its epitomized shape, is older than the First Book. In stating his main thesis Niese also states this conviction. "There is," he claims, "in truth no reason for treating the Second Book as invariably inferior to the First, but the Second Book must be regarded as the older and often purer source." ("Es liegt in Wahrheit kein Grund vor, das 2. Makkabäerbuch in allen Stücken

hinter das erste zurückzusetzen, sondern es ist als die ältere und oft reinere Quelle anzusehen," p. 8.) The two clauses of this contention have no necessary connexion. In order to win a better opinion for the Second Book it is not essential to prove that it is older than the First. As to the First Book, Niese holds that it was written after the year 105-4 B.C., for in 1 Macc. xvi. 23-4 he, like many others, finds a reference to the death of John Hyrcanus, which occurred at the date mentioned. But despite the weight of authority here on Niese's side, this statement cannot be received without demur. Schürer (III.<sup>3</sup> 141) does not commit himself to the view that this passage was written after Hyrcanus' death: on the contrary, he assigns it to "towards the end of Hyrcanus' rule." But I think one can go further. In the first place there is good reason for doubting whether this passage belongs to the original 1 Macc., and there is also ground for holding with Destinon and Wellhausen (*Geschichte*, ed. 4, p. 273) that 1 Macc. really ended with xiv. 15 (Niese's arguments against Destinon, p. 97, are not at all convincing). Be that as it may, the reference to John Hyrcanus at the end of Book I by no means implies that Hyrcanus was dead, or that he had been high priest for any considerable period. The passage runs:—

Καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθίων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἠνδραγάθησεν καὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῶν τειχέων ὧν ᾠκοδόμησεν καὶ τῶν πράξεων αὐτοῦ, ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίου ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ.

"And the rest of the acts of John, and of his wars, and of his valiant deeds which he did, and of the building of the walls which he built, and of his doings, behold they are written in the Book of Days of his high-priesthood, from the time that he was made high priest after his father."

Ewald acutely perceived that the phrase "Book of Days" probably alludes to an annual record in progress when this last sentence in the First Book of the Maccabees was written or added. The whole passage has all the appearance of a contemporary note, written soon after 135 B.C., for the phrase τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων is limited by the clause ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ— an event which occurred in 135. The note does not convey the least impression that its writer was acquainted with the whole career of Hyrcanus. Observe the details: the wars and the walls. The walls were probably strengthened by Hyrcanus immediately after his accession; perhaps the reference is to a rebuilding which came directly after the withdrawal of Antiochus VII. It is very significant that Josephus (*Antiq.* XIII. vii. 2) reports that in the *first*

year of Hyrcanus' rule Antiochus VII, despite the seven camps with which he surrounded Jerusalem, "accomplished nothing at first, because of the strength of the walls." So, too, with regard to the wars, the very opening of Hyrcanus' official life was distinguished by military operations in which his valour and determination (*τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν αὐτοῦ*) were conspicuously displayed. Further, my belief that the First Book was finished soon after the assassination of Simon is confirmed by another circumstance. In the year 143 B. C., Simon erected a magnificent mausoleum at Modein (1 Macc. xiii. 25-30). "He set up seven pyramids, one over against another, for his father, and his mother, and his four brethren." The seventh pyramid was thus for himself. How comes it, then, that we are not informed of Simon's burial in Modein? My impression is that 1 Macc. was finished at about the time of Simon's death. The expression, "This is the sepulchre which he (Simon) made at Modein, unto this day" (*έως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης*, xiii. 30), has the mark of a later gloss, and may even be a mere reminiscence of an Old Testament phrase. We, moreover, know too little of the significance of such a phrase to feel sure that an interval of ten years might not be covered by it.

Even then if 2 Macc. was written as early as Niese maintains, i. e. in 125-4 B. C., I think it unproven that it is older than the First Book. But it is on rather unsatisfactory grounds that Niese assigns the date he does to Book II. He greatly relies on the integrity of the introductory epistles, which he ascribes to Jason's epitomizer, and the date of these epistles, 125-4 B. C., fixes according to him the date of the epitome. Niese considers these letters authentic, which others besides himself do, but he stands almost alone in refusing to disintegrate them. This part of Niese's apologetic is ingenious and original, and his scorn of the excessive subdivision to which the epistles have been or are likely to be subjected is pleasant to witness. It is something peculiarly gratifying to find a critic of Niese's eminence thus vigorously contending for the unity and integrity of an ancient Judaic document; one so rarely is confronted by such faith that dissent from him must be reluctant. But I fear that the instincts of scholars have not been at fault in detecting the hand of the manipulator here. The whole of the legends from 2 Macc. i. 18b to ii. 15 are probably an interpolation, being added to serve as a commentary perhaps on 2 Macc. x. 3, or to explain the illuminations which were subsequently associated with the festival. The epistles bristle with difficulties apart from these legendary insertions. That some (late post-Maccabean) historical incident lies at the back of these letters is obvious; that phrases may be taken from a genuine

letter of Judas must be conceded. But Niese's vindication of the genuineness is that of a candid, a far too candid friend. The Judas referred to is, he holds, not Maccabeus, the Antiochus is not Epiphanes but Sidetes, though the writer reports in regard to Sidetes a story similar to that told of Epiphanes, viz., his symbolic nuptials with a heathen goddess. Apart from this, a collation of i. 18 (Μέλλοντες ἄγειν ἐν τῷ Χασελεύ . . . τὸν καθαρισμόν) with ii. 16 (Μέλλοντες οὖν ἄγειν τὸν καθαρισμόν) alone suffices to disprove the integrity of the letters, and Niese's refusal to make at least this division weakens one's interest in his whole discussion of the point. Niese has not succeeded in proving either that the epistles were written in 125-4, or that they have any close connexion with the book itself. "Gewiss," says Niese himself, "ist der innere Zusammenhang zwischen Vorrede und Buch nur locker" (p. 12). The date of the letters, in short, cannot be used as proving the date of the epitome; if they could be so used, Niese's case would be hopelessly untenable.

Niese is naturally concerned to prove that the author of the Second Book made no use of the First. Adopting Schlatter's view with an important modification, he thinks on the contrary that the author of 1 Macc. used Jason for his first seven chapters, and relied on a Seleucid chronography for the rest of his information as to events in Syria. This may be so; at all events I agree with Niese's contention that Book II is in no sense a Pharisaic rejoinder to the Sadducean Book I. This was a clever suggestion of Geiger's, and it has enjoyed the honour of acceptance by Wellhausen. But with Niese I fail to perceive any conclusive proof that the writer of Book II was acquainted with Book I at all. I think that there are *some* indications of it, but they are not decisive. But Geiger's theory that there are considerable theological and political differences between the two books cannot be brushed aside so easily. The attitudes towards the priesthood are not the same, while on the debated question as to the lawfulness of waging war on the Sabbath the two books occupy different standpoints. Even more notable is the prominence given to the resurrection in Book II, whereas there is no allusion whatsoever to the doctrine in Book I. All these and other differences indicate, not that Book I is Sadducean, but that it is more ancient. When Book I was written the Pharisaic doctrine was immature and incomplete; the book reflects exactly the Maccabean position (as shown in part in Ben Sira). Book II places itself at a frankly Pharisaic standpoint: we feel that a good deal has happened in Judæa since Book I was written. To this extent the theory of Geiger must still hold its ground.

One's sympathy with Niese rises highest when he is seeking, not



to crown the Second Book with laurels despoiled from the First, but to weave new laurels for the Second. He offers many convincing arguments to prove that in the Second Book we have a history belonging to the second century B.C., so far as Jason's original is concerned. The resemblance of the style to Polybius, the exactness of the official titles, the names and the functions of Syrian officials, are displayed by Niese with much learning and ability. Very interesting is his inference from the Roman titles (p. 30). We find only the two names, Nomen and Gentile, not the Cognomen (2 Macc. xi. 34 seq.). This points clearly to the second century B.C. Jason's date may thus be safely assigned to that period (before 153-2 B.C., says Niese, p. 37); but the epitome of Jason is not Jason. 2 Macc. is a patchwork. The epistles do not claim to be Jason's. It is wise to hold with Professor Büchler that the famous *Vorgeschichte* did not emanate from Jason. The epitome does not accurately correspond with the programme sketched in ii. 20. There are again clear differences of style between iii. 1—vii. 42 and viii onwards. The latter portion alone was probably derived from Jason. It would be attractive to follow Professor Büchler further and discuss his analysis of the chapters which may certainly be treated as derivatives from Jason. Even in these chapters Professor Büchler detects the hand of the interpolator or epitomizer. In the main, Dr. Büchler attributes the exactness, logical order, and historicity to Jason; the errors and confusion to his epitomizer, thus applying to Book II something of the same principle that Willrich would apply to Book I. Niese, without an adequate examination of these arguments, and of others of a similar character, resolutely refusing his assent to all partition theories, does less justice to Jason than do others who hold no brief for the book. Niese attributes the exaggerations, the rhetorical extravagances to Jason himself, and exclaims, "This is how a Greek wrote history." But did Polybius write history in that manner? How does Jason's great contemporary compare with him if 2 Macc. really represents Jason's style and method? Sometimes (p. 37) Niese thinks that the epitome has diverged from Jason; but he has not dealt satisfactorily with this side of the problem.

It is impossible to go the length of a thorough vindication of Book II without attacking Book I. The main outlines of the two narratives are identical, but there are serious discrepancies in detail. Niese, like his predecessors, fails to clear up the omission of Mattathias from the purview of Book II. He thinks the fault not one of omission on the part of Book II, but of commission on the part of Book I. He follows Geiger in charging the author of Book I with introducing Mattathias, or at least with exaggerating his

importance, in order to glorify Simon with the reflected light of his father, and to legitimize the later Hasmoneans, making Mattathias on his death-bed appoint as leader Simon, "a man of counsel, a father unto you" (ii. 65). But if there be one matter in which Jewish tradition on the Maccabean history has a message it is on the importance of the rôle played by Mattathias. It is highly improbable that in this respect the Synagogue has followed a Sadducean tendency; yet, if the importance of Mattathias be false, it must have done so, for the so-called Pharisaic Book II does not know Mattathias at all. The Rabbinic tradition (which is independent of both books of the Maccabees) recognized Mattathias as the principle figure in the struggle for religious liberty. In the Synagogue liturgy he and not Judas is named as the hero of the drama. (Compare the strong confirmation of this in 1 Macc. xiv. 26; see also xvi. 14, from which it appears that Mattathias was a family name.) Wellhausen in his fourth edition rightly protests that at all events there is no ground for doubting that Mattathias was the father's name. There is something very touching in this figure of the strenuous old man, a typical Puritan warrior, zealous in doctrine and in battle, dying before the fruits of victory had been won, yet enjoying unto this day deathless renown, named on the Maccabean festival in every Jewish house of prayer. Would the self-sacrificing, lion-hearted Judas have desired a finer fate than this, that his glorious career should be merged in the renown of his noble father in those Jewish "meeting-places of God" which his deeds had helped to found or preserve? The Second Book of the Maccabees is supposed by some critics to be written entirely in the personal interests of Judas. One wonders what Judas would have thought of such a eulogist. And the Jason who is credited with this is said by Niese to have been possibly a personal friend of Judas.

With a feeling of relief I turn to Niese's brilliant investigation of the chronology of the Syrian kings. He places the date of Antiochus' death at 165-4, not, as is usually done, at 164-3 B. C. The chronology of the First Book is not without difficulty, and Niese's results are deserving of the closest consideration. Wellhausen, in his fourth edition, apparently accepts Niese's chronological results. It is worth while excerpting them (p. 81):—

Antiochus III, reigned 36 years.	First year, Ol. 139, 2 (223-2 B. C.). Last year, Ol. 148, 1 (188-7 B. C.).
Seleucus IV, reigned 12 years.	First year, Ol. 148, 2 (187-6 B. C.). Last year, Ol. 151, 1 (176-5 B. C.).
Antiochus IV, reigned 11 years.	First year, Ol. 151, 2 (175-4 B. C.). Last year, Ol. 153, 4 (165-4 B. C.).

Antiochus V, reigned 2 years.	First year, Ol. 154, 1 (164-3 B. C.). Last year, Ol. 154, 2 (163-2 B. C.).
Demetrius I, reigned 12 years.	First year, Ol. 154, 3 (162-1 B. C.). Last year, Ol. 157, 2 (151-0 B. C.).
Alexander Balas, reigned 5 years.	First year, Ol. 157, 3 (150-149 B. C.). Last year, Ol. 158, 3 (146-5 B. C.).

This certainly supports somewhat the narrative of 2 Macc. as against 1 Macc.; the former seems to place the death of Antiochus before the Dedication of the Temple. Into the chronology of the Egyptian campaigns of Antiochus it is unnecessary to enter, for Niese, who prefers the arrangement in 2 Macc., tells us in his preface that he does not himself regard the issue as settled. Wellhausen (4th ed., p. 257) still prefers the account in Book I, which agrees better with Daniel. Reverting to the death of Antiochus and its relation to the Dedication, the two events clearly must have almost synchronized. Niese seems to think that 1 Macc. would date the operations of Judas against the neighbouring tribes as prior to the death of the king (p. 56), as, in fact, placing these operations between Antiochus' death and the Dedication. A close reading of 1 Macc. shows this assumption to be doubtful; this ground for preferring the arrangement in Book II has no firm foundation. In 1 Macc. vi. 5-8, we read (R.V.): "And there came one bringing him (Antiochus) tidings into Persia, that the armies, which went against the land of Judah, had been put to flight; and that Lysias went first with a strong host, and was put to shame before them; and that they had waxed strong by reason of arms and power, and with store of spoils, which they took from the armies that they had cut off; and that they had pulled down the abomination which he had built upon the altar that was in Jerusalem; and that they had compassed about the sanctuary with high walls, as before, and Bethsura, his city." This brings us only to the fortification of Bethzur, which is reported in 1 Macc. iv. 61. Hence the events of chapter v, in other words the campaigns of Judas against the neighbouring tribes, had not reached the ears of Antiochus at the moment of his death. These campaigns may have been in progress, and have continued after the king's demise. There can be no question that 1 Macc. has the more accurate account of the manner of Antiochus' death; Polybius is evidence enough of that. In all this part of the story 1 Macc. is clearly superior. It is highly improbable that Lysias would appear alone without Antiochus V in Judea after the death of Antiochus IV, as 2 Macc. (xi) requires us to believe, and as Niese believes. Lysias would not have left the side of his youthful ward, and thus thrown

him into the arms of his rival Philip. Again, Niese raises difficulties against the account in 1 Macc. which makes the occupation of Jerusalem by Judas and his re-dedication of the Temple coincident. Is it then conceivable that Judas would have allowed an appreciable interval to elapse between setting foot in Jerusalem and restoring the Temple services? Judas did not, according to 1 Macc., occupy Jerusalem without opposition, as Niese thinks (see 1 Macc. iv. 41). Niese's contention that Jerusalem could not have been retaken without a struggle on the part of the Syrian garrison may thus be true, and 1 Macc. also true. Niese himself perceives that Jerusalem was destitute of strong defences, except for the Citadel or Akra, which Judas failed to wrest from the hands of the enemy. In all of this 1 Macc. is thoroughly consistent, so consistent indeed that the narrative proclaims its truth aloud. Thus, in 1 Macc. i. 31, we are told how the walls of Jerusalem were demolished by order of Antiochus. In iii. 45 we are again informed that Jerusalem was without any fortifications except the Citadel. When Lysias temporarily withdrew, Judas was able to enter Jerusalem without a siege, though not without fighting, for he made a feint of attacking the Citadel to keep the Syrian garrison engaged, while he proceeded to cleanse and repair the Temple (iv. 41). Then he restored the walls (iv. 60, vi. 7). Note how admirably this fits in with the incident that marked the subsequent march of Antiochus V on the capital. Thanks to Judas' restoration of the walls, and to the further fact that Jerusalem was then defended by resolute Jews instead of Syrians, the city was able to sustain a siege (vi. 51). "And he encamped against the sanctuary many days; and set there mounds to shoot from, and engines of war, and instruments for casting fire and stones, and pieces to cast darts, and slings. And they also made engines against their engines, and fought for many days." The whole series of events is beautifully proportioned. It is hard to conceive that the rival narrative in the Second Book can find an advocate.

Here this review must close. I have said nothing of Niese's many valuable textual criticisms of both books, of his enlightening comments on many passages, of his careful examination of the sources. Niese never dogmatizes; if he makes an assertion, he gives his reasons. Thus the student is able to make enormous use of Niese without assenting to his results. No student of the two books can afford to neglect Niese's work. He has done a good deal towards rehabilitating the Second Book. He has also brought into fuller relief the defects of Book I, though these defects were always more or less recognized. The First Book is not free from "tendency." Some things that the author probably knew are occasionally suppressed.

The numbers are exaggerated, the priestly deficiencies are lightly touched. (Yet see 1 Macc. iv. 42.) The official documents regarding foreign states have been "edited," and are on the whole not to be relied on. The imitations and reminiscences of the Old Testament are not restricted to style, but also colour the narrations of events. Wellhausen, the fourth edition of whose *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* reached me when this paper was practically finished, agrees, and rightly agrees, with Niese on these heads (p. 246). But the Second Book must still be employed against the First with caution, though with a more credulous caution. Schürer (in *his* new edition, 1898) still holds that "The author (of Book I) has at his disposal such a fund of details that it is impossible to entertain any doubt as to the *credibility* of his narrative as a whole (*über die Glaubwürdigkeit im Grossen und Ganzen kein Zweifel obwalten kann*, p. 141). His book is one of the most valuable sources we possess for the history of the Jewish people." This view of Schürer was repeated *before* Niese's *Kritik* was published. But it remains true *after* Niese's criticism. Wellhausen, writing in full cognizance of Niese's work, now expresses himself (*loc. cit.*) in terms with which I unhesitatingly agree: "Niese's penetrating criticism of the two Books of the Maccabees has taught me much, but has not convinced me that the Second Book is older than the First and deserves preference to it . . . . One must not indeed view everything through the spectacles of the First Book. But there remains no alternative but to use it as the foundation (of the history of the period)."

#### I. ABRAHAMS.