The Jewish Quarterly Review.

EDITED BY

I. ABRAHAMS AND C. G. MONTEFIORE.

VOLUME II.

LONDON: D. NUTT.

1890.

Digitized by Project Zikaron
Touro University-NY Libraries
www.zikaron.tourolib.org
2026

CONTENTS.

Articles in Capitals ; Notes in Roman Type.

PAGE

ABARBANEL: DON ISAAC ABARBANEL. By the Rev. I. S. MEISELS 37

ADLER: THE LATE CHIEF RABBI, DR. N. M. ADLER. By Dr. M. FRIEDLÄNDER 369

Æsop: An Unknown Hebrew Version of the Sayings of Æsop. By Prof. R. GOTTHEIL 533

Alexander and His Gold-Lettered Scroll. By Prof. H. GRAETZ 102

Algazi's Chronicle and the Names of the Patriarch's Wives. By S. SCHECHTER... 190

Berechiah Naqdan. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER. 520
(See also Jewish Massorites.)

"Bestemm." By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 189

BIBLIOGRAPHY: POST-BIBLICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1888-9. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 191

BOSWELL: A JEWISH BOSWELL. By S. SCHECHTER 139

BROWNING: BROWNING AS A RELIGIOUS THINKER. By MARIAN VON GLEHN 230

BROWNING'S THEOLOGY. By JOSEPH JACOBS... 249

THE CHILD IN JEWISH LITERATURE. By S. SCHECHTER ... 1

CORI: THE COMMUNITY OF CORI IN THE CAMPAGNA. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 297

CRITICAL NOTICES.

DEMBITZER'S "KLILATH JOFI" 514
DRIVER'S "THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL" 509
JACOBS' "FABLES OF ÆSOP" 182
KUENEN'S INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT ... 311
MARGOLIOUTH'S EDITION OF JAPHET'S DANIEL 186
O. J. SIMON'S "THE WORLD AND THE CLOISTER" ... 518
ROBERTSON SMITH'S "RELIGION OF THE SEMITES" ... 178

DELITZSCH: FRANZ DELITZSCH. By Prof. KAUFMANN ... 386

EDUCATION: JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. By Mrs. HENRY LUCAS 270

Eugenius IV: Pope Eugenius IV. on the Jews. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 530

FAITH: THE POSITION OF FAITH IN THE JEWISH RELIGION. By O. J. SIMON 53

A UNITARIAN MINISTER'S VIEW OF THE TALMUDIC DOCTRINE OF GOD. By the Rev. R. TRAVERS HERFORD. ... 454

HIRSCH: JEWISH PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH. By Dr. S. A. HIRSCH 109

Hosea xiv. 8. By the Rev. L. M. SIMMONS 533

IDEALS: JEWISH IDEALS. By JOSEPH JACOBS 494

Jewish History in Arabian Historians. By Dr. C. ADLER... 106

JUDAISM: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUDAISM FOR THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE. By Prof. A. GRAETZ .. 257

MAIMUN: LETTER OF CONSOLATION OF MAIMUN BEN JOSEPH. By the Rev. L. M. SIMMONS, B.A. 62
[The Arabic text will be found between pages 335 and 369.

PAGE

MARRIAGES ARE MADE IN HEAVEN. By I. ABRAHAMS ... 172
Masnuth: Samuel Masnuth. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 526
MASSORITES: English Massorites. (1) By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 322
(2) By J. JACOBS 330
(See also Berechiah Naqdan.)
Meir: Rabbi Meir and "Cleopatra." By Prof. W. BACHER. 188
Merton College: Shtars in Merton College. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER ... 527
MANY MOODS IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES. By C. G. MONTEFIORE 142
NASSI: DON JOSEPH NASSI. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 291
ARE THE JEWS A NATION TO-DAY? By the Rev. Dr. M. H. HARRIS 166
New Volume of the work *Talmud Torah*. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER... ... 333
ORACLES: THE JEWISH SYBILLINE ORACLES. By Dr. S. A. HIRSCH 406
Persecutions: Fragment of an Account of Persecutions. By Dr A. NEUBAUER 531
Plagiarism: A Recent Case of Plagiarism. By S. SCHECHTER 108
POLYTHEISM IN PRIMITIVE ISRAEL. By the Rev. Prof. A. H. SAYCE... 25
PROVERBS: NOTES UPON THE DATE AND RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS. By C. G. MONTEFIORE 430
SABBATARIANS: THE SABBATARIANS OF HUNGARY. By Prof. W. BACHER 465
Sambary and Benjamin of Tudela. By I. ABRAHAMS 107
SEPTUAGINT: ARE THERE TRACES OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN THE SEPTUAGINT? By Prof. J. FREUDENTHAL ... 205
TALMUD: Burning the Talmud in 1322. By Prof. H. GRAETZ 104
Translation of the Talmud in England in 1568? By S. SCHECHTER 188
THEBES: JEWISH TAX-GATHERERS IN THEBES. By Prof. A. H. SAYCE 400
ZENDAVESTA: THE ZENDAVESTA AND THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS. By the Rev. Dr. A. KOHUT 223

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLUME II.

I. ABRAHAMS.
C. ADLER.
W. BACHER.
J. FREUDENTHAL.
M. FRIEDLÄNDER.
R. GOTTHEIL.
H. GRAETZ.
M. H. HARRIS.
R. T. HERFORD.
S. H. HIRSCH.
J. JACOBS.
D. KAUFMANN.
A. KOHUT.
A. LUCAS.
I. S. MEISELS.
C. G. MONTEFIORE.
A. NEUBAUER.
A. H. SAYCE.
S. SCHECHTER.
L. M. SIMMONS.
O. J. SIMON.
S. A. STRONG.
M. VON GLEHN.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1889.

THE CHILD IN JEWISH LITERATURE.

"I SAW a Jewish lady only yesterday with a child at her knee, and from whose face towards the child there shone a sweetness so angelical that it seemed to form a sort of glory round both. I protest I could have knelt before her, too, and adored in her the divine beneficence in endowing us with the material *storgé* which began with our race and sanctifies the history of mankind." These words, which are taken from Thackeray's "Pendennis," may serve as a starting-point for this paper. The fact that the great student of man perceived this glory just round the head of a Jewish lady rouses in me the hope that the small student of letters may, with a little search, be able to discover in the remains of our past, many similar traces of this divine beneficence and sanctifying sentiment. Certainly the glimpses which we shall catch from the faded leaves of ancient volumes, dating from bygone times, will not be so bright as those which the novelist was so fortunate as to catch from the face of a lady whom he saw but the previous day. The mothers and fathers, about whom I am going to speak in this paper, have gone long ago, and the objects of their anxiety and troubles have also long ago vanished. But what the subject will lose in brightness, it may perhaps gain in reality and intensity. A few moments of enraptured devotion do not make up the saint. It is a whole series of feelings and sentiments betrayed on different occasions, expressed in different ways, a whole life of sore troubles, of bitter disappointments, but also moments of most elevated joys and real happiness.

379

And surely these manifestations of the divine beneficence, which appear in their brightest glory in the literature of every nation when dealing with the child, shine strongest in the literature of the Jewish nation. In it, to possess a child, was always considered as the greatest blessing God could bestow on man, and to miss it as the greatest curse. The patriarch Abraham, with whom we enter on history, complains —"Oh Lord, what will thou give me, seeing I go childless!"

The Rabbis declared the childless man as dead, whilst the Cabbalist in the Middle Ages thought him who died without posterity as one who failed in his mission in this world, so that he would have to appear again on our planet to fulfil this duty. To trace out the feelings which accompanied the object of their greatest anxiety, to let them pass before the reader in some way approaching to a chronological order, to draw attention to some points more worthy of being emphasised than others, is the aim of this paper.[1]

I said that I propose to treat the subject in chronological order. I meant by this that I shall follow the child in the different stages through which it has to pass from its birth until it ceases to be a child and attains its majority. This latter period is the beginning of the thirteenth year in the case of a female, and the beginning of the fourteenth year in the case of a male. I shall have occasion later on to examine this point more closely.

But there is the embryo-period which forms a kind of preliminary stage in the life of the child, and plays a very important part in the region of Jewish legends. Human imagination always occupies itself most with the things of which we know least. And so it got hold of this semi-existence of man, the least accessible to experience and observation, and surrounded it by a whole cycle of all sorts of legends and stories. They are too numerous to be related here. But I shall hint at a few points which I consider as the most conspicuous features of these legends.

These legends are chiefly based on the notion of the pre-

---

[1] The chief authority on this subject is the work *Die Lebensalter*, by Dr. Leopold Löw, the late chief Rabbi of Szegidin, who put together almost all the references in Jewish literature to our theme. Not wishing to overload this popular essay with unnecessary footnotes, I shall in most cases refrain from giving the authorities, that can easily be found in his work, and shall only refer to those which have been, for some reason or other, left out by Löw, or which have been added since the appearance of his book. A not less excellent book is *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker*, by Dr. Plöss, containing most valuable information, especially concerning the customs and usages with primitive nations. That I have made ample use of such books as the מקורי המנהגים it is hardly necessary to say.

existence of the soul on the one hand, but on the other hand they are a vivid illustration of the words of the Fathers, "Thou art born against thy will." Thus the soul when it is brought before the throne of God, and is commanded to enter into the body, pleads before him: "O Lord, I was till now holy and pure; do not bring me into contact with what is unclean and common." Thereupon the soul is given to understand that it was for this destination alone that it was created. Another remarkable feature is the warning given to man before his birth that he will be responsible for his actions. He is regularly sworn in. The oath has the double purpose of impressing upon him the consciousness of his duty to lead a holy life, and of arming himself against the danger, lest a holy life make him vain. As if to render this oath more impressive, the unborn hero is provided with two angels who, besides teaching him the whole of the Torah, take him every morning through paradise and show him the glory of the just ones who dwell there. In the evening he is taken to hell to witness the sufferings of the reprobate. But such a lesson would make free will impossible. His future conduct would only be dictated by the fear of punishment and hope of reward. And the moral value of his actions also depends, according to Jewish notions, upon the power to commit sin. Thus another legend records: "When God created the world, he produced on the second day the angels with their natural inclinations to do good, and the absolute inability to commit sin. On the following days again, he created the beasts with their exclusively animal desires. But he was pleased with neither of these extremes. If the angels follow my will, said God, it is only on account of their impotence to act in the opposite direction. I shall therefore create man who will be a combination of both angel and beast, so that he will be able to follow either the good or evil inclination. His evil deeds will place him beneath the level of animals, whilst his noble aspirations will enable him to obtain a higher position than angels."[1] Care is therefore taken to make the child forget all it has seen and heard in these upper regions. Before it enters the world an angel strikes it on the upper-lip, and all his knowledge and wisdom disappear at once. The pit in the upper-lip is a result of this stroke, which is also the cause why children cry when they are born.

As to the origin of these legends, the main features of which are already to be found in the Talmud, I must refer

[1] Quoted in the פסיק"ת, § 53, from a Midrash.

the reader to the researches of Löw and others.[1] Here we have only to watch the effect which these legends had upon the minds of Jewish parents. The newly-born child was in consequence looked upon by them as a higher being, which, but a few seconds before, had been conversing with angels and saints, and had now condescended into our profane world to make two ordinary mortals happy. The treatment which the child experienced from its parents, as well as from the whole of the community, was therefore a combination of love and veneration. One may go even further and say that the belief in these legends determine greatly the destination of the child. What other destination could a being of such a glorious past have than to be what an old German Jewish poem expressed in the following lines:

"Geboren soll es wehren
Zu Gottes Ehren."

"The child should be born to the honour of God." The mission of the child is to glorify the name of God on earth. And the whole bringing up of the child in the old Jewish communities was more or less calculated to this end. The words of the Bible, "And you shall be unto me a kingdom of priests" were taken literally. And every man felt it his duty to bring up his children, or at least one member of his family, for this calling. How they carried out this programme we shall see later on.

Now, regarding almost every infant as a predestined priest, and thinking of it as having received a certain preparation for this calling before it came into this world, we cannot wonder that the child was supposed to show signs of piety from the days of its earliest existence, and even earlier. Thus we read that even the unborn children joined in with the chorus on the Red Sea and sang the *Shirah*. David again composed Psalms before perceiving the face of this world. On the Day of Atonement they used to communicate to the unborn child through the medium of its mother, that on this great day it had to be satisfied with the good it had received the day before. And when a certain child named Sabbathai in after life refused to listen to such a request, R. Jochanan applied to it the verse from the Psalm, "The wicked are estranged from the womb." Indeed, Sabbathai turned out a great sinner. It will perhaps be interesting to hear what his

[1] Besides Löw, p. 65, see also Freudenthal, Das IV. *Maaccabäerbuch*, p. 48, note 2, and his *Hellenische Studien*, I., 72; Güdemann's *Religionsgeschichtliche*, Studien 1-20; Joel's *Blicke*, I., 118; and Brüll's *Jahrbuch*, III., 176.

sin was. It consisted in forestalling the corn in the market and afterwards selling it to the poor at a much higher price. Of a certain child the legend tells that it was born with the word אמת (Truth) engraved on its forehead. Its parents named it Amiti, and the child proved to be a great saint.[1]

The priest, however, could not enter into his office without some consecration. As the first step to this consecration of the child we may consider the covenant of Abraham. But this was prefaced by a few other solemn acts which I must mention. One of the oldest ceremonies connected with the birth of a child was that of tree-planting. In the case of a boy they planted a cedar, in that of a girl a pine; and on their marriage they cut branches from these trees to form the wedding-canopy.[2] Other rites followed, but they were more of a medical character, and would be better appreciated by the physician. In the Middle Ages superstition played a great part. To be sure, I have spoken of saints, but we ought not to forget that saints, too, have their foolish moments, especially when they are fighting against hosts of demons, the existence of which is only guaranteed by their own over-excited brains. Jewish parents were for many centuries troubled by the fear of Lilith, the devil's mother, who was suspected of stealing children and killing them. The precautions that they took to prevent this atrocity were as foolish as the object of their fear. Now, I do not intend to enumerate here all these various precautions. Every country almost has its own usages and charms, one more absurd than the other. It will suffice to refer here to the most popular of these charms in which certain angels are invoked to protect the child against its dangerous enemy Lilith. But of whatever origin they may be, Judaism could do better without them. The only excuse for their existence among us is to my mind that they provoked the famous Dr. Erter to the composition of one of the finest satires in the Hebrew language.[3]

Of a less revolting character was the so-called ceremony of the "Reading of the Shema." It consisted in taking all the little children of the community into the house of the newly-born child, where the teacher made them read the Shema, sometimes also the ninety-first Psalm. The fact that little

---

[1] ספר המעשים (ed. Basel), § 166. [2] Gittin, 57*a*.

[3] Attempts to explain these charms have been made in the *Hamagid*, III., p. 170, and by Dr. Gaster in his pamphlet *Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Sagen und Märchen-Kunde*, p. 67. We will only remark that MS. Add. 15,229 in the British Museum (101*a*) has סנמנלף instead of סמנגלף, whilst Heb. ii. in Oxford has סנמנלא.

children were the chief actors in this ceremony reconciles one a little with it despite its rather doubtful origin. In some communities these readings took place every evening up to the day when the child was brought into the covenant of Abraham. In other places they performed the ceremony only on the eve of the day of the *Berith*. Indeed this was the night during which Lilith was supposed to play her worst tricks, and the watch over the child was redoubled. Hence the name "Wachnacht," or the "Night of Watching." They remained awake for the whole night, and spent it in feasting and in studying certain portions of the Bible and the Talmud, mostly relating to the event which was to take place on the following day. This ceremony was already known to Jewish writers of the thirteenth century. Nevertheless, it is considered by the best authorities on the subject to be of foreign origin.[1] Quite Jewish, as well as entirely free from superstitious taint, was the visit which was paid to the infant-boy on the first Sabbath of his existence. It was called "Shalom Zachar," probably meaning "Peace-boy," in allusion to a well-known passage in the Talmud to the effect that the advent of a boy in the family brings peace to the world. Some authorities think that this was the ceremony known in the Talmud under the name of שבוע הבן, "the week of the son." But these words, as well as that of ישוע הבן, belong, unfortunately, to that class of Talmudical terms which seem doomed to remain obscure for ever.[2]

At last the dawn of the great day of the Berith came. I shall, however, only touch here on the social aspects of this rite.[3]

Its popularity began as it seems already in very olden times. The persecutions which Israel suffered for it in the

---

[1] The latest authority on the subject is Dr. Perles, in the *Graetz-Jubelschrift*, p. 23. See also Güdemann, *Geschichte*, etc., III., 103.

[2] See Löw, p. 89, 384, where the references to the Talmudic literature are given, to which *Megillath Taanith*, VI., and *Tossephta Sotah* 15 may be added. See also the earlier commentaries to these passages, and the *Aruch*, s. v. שבע (i.). Löw's explanation that the Jewish שבוע הבן was an imitation of the Greek *hebdomeuonomena*, and thus observed on the *seventh* day after the birth of the child, gains some support from the commentary of R. Gershon to Baba Bathra, which was lately published in the Wilna edition. Here (p. 60*b*) we read the words לשבוע הבן שעושין לסוף שבעה. The fact that in certain versions of the *Tractate Semachoth* mention is also made of שבוע הבת (see Nachmanides תורת האדם ed. Venice, 35*b*) makes it still more probable.

[3] The late Dr. Asher, in his excellent book "The Jewish Rite of Circumcision," has treated the subject from its Halachic and medical as well as historical sides. In the preface, he gives also an excellent list of authorities on the subject. It is to be hoped that his son-in-law, Dr. Abraham Cohen, will soon re-edit this useful book with the MS. notes of the author and his own additions.

times of the tyrant, Antiochus Epiphanes, "when the princes and elders mourned, the virgins and the young men were made feeble, and the beauty of women was changed, and when certain women were put to death for causing their children to be circumcised," are the best proof of the attachment of the people to it. The repeated attempts on this law, both by heathen and Christian hands, only served to increase its popularity. Indeed R. Simeon ben Elazar characterised it as the law for which Israel brought the sacrifice of martyrdom, and therefore held firmly by it. In other words they suffered for it, and it became endeared to them. R. Simeon ben Gamliel declares it to be the only law which Israel performs with joy and exultation.[1] As a sign of this joy we may consider the eagerness and the lively interest which raised this ceremony from a strictly family affair to a matter in which the whole of the community participated. Thus we find that already in the times of the Gaonim the ceremony was transferred from the house of the parents into the synagogue. Here it took place after the prayers, in the presence of the whole congregation. The synagogue used to be especially illuminated in honour of the event. Certain pieces of the daily prayer, of a rather doleful nature, such as the confession of sins, were omitted, lest the harmony of the festival should be disturbed. As a substitute for these prayers, various hymns suitable for the occasion were composed and inserted in the liturgy for the day. As the most prominent members among those present, figured the happy father of the child and the medical man who performed the ceremony, usually called the Mohel or Gozer, both wearing their festival garments and having certain privileges, such as being called up to the Torah and chanting certain portions of the prayers. It is not before the tenth century that a third member suddenly emerges to become almost as important as the father of the child. I am referring to the Sandek or Godfather. In some countries he was also called Baal Berith. In Italy they seemed to have had two Sandeks. This word was for a long time supposed to be the Greek word *συνδικος*. But it is now proved beyond doubt that it is a corruption of the word *συντεκνος* used in the Greek church for Godfather. In the church he was the man who lifted the neophyte from the baptismal waters. Among the Jews, the office of the Sandek was to keep the child on his knees during the performance

[1] *Sabbath*, 130; Sifre *Debarim*, § 76. There is much reason for suggesting that R. Simeon b. Gamliel was the author of both passages. Compare also Rapoport, *Erech Millim*, p. 19.

of the ceremony.[1] The Sandek's place was, or is still, near the seat of honour, which is called the Throne of Elijah, who is supposed to be the angel of the covenant. Other angels, too, were believed to officiate at this ceremony. Thus the angel Gabriel is also said to have performed the office of Sandek to a certain child. According to other sources, the archangel Metatron himself attended the ceremony.[2] Probably it was on this account that later Rabbis admonished the parents to take only a pious and good Jew as Sandek for their children. Christian theologians also declared that no good Christian must do such a service to a Jew. The famous Buxdorf had to pay a fine of 100 gulden for having attended the Berith of a child, whose father he had employed as reader when editing the well-known Basel Bible. The poor reader himself, who was the cause of Buxdorf's offence, was fined 400 gulden. Of an opposite case in which a Jew served as godfather to a Christian child, we find a detailed account in Schudt's "Merkwürdigkeiten der Juden," a very learned and very foolish book. When the father was summoned before the magistrate, and was asked how he dared to charge a Jew with such a holy Christian ceremony, he coolly answered, because he knew that the Jew would present him with a silver cup.[3] As to the present, I have to remark that also with the Jews the godfather was expected to bestow a gift on the child. In some communities he had to defray the expenses of the festival-dinner, of which I shall speak presently. In others, again, he had also to give a present to the mother of the child.[4]

Much older than the institution of the Sandek is the festival-dinner just alluded to, which was held after the ceremony.

---

[1] Besides Löw, p. 84, the originator of this explanation, it is accepted by Dr. Perles in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Hebräischen und Aramaischen Studien* (München, 1884), p. 56, where also the explanations of other authorities are discussed.

[2] *Maaseh Buch* (ed. Basel), § 179, Shudt's *Merkwürdigkeiten*, II.*, 295. Compare also לקוטי הפרדס לרשי 4*b*.

[3] I. 223.

[4] The following lines from an anonymous MS. in Oxford (Cat. Neubauer, 273), will not be uninteresting in this place :—

ונהגו ג"כ שהסנדיקוס מוזג לאם הילד כשמחזיר לה הילד ... וע"כ נהגו אבותינו בעת הברית שהיולדת מפקרת בנה למילה והסנדיקוס נוטלת אותו ואינה יודעת מה שיקרא בעת הברית בלי ספק הוא כמו הקיר' (הקרבן) ובפרט נשים שהם פחדניות וכשלוקחים בנ[ם] הם מפקירים אותו לשמים וכשמחזירים לה בנה נותנים לה שכר הן רב הן מעט ומנהג אבותינו תורה היא ובזה אני נאה דורש ונאה מקיים כי נקראתי לסנדיקוס בתנאי שלא אמזוג ואחר כותבי נתאמצתי שלא לסור מן המנהג :

Jewish legend supplies many particulars of the dinner the patriarch Abraham gave at the Berith of his son Isaac. This is a little too legendary, but there is ample historical evidence that such meals were already customary in the times of the Second Temple. The Jerusalem Talmud gives us a detailed account of the proceedings which took place at the Berith dinner of Elisha ben Abuyah, who afterwards obtained a sad celebrity as Acher. Considering that Elisha's birth must have fallen in the first decades after the destruction of the Temple, and that these sad times were most unsuitable for introducing new festivals, we may safely date the custom back to the times of the Temple. The way in which the guests entertained themselves is also to be gathered from the passage referred to. First came the dinner, in which all the guests participated; afterwards the great men of Jerusalem occupied one room, indulging there in singing, clapping, and dancing. The scholars again, who apparently did not belong to the great men, were confined to another room, where they enjoyed themselves with discussing Biblical subjects.[1] In later times special hymns, composed for this festival, were inserted in the grace after dinner. After the dinner sermons or speeches used also to be given, the contents of which were usually made up of reflections on Biblical and Talmudical passages relating to the event of the day. Sometimes they consisted of a kind of learned puns on the name which the child received on this occasion.[2]

With this meal the first consecration of the child-priest was concluded. In some places they used to come to the father's house on the third day after the circumcision with the purpose of making inquiries after the child's health. In the case when the child was the first-born the ceremony of פדיון הבן "redeeming the child" in accordance with Exodus xiii. used to take place. The details of this ceremony are to be found in almost every Prayer-book, and there is nothing fresh to add. But perhaps I may be allowed to draw attention to another distinction that the first-born received in the Middle Ages. I am referring to an account given by the author of the book חוקת התורה, who flourished in the thirteenth century. He says: Our predecessors made the rule

---

[1] See Yerushalmi, *Chagigah*, II., 1. Löw (p. 90), thinks that this story is antedated, and that it therefore possesses no historical value, but his proofs are in no way convincing. See also *Koheleth Rabbah*, chapter iii., and *Debarim Rabbah* ix., according to which the reference in *Yalkut Mishleh*, § 947, is to be corrected.

[2] See Cat. Neubauer 970, 2. The Derashah is for the greatest part on the name of the child.

to destine every first-born to God, and before its birth the father had to say, "I take the vow that if my wife presents me with a son, he shall be holy unto the Lord, and in his Torah he shall meditate day and night." On the eighth day after the Berith Milah they put the child on cushions, and a Bible on its head, and the elders of the community, or the principal of the college, imparted their blessings to it. These first-born sons formed, when grown up, the chief contingent of the Yeshiboth (Talmudical Colleges), where they devoted the greatest part of their lives to the study of the Torah.[1] In later centuries the vow was dropped, but from the abundance of the Yeshiboth in Poland and elsewhere it seems as if almost every child was considered as having no other calling but the study of the Torah.[2] Indeed, the growing persecutions required a strengthening of the religious force.

With these ceremonies the first act of consecration ended in the case when the new-born child was a boy. I will now refer to the ceremony of the name-giving, which was common to male and female. In the case of the former this ceremony was connected with the *Berith Milah.* The oldest formula, which is to be found already in the *Seder Rab Amram Gaon*, is composed in Aramaic. It is, like many prayers in this language, a most beautiful composition, and very suitable for the occasion. Our Hebrew prayer, beginning קיים את הילד, etc., is by far less beautiful, and dates from a much later age. In some countries the ceremony of naming was repeated in the house of the parents. It took place on the Sabbath, when the mother returned home from her first visit to the synagogue after her recovery. Here the friends and relatives of the family assembled, and after arranging themselves round the cradle of the child they lifted it three times, shouting the new name at every lifting. This name was the so-called שם החול, or profane name, whilst the name it received in the synagogue was the שם הקודש, or the Hebrew name. The ceremony concluded with the usual festival dinner. By the way, there was perhaps a little too much feasting in those days. The contemporary Rabbis tried indeed to suppress some of the banquets, and put all sorts of restrictions on dinner-hunting people.[3] But considering the fact that, as Jews, they

---

[1] See Güdemann, *Geschichte*, etc., *in Frankreich und Deutschland*, I., 270, § 5, but see also 267, § 1. The biblical stories of Samson, Samuel, and Levi (according to *Bereshith Rabbah*, chapter 70 and parallel passages) offer a kind of parallel to this custom.

[2] See יון כיצולה, ed. Venice, 11*a*.

[3] See, for instance, תקנות פרנקפורט as they are given in *Schudt*, IV., p. 81, *seq.*

were shut out of every public amusement, we cannot grudge them the pleasure they drew from these semi-religious dinners. For people of an ascetic disposition it was, perhaps, the only opportunity of enjoying a proper meal. And so, in our days, the most severe father would not deny his lively daughter the pleasure of dancing or singing charitably for the benefit of suffering humanity. The ceremony described was known to the authors of the Middle Ages by the name of Holle Kreish. These words are proved by Dr. Perles to be of German origin, and based on some Teutonic superstition into the explanation of which I cannot enter here.[1]

Of much more importance was the ceremony of name-giving in the case of a girl, it being the only attention the female child received from the synagogue. The usages were different. In some countries the name was given on the first Sabbath after the birth of the child. The father was called up to the Torah, on which the מי שברך followed, including the blessing and the announcement of the child's name. After the prayer the congregation assembled in the house of the parents to congratulate them. In other countries the ceremony took place on the Sabbath when the mother attended the synagogue after the recovery. The ceremony of Holle Kreish seems to have been especially observed in the case of a girl.

Though the feasting was now over for the parents, the child still lived in a holiday atmosphere for a long time. In the legend on the "Ages of Men" the child is described in the first year of its existence as a little prince, adored and petted by all. The mother herself nourished and tended the child. Although the Bible already speaks of nurses, many passages in the later Jewish literature show a strong aversion to these substitutes for the mother.[2] In the case that the father of the child died, the mother was forbidden to marry before her suckling infant reached the age of two years, lest a new courtship might lead to the neglect of the child.

More difficult is it to say in what the other signs of loyalty to the little prince consisted; as, for instance, whether Jews possessed anything like lullabies to soothe the little prince into happy and sweet slumber. At least I am not aware of the existence of such songs in the ancient Jewish literature, nor are they quoted by mediæval writers. The "Schlummerlied," by an unknown Jewish bard, about which German

---

[1] See his essay in the *Graetz-Jubelschrift*, p. 24, *seq.*; Güdemann, *Geschichte*, etc., III., pp. 104 and 105.

[2] תועליות הרל"בג to 1 Samuel vii. (תועלת י"ד), *Brautspiegel*, chapter xxxiv. See, however, *Debarim Rabbah*, chapter lx., at the end.

scholars wrote so much, contains more heathen than Jewish elements.[1] From the protest in the Sepher Chassidim (§ 238) against using non-Jewish cradle-songs, it seems that little Moshechen was lulled to sleep by the same tunes and words as little Johnny. The only Jewish lullaby of which I know, is to be found in the work of a modern writer who lived in Russia. How far its popularity goes in that country I have no means of ascertaining. This jingle runs as follows :—

O ! hush thee, my darling, sleep soundly my son,
Sleep soundly and sweetly till day has begun;
For under the bed of good children at night
There lies, till the morning, a kid snowy white.
We'll send it to market to buy Sechora,
While my little lad goes to study Torah.
Sleep soundly at night and learn Torah by day,
Then thou'lt be a Rabbi when I have grown gray.
But I'll give thee to-morrow ripe nuts and a toy,
If thou'lt sleep as I bid thee, my own little boy.[2]

But naturally the holiday atmosphere I spoke of was very often darkened by clouds resulting from the illness of the child. Excepting small-pox, the child was subject to most of those diseases which so often prove fatal to our children. These diseases were known under the collective name of צער גדול בנים, "the difficulties (or the pain) of bringing up children." These difficulties seem to have been still greater in Palestine, where one of the old Rabbis exclaimed that it was easier to see a whole forest of young olive-trees grow up than to rear one child.[3] To avoid so mournful a subject, I refrain from repeating the touching stories relating to the death of children. The pain was the more keenly felt since there was no other way of explaining the misfortune which befell the innocent creature than that it had suffered for the sins of the parents; and the only comfort the latter had was that the child could not have lost much by its being removed from this vale of tears at such an early period. A remarkable legend describes God himself as giving lessons so many hours a day to these prematurely deceased children.[4] Indeed, to the mind of the old Rabbis, the only thing worth living for was the study of the Torah. Consequently the child that

---

[1] See Geiger, *Zeitschrift*, 1867, 134. See also *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, III., 93.

[2] This poem is to be found in the Hebrew novel תועה בדרכי החיים, by Smolensky. I am indebted for this beautiful English adaptation to Mrs. Henry Lucas.

[3] *Bereshith Rabbah*, chapter xx. For another reading see ראשית חכמה (ed. Cracow), p. 374.

[4] *Abodah Zarah*, 3*b*.

suffered innocently could not have a better compensation than to learn Torah from the mouth of the Master of masters.

But even when the child was healthy, and food and climate proved congenial to its constitution, there still remained the troubles of its spiritual education. And to be sure it was not an easy matter to bring up a "priest." The first condition for this calling was learning. But learning cannot be acquired without honest and hard industry. It is true that R. Akiba numbers wisdom among the virtues which are hereditary from father to son. Experience, however, has shown that it is seldom the case, and the Talmudists were already troubled with the question how it happens that children so little resemble their fathers in respect of learning.

Certainly Jewish legends can boast of a whole series of prodigies. Thus a certain Rabbi is said to have been so sharp as to have had a clear recollection of the mid-wife who made him a citizen of this world. Ben Sira again, instantly after his birth, entertains his terrified mother with many a wise and foolish saying, refuses the milk she offers him, and asks for solid food. A certain Nachman was born with a prophecy on his lips, predicting the fate of all nations on earth, as well as fixing the date for the coming of the Messiah. The youngest of seven sons of Hannah, who became martyrs under the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, was according to one version aged two years, six months, six hours, and thirty minutes. But the way in which he defied the threats of the tyrant was really worthy of one of seventy. R. Judah de Modena is said to have read the Haftarah in the synagogue at the age of two years and a half. A famous Cabbalist Nachum, at the age of three, gave a lecture on the decalogue that lasted for three days. The Chassidim pretended of one of their Rabbis that he remembered all that he had been taught by the angels before his birth, and thus excused their Zaddik's utter neglect of studying anything. Perhaps I may mention in this place a sentence from Schudt, which may reconcile one to the harmless exaggerations of the Chassidim. It relates to a case where a Jewish girl of six was taken away by a Christian with the intention of baptising her, for he maintained that this was the wish and pleasure of the child. Probably the little girl received her instruction from the Christian servant of the house, as has happened many times. Schudt proves that this wish ought to be granted in spite of the minority of the child. He argues: As there is a maxim, "What is wanting in years may be supplied by wickedness," why could not also the reverse be true that

"What the child is wanting in years can be supplied by grace"; a very fine piece of clerical logic indeed. Of a certain R. Meshullam, again we know that he preached in the synagogue at Brody, at the age of nine, and perplexed the chief Rabbi of the place by his deep Talmudical learning. As the Rabbi had a daughter of seven, the cleverness exhibited by the boy Rabbi did not end without very serious consequences for all his life.[1]

Happily all these prodigies or children of grace are only exceptional. I say happily, for the Rabbis themselves disliked such creatures. They were more satisfied with those signs of intelligence that indicate future greatness. The following story may serve as an instance:—R. Joshua ben Chananyah once made a journey to Rome. Here he was told that amongst the captives from Jerusalem there was a child with bright eyes, its hair in ringlets, and its features strikingly beautiful. The Rabbi made up his mind to redeem the boy. He went to the prison and addressed the child with a verse from Isaiah, "Who gave Jacob for a spoil and Israel to the robbers?" On this the child answered by continuing the second half of the same verse, "Did not the Lord, he against whom we have sinned? For they would not walk in his ways, neither were they obedient unto his law." The Rabbi was so delighted with this answer, that he said: "I am sure he will grow up to be a teacher in Israel. I take an oath to redeem him, cost what it may." The child was afterwards known under the name of R. Ishmael ben Elisha.[2] Such children were ideals of the Rabbis, but they hated the baby scholar, who very often grew impertinent and abused his elders.[3] The Rabbis much more preferred the majority of those tiny creatures, which is characterised by the already mentioned legends on the "Ages of Men" as little animals playing, laughing, crying, dancing, and committing all sorts of mischief.

But these children must be taught. Now there is the well-known Boraitha of Judah ben Tema, who used to say that the child at five years was to be taught Scripture, at ten years Mishnah, at thirteen to fulfil the Law, etc. This Boraitha incorporated in most editions to the fifth chapter of the sayings of the Fathers is usually considered as the programme of Jewish education. But, like so many programmes, this

---

[1] Besides Löw, pp. 67 and 149, see also *Midrash Echah*, chapter i., *Yerushalmi Ketuboth*, V., 6, ישם הגדולים החדש I., 58*a*, Schudt, 279.

[2] *Gittin*, 58*a*.

[3] *Yerushalmi Sotha*, iii., 4.

tells us rather how things ought to have been than how they were. In the times of the Holy Temple, the participation of the youth in religious actions began at the tenderest age. As soon as they were able to walk a certain distance with the support of their parents, the children had to accompany them on their pilgrimages to Jerusalem. In the Sabbatical year they were brought to the Temple, to be present at the reading of Deuteronomy by the king. The period at which the child's allegiance to the synagogue began is still more distinctly described. Of the many Talmudical passages relating to this question, I shall select the following quotation from a later Midrash, because it is the most concise. In allusion to Leviticus xix. 23, 24, concerning the prohibition of eating the fruits of a tree in the first three years, this Midrash goes on to say: "And this is also the case with the Jewish child. In the first three years the child is unable to speak, and therefore is exempted from every religious duty, but in the fourth year all its fruits shall be holy to praise the Lord, and the father is obliged to initiate the child in religious works." Accordingly the religious life of the child began as soon as it was able to speak distinctly or with the fourth year of its life. As to the character of this initiation we learn from the same Midrash and also from other Talmudical passages, that it consisted in teaching the child the verses שמע ישראל and תורה צוה לנו משה. "Moses commanded us the Torah, the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob." It was also this year in which the boys began to accompany their parents to the synagogue, carrying their Prayer-books.[1] When the girls first came out —not for their first party, but with the purpose of going to the synagogue—is difficult to decide with any degree of certainty. But if we were to trust a rather doubtful reading in Tractate Sopherim, we might maintain that their first appearance in the synagogue was also at a very tender age. I hope that they behaved there more respectfully than their brothers, who played and cried instead of answering the responses and singing with the congregation. In some communities they proved so great a nuisance, that a certain Rabbi declared it would be better to leave them at home rather than to have the devotion of the whole congregation disturbed by these urchins. Another Rabbi recommended the praiseworthy custom of the Sephardim, who confined all the boys in

[1] See *Tanchuma*, ed. Buber, III., 40*a*; *Succah*, 42*a*. From the parallel passages in the *Sifre Debarim* xlvi., and *Tosephta Chagigah*, i. (compare preface to ספר הרקמה, iv.) it seems that the father had also the duty of teaching the child to speak the holy language. See also Güdemann, *Geschichte*, etc., I., p. 116, note 2.

the synagogue to one place, and set a special overseer by their side, with a whip in his hands, to force them to keep quiet and to worship with due devotion.[1]

A strange custom is known among the Arabian and Palestinian Jews under the name of *Chalaka.* It means the first hair-cutting of the boy after his fourth birthday. As on this occasion, loyalty to the Scripture is shown by not touching the פאת (corners), the whole action is considered a religious ceremony of great importance. Usually it takes place on the thirty-third day of the Omer, when friends and relatives assemble at the house of the parents. Thither the boy is brought, dressed in his best garments, and every one of the assembly is entrusted with cutting a few hairs, which is considered a great honour. The ceremony is as usual followed by a dinner given to the guests. The Jews in Safed and Tiberias perform the ceremony with great pomp in the courtyard surrounding the grave of R. Simeon ben Jochai, which is supposed to be in one of the neighbouring villages.[2]

Another custom already mentioned in the Talmud, but which quite disappeared in the latter times, is that of weighing the child. It would be worth reviving if performed in the way in which the mother of Doeg ben Joseph did it. This tender-hearted mother weighed her only son every day, and distributed among the poor as much gold as the amount of the increased weight of her child.[3]

I pass now to the second great consecration of the boy. I refer to the rites performed on the day when the boy went to school for the first time. This day was celebrated by the Jews, especially in the Middle Ages, in such a way as to justify the high esteem in which they held the school. The school was looked upon as a second Mount Sinai, and the day on which the child entered it as the Feast of Revelation. Of the many different customs, I shall mention here that Minhag, according to which this day was fixed for the Feast of Weeks. Early in the morning, while still dark, the child was washed and dressed nicely. In some places they dressed it in a Talith. As soon as day dawned the boy was taken to the synagogue, either by his father or by some worthy man of the community. Arrived at their destination, the boy was put on

---

[1] See Löw, 134, and references. Müller's edition of *Sopherim*, p. 260. About the much-vexed question of taking little children to the synagogue, see, besides the authorities given by Löw, the מקור חכמה, 21*a*, and Ralbag's commentary to Nehemiah viii. 2 (lately published in Gruber's *Magazin*, אוצר הספרות, II.)

[2] Mr. Luncz's ירושלים, II.

[3] *Echah Rabba*, chapter I. Compare Ralbag to 2 Samuel xiv. 26.

the Almemor, or reading-dais, before the Scroll of the Law, from which the narrative of the Revelation was read as the portion of the day. From the synagogue the boy was taken to the house of the teacher, who took him into his arms. Thereupon a slate was brought, containing the alphabet in various combinations, the verse, תורה צוה, and the first verse of the Book of Leviticus, and the words תורה תהי אומנתי "The Torah will be my calling." The teacher then read the names of the letters, which the boy repeated. After the reading, the slate was besmeared with honey, which the boy licked off. This was done in allusion to Ezekiel iii. 3, where it is said: "And it (the roll) was in my mouth as honey for sweetness." The boy was also made to eat a sweet cake, on which passages from the Bible were written relating to the importance of the study of the Torah. The ceremony was concluded by invoking the names of certain angels, asking them to open the heart of the boy, and to strengthen his memory.[1] By the way, I am very much afraid that this invocation has to be answerable for the abolition of this ceremony. The year in which this ceremony took place is uncertain, probably not before five, nor later than seven, according to the good or bad health of the child. As to the constitution of the school, the programme of teaching, the payment of the teachers, etc., I must refer the reader to the treatises on the subject, both by English and foreign scholars.

The reverence for the child already hinted at was still further increased when the boy entered the school. The abbreviation תשב"ר, "the children of the school," is a regular phrase in Jewish literature. It is their pure breath on which the existence of the world is dependent, and it is their merit that justifies us in appealing to the mercy of God. The words of the Scripture, which they uttered quite innocently, were considered as oracles; and many a Rabbi gave up an undertaking on account of a verse pronounced by a schoolboy, who hardly understood its importance. Hear only one instance: R. Jochanan was longing to see his friend Mar Samuel in Babylon. After many disturbances and delays, he at last undertook his journey. On the way he passed a school, where the boys were reciting the verse from 1 Samuel xxviii. 3, "And Samuel died." This was accepted by him as a hint given by Providence that all was over with his friend.[2]

Especially famous for their wisdom and sharpness were the

---

[1] See Güdemann, *Geschichte*, etc., I., 50, note 2, and III., 112. See also אגרות שר"ל, p. 466, קב הישר, chapter 72, and שו"ת חוות יאיר No. 16, at the end.

[2] *Chulin*, 95*b*.

children of Jerusalem. From the many illustrative stories given in Midrash Echah Rabbathi, the following one will suffice :—R. Joshua was one day riding on his donkey along the high road. As he passed a well, he saw a little girl there, and asked her to give him some water. Now she gave water to him and to his animal. The Rabbi thanked her with the words: "My daughter, you acted like Rebecca." "To be sure," she answered, "I acted like Rebecca; but you did not behave like Eleazar."[1] I must add that there are passages in Jewish literature from which, with a little ingenuity, it might be deduced that Jewish babies are the most beautiful of their kind. The assertion made by a monk that Jewish children are inferior to Christian children is a dreadful libel. The author of the Nizzachon Yashan, in whose presence this assertion was made, was probably childless, or he would have simply scratched out the eyes of this malicious monk, instead of giving a mystical reason for the superior beauty of any other children than his own.[2]

Another point to be emphasised is that the boys were not confined all day long to the close air of the school-room. They had also their hours of recreation. This recreation consisted chiefly, as one can imagine, in playing. Their favourite game was the ball, boys as well as girls being fond of this form of amusement. They did not deny themselves this pleasure even on festivals. They were also fond of the kite and games with nuts, in which their mothers also took part. Letter-games and riddles also occupied their minds in the recreation-hours. The angel Sandalphon, who bears in the Cabbala also the name of "Boy," was considered by the children as their special patron, and they invoked him in their plays, addressing to him the words: "Sandalphon, Lord of the forest, protect us from pain."[3] Speaking generally, there are very few Jewish games. From the researches of Zunz, Güdemann and Löw on this subject, it is clear that the Jews always adopted the pastimes of the peoples among whom they dwelt.

On the other hand, it must not be thought that there was too much playing. Altogether, Jewish education was far from spoiling the children. And though it was recommended —if such recommendation is necessary—to love children more than one's own soul, the Rabbis strongly condemned that blind partiality towards our own offspring, which ends in

---

[1] *Echah Rabba*, chapter I. See Perles, *Zur Rabbinischen Sprach- und Sagenkunde*, p. 91.

[2] Wagenseil *Tela igna*, 251.

[3] Goldberg on the periodical *Lebanon*, VI., 142.

burdening our world with so many good-for-nothings. The sad experience of certain Biblical personages served as a warning for posterity. And even from the quite natural behaviour of Jacob towards his son Joseph, which had the best possible results in the end, they drew the lesson which no man must show to one of his children marks of greater favour than to the others.[1] In later times they have been even anxious to conceal this love altogether, and some Rabbis went so far as to refrain from kissing their children.[2] The severity of Akabya ben Mahalel is worth mentioning, if not imitating. When this Rabbi, only a few minutes before his death, was asked by his son to recommend him to his friends and colleagues, the answer the poor boy received was: Your conduct will recommend you to my friends, or will estrange you from them.[3] Another Rabbi explained the words וחיים לנערותיך: Give life to thy youth, to mean teach him temperance in his diet, and do not accustom him to meat and wine.[4] R. Jehuda Hachassid, in the Middle Ages, gives the advice to rich parents to withdraw their resources from their sons, if they lead a disorderly life. The struggle for their existence, and the hardship of life, would bring them back to God.[5] When the old Rabbi said that poverty is a most becoming ornament for Jews, his remark was probably suggested by a similar thought. And many a passage in the Rabbinic literature gives expression to the same idea as that in Goethe's divine lines:—

> " Wer nie sein Brot mit Thränen ass,
> Wer nie die kummervollen Nächte
> Auf seinem Bette weinend sass,
> Der kennt Euch nicht, Ihr himmlischen Mächte."

I have spoken of a kingdom of priests, but there is one great disadvantage in such a polity. One or two priests in a community may be sustained by the liberality of the congregation. But if a community consisted of only priests, how could that be maintained? Besides, the old Jewish ideal expected the teacher to be possessed of a divine goodness, imparting his benefits only as an act of grace. Salaries, therefore, either for teaching or preaching, or giving ritual decisions, were strongly forbidden. The solution of the question already put by the Bible, " And if ye shall say, What shall we eat?" is to be found in the law that every father was obliged

---

[1] *Sabbath*, 10*b*. [2] See, for instance, the will of R. Süsskind, of Horodna.
[3] *Edoyoth*, V., 7. [4] *Chulin*, 84*a*. [5] *Sepher Chassidim*, 325.

to teach his son a handicraft, enabling him to obtain a living.

I have now to speak about the date with which childhood is brought to a conclusion. It is, as I stated above, in the case of a girl at the beginning of the thirteenth year, and in that of a boy at the beginning of the fourteenth year. As a reason for this priority I will reproduce the words of R. Chisda, who said that God has endowed women with a greater portion of intelligence than man, and therefore she obtains her maturity at an earlier period than man does.[1] A very nice compliment, indeed; but like all compliments it is of no practical consequence whatever. It is not always the wiser who get the better of it in life. Whilst the day on which the girl obtained her majority passed unnoticed either by her or by her family, it was marked in the boy as the day on which he became a son of the Law, and was distinguished by various rites and ceremonies, and by the bestowing on him of beautiful presents. I assume that there is no need to describe these well-known ceremonies. I miss only the wig, which used to form the chief ornament of the boy on this happy day.[2]

Less known, however, is the origin of this ceremony, and the reason for fixing its date. It cannot claim a very high antiquity. I may remark that in many cases it takes centuries before an idea or a notion takes practical shape, and is crystallised into a custom or *Minhag*, and still longer before this custom is fossilised into a law or *Din*. As far as the Bible goes there is not the slightest indication of the existence of such a ceremony. From Leviticus xxvii. 5, and Numbers xiv. 29, it would rather seem that it was not before the twentieth year that the man was considered to have obtained his majority, and to be responsible for his actions. It was only in the times of the Rabbis, when Roman influence became prevalent in juristic matters at least, that the date of thirteen, or rather the *pubertas*, was fixed as giving the boy his majority.[3] But it would be a mistake to think that before having obtained this majority the boy was considered as under age in every respect. Certainly the law made every possible effort to connect him with the synagogue, and to

---

[1] *Niddah*, 45*b*. An interesting question concerning the confirmation of girls is to be found also in *Nizzachon Yashan* in Wagenseil's *Tela igna*, I., 251.

[2] See Schudt, II.*, 295.

[3] Löw has treated the subject with such thoroughness, that it is impossible to add anything to it. Perhaps it is necessary to say that the term בר מצוה occurring in the Talmud (*e.g. Baba Mezia*, 96*a*) has nothing to do with the majority of the boy.

initiate him in his religious duties long before the age of thirteen.

We have seen that the boy's first appearance in the synagogue was at the beginning of the fourth year. We have noticed the complaints about his troublesome behaviour. But how could we expect the poor child to be attentive to things which quite surpassed the intellectual faculties of his tender age? There was no better reason for this attendance either in the Holy Temple or in the synagogue than that the parents might be rewarded by God for their trouble of taking their children there. These cares, by the way, were most incumbent upon the women. The mother of R. Joshua enjoyed this trouble so much that she carried her boy, when still in the cradle, to the Beth Hamidrash, in order that his ears might be accustomed to the sound of the Torah.[1] In later times there was another excuse for taking the little children to the synagogue. They were there allowed to sip the wine of the Kiddush, which was the exclusive privilege of the children; an easy way of worshipping, but, as you can observe, it is a method that they enjoy and understand most excellently. They did not less enjoy and understand the service with which they were charged on the day of "The Rejoicing of the Law." On this feast they were provided with flags, which they carried before the bearers of the Torah, who feasted them after the service with sweets. Another treat was that of being called up on this day to the Torah, a custom that is still extant. In the Middle Ages they went in some countries so far as to allow these little fellows who did not wear caps to be called up to say the blessings over the Law bare-headed. A very nice custom was that every Sabbath, after finishing the weekly portion and dressing the Sepher Torah, the children used to come up to the Almemor and kiss the Torah.[2] Leaving the synagogue they kissed the hands of the scholars. At home the initiation began by the blessing the child received on every eve of the Sabbath, by teaching it the first verse of the Shema, and other verses as already mentioned. Short prayers, consisting of one sentence, were also chosen[3] for children of this age. The function of the child on the Seder-night is well known. Besides the putting of the four questions, the boy had also to recite or rather to sing the Hallel. But I am afraid that they

---

[1] *Yerushalmi Yebamoth*, I., § 6. Perhaps it was this fact that suggested the *Keriath-Shema-Leinen*. For, as they could not carry the child into the synagogue, they brought the synagogue to the child.

[2] *Or Zarua*, II., 11*b*; *Reshith Chochma*, 373*b*. [3] *Pesikta Rabbati*, 174.

enjoyed better the song of חד גדיא, which was composed or rather adapted for their special entertainment, from an old German poem.[1]

Within three or four years after entering the synagogue, and with the growth of intellect and strength, the religious duties of the boy increased, and became of a more serious character. He had not only to attend the school, which was troublesome enough, but he was also expected to attend the services more regularly, and to gain something by it. Yet the Rabbis were not so tyrannical as to put unjust demands on the patience of the child. The voice of God on Mount Sinai, the Rabbis said, was adapted to the intellect, and the powers of all who witnessed the Revelation—adapted, as the Midrash says, to the powers of old and young, children and women. It was in accordance with this sentiment that the Rabbis suited even their language to the needs of the less educated classes. Thus we read in the *Massecheth Sopherim* that according to the *Din* the portion of the week, after having been recited in Hebrew, must be translated into the language of the vernacular for the benefit of the unlearned people, the women, and the children.[2] Another consideration children experienced from the Rabbis was that at the age of nine or ten the boy was initiated into the observance of the Day of Atonement by fasting a few hours. But that this good work might not be overdone, and thus endanger the child, the sage R. Acha used to tell his congregation after the prayer of Mussaph, "My brethren, let every one of you who has a child go home and make it eat."[3] In later centuries, when the disease of small-pox became so fatal, some Rabbis declared that it is every father's duty to leave the town with his children as soon as the plague showed itself. The joy with which the Rabbis hailed the invention of Dr. Jenner deserves our recognition. None of them perceived in vaccination a defiance of Providence. R. Abraham Nansich, from London, wrote a pamphlet to prove its lawfulness. The Cabbalist Buzagli disputed Dr. Jenner's priority, but nevertheless approved of vaccination. R. Israel Lipschütz declared that the Doctor acquired salvation by his new remedy.[4]

With his advancing age, not only the boy's duties were increased, but also his rights. An enumeration of all these rights would lead me too far, but I shall mention the cus-

---

[1] Brull, *Jahrbuch*. IV., 97, and Perles. *Graetz-Jubelschrift*, 37.

[2] *Shemoth Rabbah*, chapter 5, and *Masecheth Soferim*, chapter 18.

[3] *Yerushalmi Yoma*, VI., § 4. See also *Tossephta*, *ibid.*, chapter V.

[4] עלה תרופה, London, and the commentary תפארת ישראל to *Aboth*, III., 14.

tom which allowed to the boy the recital of Kaddish and Borchu in the synagogue. We have restricted this privilege to the orphan boy. It is interesting to hear that girls were also admitted to say Kaddish in the synagogue, in case their parents left no male issue. I have myself witnessed such a case. In some countries the boy had the exclusive privilege of reading the prayers on the evenings of the festivals and Sabbaths. R. Simeon ben Eleazar, in the fifteenth century, again received his family name ברוך שאמר from the skill with which he recited this prayer when a boy. He chanted it so nicely that he was called by the members of the community Master ברוך שאמר.[1] As to the question whether the boy, while under age, was allowed to be considered as one of the ten when Minyan was required, or one of the three in the case of Mesuman, I can only say that the authorities never agreed in this respect. Whilst the one insisted upon his having obtained his majority, the other was satisfied with his showing such signs of intelligence as would enable him to participate in the ceremony in question. Here is an instance of such a sign. Abaje and Raba, the two celebrated heroes of the Babylonian Talmud, were sitting at the table of Rabbah. Before saying grace he asked them, "Do you know to whom these prayers are addressed?" Thereupon one boy pointed to the roof, whilst the other boy went out and pointed to the sky. The examiner was satisfied with their answer.[2]

The privilege of putting on the *Tephillin* forms now in most countries the chief distinction of the Barmitzvah; in olden times, however, every boy had claim to it as soon as he showed the ability of behaving respectfully when wearing the holy symbol. It even happened that certain honours of the synagogue were bestowed on the clever boys, though under age. We possess a copy of a Jewish epitaph dating from about the third century, which was written in Rome for a boy of eight years, who is there designed as archon.[3] The fact is the more curious, as on the other hand the Palestinian R. Abuha, who lived in the same century, maintained that no man must be elected as Parnass before he achieved his fiftieth year. That boys were admitted to preach in the synagogue I mentioned before.

From all these remarks it will easily be seen that in olden times the boy enjoyed almost all the rights of majority long before the day of his Barmitzvah. The condition of the

---

[1] Preface to his book ברוך שאמר. [2] *Berachoth*, 48*a*.

[3] See Schürer's *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, p. 24. Compare *Hamazkir* xix., p. 79.

novice is hardly discernible from that of the initiated priest. The Talmud, the Gaonim, and even R. Isaac Alfassi and Maimonides knew neither the term Barmitzvah nor any ceremony connected with it.[1] There is only one slight reference to such an institution, recorded in the Massecheth Sopherim, with the quotation of which I shall conclude this paper. We read there: "In Jerusalem there was the godly custom to to initiate the children with the *beginning* of the thirteenth year by fasting the whole Day of Atonement.[2] During this year they took the boy to the priests and learned men that they might bless him, and pray for him that God might think him worthy of a life devoted to the study of the Torah and pious works." For, this author says, "they were beautiful, and their lives harmonious and their hearts directed to God."

S. SCHECHTER.

---

[1] See note 3, p. 20.

[2] Ed. Müller. p. xxx. and 258.

POLYTHEISM IN PRIMITIVE ISRAEL.

THE first words of the Hebrew Bible are significant of the gulf which separates Israel of the law from Israel before the law. "In the beginning," we are told, "Elohim created the heavens and the earth." The verb is singular, but its nominative has a plural form. From the earliest days of Biblical study the fact has forced itself upon the attention of the scholar, and various attempts have been made to explain the origin of such a use of the plural *Elohim*. It has been called a *pluralis majestatis*, and grammarians and theologians have united in seeing in it an expression of the omnipotence of the Hebrew Deity and his exaltation over all other gods.

But the student of linguistic science cannot be satisfied with this or any similar explanation. He knows that language is not the cunningly-devised invention of priests and philologists, and that words and forms of words do not enter into common use because they express the ideas of scholars and theologians. People do not employ a plural form to express a singular idea unless that singular idea had once been conceived of as a plural. We may speak of "a means to an end," but when the word was first received into English speech, it represented more "means" than one. Words, in fact, are like fossils; they preserve for us older modes of thought and belief embedded within the skeleton of their outward form. *Elohim* would never have come to denote the singular "God" had it not first denoted the plural "gods."

The Old Testament itself bears witness to the fact. Apart from the use of the word to denote the "gods" of the heathen (Gen. xxxi. 30; Exod. xii. 12; Ps. xcvii. 7, etc.), or even the princes of an earthly state (Ps. lxxxii. 1), we find it employed with a plural verb in one or two old phrases which have been preserved by ancient tradition. Thus in Gen. i. 26, Elohim says: "Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness"; and in Gen. xi. 7, when the Tower of Babel was being built even Yahveh is described as saying, "Go to, let *us* go down and there confound their language." Of course the Christian

fathers found in these expressions an allusion to the doctrine of the Trinity, and equally of course the Jewish Rabbis discovered in them a reference to the angels; the modern student of language is forbidden to read into his text ideas which belong to a later age.

A recent discovery has shown that the application of the plural "gods" to a single person goes back to a period when as yet the Israelites had not entered the Promised Land. Clay tablets inscribed with cuneiform characters and written in the Babylonian language have been found among the ruins of the palace of Amenôphis IV. at Telel-Amarna on the Nile, and prove to be despatches to the Egyptian king from the kings and governors of Babylonia and Assyria, of Syria, of Mesopotamia, and of Palestine. Palestine was at the time under Egyptian rule and administered by Egyptian officers. But the officers for the most part bore Semitic names of a Canaanitish stamp, and the language of the despatches they forwarded to their Egyptian master is tinged with a Canaanitish colouring. Now in the protocol of these, the Egyptian sovereign is not only termed "sun-god" and "god," but "gods" as well. A writer, for instance, who dates from what was afterwards the territory of Judah, addresses his letter to the king, "my lord, my gods, my sun-god." The employment of the plural for the singular in the case of the divine name was accordingly familiar to Canaanitish lips and pens long before the invasion of Joshua.

The usage of Canaan naturally became the usage of Israel. It must be remembered that Hebrew was, as is stated by Isaiah (xix. 18), "the language of Canaan," and since the decipherment of the Phœnician inscriptions it has been recognised by scholars that it must have been adopted by the Israelites from their predecessors in the land. It is probable that the primitive language of Israel was one of those Aramæan dialects which were spoken in the deserts of Northern Arabia and in the fastnesses of Edom and Midian. However this may be, the Hebrew of the Bible was originally the language of the Canaanitish tribes.

But the Hebrew of the Bible continued to bear traces of its twofold ancestry. By the side of Elohim, with its singular Eloah, we find the word El in the sense of "God." Now the use of El and Eloah (or rather Elâh) separates the two great divisions of the ancient Semitic world almost as effectually as the use of Elohim and Yahveh has been held to separate one component part of the Book of Genesis from another. While Elah was unknown to the Phœnicians, the Assyrians, and the Babylonians, El was unknown to the

Aramæan and Arabian tribes, except where it entered into the composition of archaic proper names.[1] In Hebrew alone the two words stand side by side. But the use of El is closely restricted. After a careful examination of the passages in which it occurs, Professor Baethgen sums up as follows: "From the time of Amos onward it is avoided by the larger number of writers; in others it occurs occasionally, but only in poetical quotations. It is also found certainly in rhetorical passages (in Isaiah and the latter parts of Deuteronomy), as well as in archaic passages (in Exodus) and the poetical prose of Genesis, but more especially in the purely poetical Books of Job and the Psalms. Hence we may conclude that El in Hebrew is pre-eminently a poetical and archaic word which remained foreign to the living speech, or at least to ordinary prose where it was replaced by Elohim."

This conclusion, however, admits of modification. El did not "*remain* foreign to the living speech," it became so in the course of time. This is shown by the large number of proper names which were compounded with it, and which continued to be compounded with it down to comparatively recent times. The system of nomenclature became crystallised, or the Hebrew language began to die out before Elohim obtained so strong a hold on the linguistic consciousness of the people as to allow it to be introduced into proper names. The proper names survived to assure us that there was a time when El, and not Elohim, was the common name of "God" in the language of Canaan.

We can assign a reason for its gradual disappearance. Baal was once a title of Yahveh, but the associations connected with the title caused it to be discountenanced by the prophets. Hosea (ii. 16) announced that the Lord would no longer be called Baali, and names like Mephi-Baal and Baal-yada were changed into Mephi-bosheth and El-yada. The name of Baal disappeared from the vocabulary of the pious Israelite except in reference to the gods of the heathen, and there is, accordingly, but little trace of it in the pages of the Old Testament. The same evil associations which haunted the name of Baal, haunted also the name of El. It recalled the old days of darkness, as well as the actual beliefs of pagan neighbours. El still denoted a god of Phœnicia, and doubtless also of places within the boundaries of Israel itself. Its gradual disappearance from the language of the prophets is not difficult to account for.

---

[1] See Baethgen's *Excurs* at the end of his *Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1888).

Such a disappearance must have been co-eval with the change in the meaning of the plural Elohim. The usage of the Canaanitish language, before the Israelites had even learned to speak it, prepared the way for the change. Pharaoh could be addressed as "my gods," because, like the sun-god, he embodied the powers and attributes of the various deities who governed the universe. He was as it were the concrete impersonation of their manifold manifestations. Those who addressed him in such language were necessarily believers in a plurality of gods, and no one would maintain the contrary. It was because the Canaanitish officers of Amenophis believed in "gods many and lords many" that they saw in him the visible embodiment of them all. The application of the plural term to a single individual implies polytheism on the part of those who applied it.

What holds good of the Canaanitish officers of the Pharaoh, holds equally good of the Israelites who first ventured to use the plural Elohim of their national God. And the fact that the Israelites never forgot that it was a plural term, that up to the last they often employed it in a plural sense, proves that the earliest users of it were worshippers of many deities. They recognised Elohim as well as El.

How late this recognition lasted is indicated even in the Old Testament. It was not only Rachel (Gen. xxxi. 19), and David (1 Sam. xix. 13), who placed their households under the protection of the teraphim or images of the household gods; the Prophet Hosea himself (iii. 4) paints the coming desolation of Israel as a time when the people shall have to "abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim." We may gather from the history of Micah, in Judges xviii., that the worship of the teraphim was the necessary accompaniment of the tribal worship of Yahveh, as represented by a "carved image," and in the case of the Tribe of Dan at all events, it lasted "until the day of the captivity of the land" (Judges xviii. 17, 18, 30). As elsewhere, the older cult of the household survived by the side of the worship of the tribal deity; the old household gods were still revered, though subordinated, like the household itself, to the supreme god of the whole community. Yahveh was not yet conceived of as the sole god; he was still but "God of gods and Lord of lords" (Deut. x. 17). Even the Psalmist declares (xcv. 3), that "the Lord is a great King above all gods" and calls upon all the gods to worship him (xcvii. 7).

It was in Judah that the older cult first died out of the

popular belief. After the division of the kingdom, Judah with its central capital at Jerusalem formed a compact and organised community, in which the earlier tribal distinctions which had marked it off from Simeon, or Dan or Benjamin were soon obliterated. The dynasty of David welded the community together, and the temple of Solomon became more and more the centre of the common faith. The worship that was carried on in it, the belief of which it was the outward expression, the religious teaching and influence which emanated from it, gradually affected the ideas and convictions of the Jewish people. A time came at length when Josiah could venture to destroy the "high-places" where the old local cults had been carried on for unnumbered generations, and order his subjects to "worship before the altar" at Jerusalem alone.

Doubtless the local cults had ceased in many, if not in most instances, to imply what we should now call polytheism. The deity adored on each of the "high-places" was doubtless nominally a form of Yahveh. Even the brazen serpent, to which incense was burned within the precincts of the temple itself as late as the days of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4), may have been regarded as an image or manifestation of the national God. But the very passage which tells us of the brazen serpent, also tells us that as at Dan and Bethel, so too, in the cities of Judah, images stood on the high-places, and not only images but symbols of Asherah, the goddess of fertility, as well. Moreover, even where the high-place was dedicated in name to Yahveh alone, it was to Yahveh under a particular form, and as identified with a particular local deity. The high-places had been sanctuaries long before the Israelites entered Canaan, and as long as they continued to be holy, it was inevitable that the old worship would live on in them under a new name. What happened in Europe when the wild tribes of Germany or Anglo-Saxon England, were first converted to Christianity, must have happened also in Palestine, when the Israelites first brought with them the name and worship of their national God.

The frequent lapses of the Israelites into idolatry are a standing witness of the narrow partition which divided the religion of the majority from the polytheistic beliefs of their Semitic kinsfolk. Whether we accept the views of the modern school of evolutionary historians, who see in these so-called lapses but so many stages in the progressive religious education of the people, or whether we fall back on the old doctrine, like Professor Baethgen, and regard them as really lapses from a purer form of faith, is of little consequence.

The fact remains that, as soon as the pressure of the central government was removed, or the enthusiasm kindled by a popular prophet was quenched, there was at once a rebound to the adoration of the Baalim and Ashtaroth of an earlier time. Such rebounds must be carefully distinguished from the attempts made by the government itself to supersede the worship of the Baalim of Israel by the Baalim of Phœnicia or Syria; attempts like these were never successful, and even in the northern kingdom were extinguished in blood. But while Hebrew idolatry remained intensely national, it was idolatry all the same.

Now this idolatry was necessarily polytheistic, if by polytheism we mean the belief in more gods than one. Renan, it is true, has asserted that the Semitic race is fundamentally monotheistic, and his assertion has been endorsed by several other scholars. From one point of view, indeed, it may be justified. Semitic religion tended towards monotheism; its essential character was such that a philosophic thinker who was himself a monotheist, could at any time have demonstrated that it led logically to monotheism. But philosophic thinkers do not usually appear among primitive communities; it is not until a certain stage of culture and civilisation is reached, that people begin to reason about their beliefs, and to enquire into their nature and origin. However much Semitic religion might from the outset have contained the seeds of monotheism, they were long in bearing fruit. The most cultivated of the Semitic communities, the Phœnicians, the Assyrians and the Babylonians, were grossly polytheistic; and we have only to go to Mohammedan writers to learn how deeply rooted was the polytheism of Western Arabia before the rise of Islam. Inscriptions show that the Aramæans and Yemenites were equally polytheistic; on every high-place and under every green tree incense was burned to divinities innumerable.

But these divinities were also in great measure repetitions one of the other. They were for the most part mere local forms or manifestations of the supreme Baal, "the Lord" of heaven, and his divine wife. To the primitive Semite the divine declared itself in growth and decay. It was the power which produced and destroyed life. Wherever life existed or could be destroyed the divine was visible to the eye of faith. The god worshipped by the faithful was a god of fertility who caused the seed to grow in his goodness, or consumed it in his wrath. It was in the sun, with his vivifying beams, that the Semite saw the concrete form of his deity. Life seemed to depend on the will of the great

luminary of day, nurtured as it was by the kindly rays of spring, or parched and withered in the fierce heats of summer. The sun was the visible emblem of the power which supported or menaced life.

The supreme object, therefore, of the Semitic cult was the "Lord" and "father," who gave and took away life, and who manifested himself to his worshippers in the orb of the sun. But the "father" and giver of life necessarily implied a female consort. By the side of the supreme Baal necessarily stood the supreme Baalah, like the woman by the side of the man. The Semite's conception of the woman, however, was not that of races among whom the mother stands at the head of the family. To him she was but the colourless double of man, the docile helpmeet, who had been created from his loins, whose desire was to her husband, and over whom the husband should rule (Gen. iii. 16). Baalah, therefore, was but the pale reflection of Baal, the necessary complement of a deity, whose lineaments were derived from his vivifying and paternal functions. As the masculine noun in the Semitic languages had its corresponding feminine, so the masculine Baal was accompanied by the feminine Baalah. But the features of the wife were absorbed in those of her husband, and except where the worship of a foreign female divinity had taken strong hold of the popular belief, it was not difficult in time to forget her altogether. The "face of Baal" or "El" (*Penê Baal, Peni-el*)[1] ceased in time to recall the feminine counterpart of the God, and like "the face of Yahveh" (Gen. x. 9; Exodus xxxiii. 20, etc.), came to denote little more than the male deity himself. The colourless character of Baalah assisted the prophets in rooting out such elements of polytheism as were associated with the belief in a female divinity. It was only where the worship of the virgin goddess of non-Semitic Babylonia had made its way, only where Istar or Astartê, "queen of heaven with crescent horns," had taken equal rank with Baal, that they failed in their task. In Phœnicia, the voice of the monotheist would have been lifted up in vain.

But even in a country like Babylonia, where the Semitic population was largely mixed with foreign elements, and where the national pantheon was filled with the gods and goddesses of an alien faith, there are traces of a striving to discover an underlying unity in the manifold objects of popular belief. Not only are there references in the hymns

[1] See my Hibbert Lectures on the *Religion of the Ancient Babylonians*, pp. 110, 111.

to "the one God"; there are also tablets in which the older deities of the pantheon are resolved into forms of the supreme god Anu. At Sippara, in northern Babylonia, a city more distinctively Semitic than most of its fellows, a school arose which consecrated itself to the worship of the sun-god. The hymns which formed part of its ritual not unfrequently describe the sun-god in language which seems at first sight to imply that he was the one and only God. But the illusion is momentary only. We have not to read far before we find that the poets accepted without questioning the existence of other deities, though to them the sun-god was not only the supreme lord of heaven, but the god in whom were reflected, as it were, the attributes and powers of all other divinities. In Assyria, the priests and poets went yet further than in Babylonia. Asshur, the national god of the kingdom, overshadowed his divine compeers, so that at times they seem to disappear altogether. He is "the king of all the gods," "the father, who has created them"; in his name, and with his help the Assyrian armies go forth to conquer, and it is to bring fresh worshippers to his shrine that the lands of the foreigner are invaded. He stands alone; it was only some pedant, versed in Babylonian literature, who found for him a consort. In the general belief of the Assyrian people, Asshur was wifeless, like Yahveh of Israel. It needed, seemingly, but a little to transform the worship of Asshur into a worship as pure as that of Yahveh. But the little was wanting; the message proclaimed by the law and the prophets was delivered to Israel, and not to Assyria; the Assyrian, indeed, came near to monotheism, but it was reserved for another people to listen to the words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord."

In Israel itself it was long before the meaning of the words was fully realised. As we have seen, the services at the high places, and the use of the teraphim—practices implying a belief in a plurality of gods—lasted down to the captivity, and until the age of Hezekiah do not seem to have been regarded as otherwise than right. The readiness to fall into idolatry proved how little distinction the people in general could see between the popular faith of Israel and that of the nations around them. When David could ask Saul whether "the children of men" had driven him out "from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go, serve other gods" (1 Sam. xxvi. 19), it is evident that the belief in these "other gods" was a very real and living one. Yahveh was the God of the Jew as long as the Jew remained in Israel; but the exile passed beyond his dominion and power, and entered the

service of the deity in whose land he found a refuge. The power of the national God extended only so far as the nation itself. We are reminded of the words of Ruth (i. 16), "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

The first step in the religious education of Israel, which prepared it for receiving the divine message of the law and the prophets, was to identify the national God with the gods of the numerous local cults which existed within his territory. It was not difficult to do so. As we have seen, the Baalim of the Semites were almost indistinguishable from one another; they were all alike manifestations of that vital force and energy which had its visible centre in the sun. As tribe conquered tribe, or the cities of Palestine were absorbed into a common power, the local Baalim were necessarily identified with each other. Just as the Babylonian scribe had resolved the older gods into forms of Anu, so in Palestine the Baalim or "lords" of the smaller towns were resolved into forms of the Baal who watched over the destinies of the capital city. The process was aided by the epithetical character of the names borne by most of them. If the name were not Baal, "lord," it was likely to be El "God" or Moloch, "king." The names, in fact, were usually titles, the distinction between one local deity and another being supplied by the name of the locality itself, or of some object there with which he was specially associated. If he were not the Baal of Perazim, he was Baal-Zebub, the "Baal of the flies," who thronged his oracle at Ekron.

From the days when the Semites first began to lead settled lives, the process of identification had been going on. A large number of proper names declares the fact. It was more especially the title El, which at an early period had acquired the sense of "God," that lent itself to the work. The Assyrians formed names like Samsi-ilu, "Samas (the sun-god) is El"; Tsidqi-ilu, "Tsedeq is El"; Ilu-milik, "El is Moloch," and the geographical lists of the Egyptian king Thothmes III. at Karnak present us with such names of Canaanitish localities as Yaâqab-el, "Jacob is El," and Yesep-el, "Joseph is El." A similar compound is met with in Joshua xix. 14, 27, where we read of the Valley of Jiphthah-el or "Jephthah is El," a compound which differs but little from that of Joel, "Yahveh is El," or the converse Eli-Yahu, "El is Yahveh." As time went on, the process of identification was extended to deities, both of whom bore names of an individual, and not a general, stamp. The Assyrian texts contain such names as Samsi-Raman, "Samas is Rimmon"; Assur-Â, "Assur is Â"· Nergal-Â, "Nergal is Â"; and Zechariah (xii. 11)

speaks of the mourning for the sun-god Hadad-Rimmon, where the Assyrian Rimmon is identified with the Syrian Hadad, as he is on one of the cuneiform tablets. It was only needful for the process of identification to proceed far enough for the whole of the Semitic pantheon—so far at least as the male divinities were concerned—to be resolved into a single god. In time the Baalim would become Baal.

But we cannot reverse the process. We cannot suppose that the gods were conceived of as one and the same before they were thus identified. Samas and Rimmon continued to be distinct and different divinities to the mass of Assyrians, even after some bold thinker had declared them to be but forms of the same divinity. The very fact that such names as Joel or Hadad-Rimmon were invented implies that the deities whose names are united in them were once regarded as separate. If it had always been admitted that Yahveh was identical with El, there would have been no necessity for emphasising the fact. The existence of names like these brings with it the assurance that Israel as much as Assyria had once been polytheistic.

Natural causes prepared the nation for receiving the message of the law and the prophets. The epithetic character of the names given to the local deities of Canaan allowed them to be readily identified with the national God. There was little difficulty in discovering Yahveh in the Baal of Dan or Bethel. The unification of the Israelitish tribes, and above all the consolidation of the Jewish kingdom necessarily brought with it a unification and consolidation of religious worship and belief. When Jerusalem became the religious as well as the political centre of the people, it was inevitable that the religion of the court should become the religion of the subject, and that the autocratic political sovereign should be regarded as the type and representative of an autocratic spiritual sovereign. As the nation acknowledged only one king, so too, the suppression of the provincial centres of worship led it more and more to acknowledge only one spiritual ruler. It is probable that the Assyrian wars largely aided in producing this result. Not only did they arouse a national spirit of resistance to the invader, but they forced the whole people as it were into the capital. Jerusalem alone held out against the enemy; the rest of Judah was overrun, its towns and villages destroyed, and their inhabitants carried into captivity. Those only who had found a refuge in Jerusalem escaped the general disaster; it was out of Mount Zion that the remnant came forth which restored the name of Judah and inhabited again the depopulated land.

The old local cults had been swept away, the traditions of the past had been broken with, and the temple of Yahveh at Jerusalem remained without rivals or compeers.

But there had been a still more powerful influence at work, disintegrating and destroying the old belief in polytheism. Semitic polytheism found its main support in the worship of female deities. The gods resembled one another too much, it was too easy to resolve them into forms or manifestations of a single divinity, for them to stand alone. Where polytheism continued to flourish, as in Phœnicia or Babylonia, it was where the worship of Astartê took equal rank with the worship of Baal. Among the tribes with whom the Hebrews claimed the nearest connection, the worship of the ancient Accadian goddess never made much way. Of purer blood than the inhabitants of Phœnicia or Babylonia, they clung more faithfully to the old Semitic conception, which saw in the woman the reflection of the man, and in the female deity the mere complement of the male. In process of time, accordingly, the features of the female deity became more and more obliterated, she fell more and more into the background and hardly survived except in old expressions and forms of speech. The Moabite Stone affords at once a proof and an illustration of this fact. In the inscription of Mesha, the national god Chemosh is all in all. He has absorbed the attributes and worship of the local Baalim as completely as Yahveh of Israel. Once and once only is reference made to another deity as worshipped within the limits of Moab. This deity is Ashtoreth. But it is no longer the female Ashtoreth, whom the servants of Chemosh adore. Ashtoreth has become the male Ashtor, and as such has been identified with Chemosh. It is to Ashtor-Chemosh that the captive women of Israel were consecrated.

Nothing can show more plainly how foreign to the Moabite mind was the conception of an independent goddess who stood on an equal footing with the god. She is first transformed into a male divinity and then absorbed into the national god.

What held good of the Moabites held good also of their Israelitish kinsfolk. So far as these were the descendants of the desert tribes who had wrested Palestine from the hands of its Canaanitish masters, they had little inclination for the worship of female divinities. Ashtoreth and Asherah were deities of the older inhabitants of the land, not of their conquerors. Little by little the colourless feminine reflections of the male god faded into the background, the "face of El" became "El" himself, while El became indistinguishable

from Yahveh. It may be that those are right who hold that every Semitic god once had his female counterpart, and that as Elah was the wife and female double of El, so Yahveh was but the consort of the male Yahu. But such consorts had a grammatical rather than a religious existence, and have for us an archæological or linguistic interest only. They are fast disappearing from Israelitish memory when the religious history of Israel first begins, and with them disappears the main support of early Semitic polytheism. Where, instead of disappearing, they developed and absorbed the cult of Astartê, a polytheism of the grossest kind was the result. Happily for Israel, there were a chosen few within it who remained true to their ancient stock and faith, and awaited the day when it was revealed to them: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord."

A. H. Sayce.

DON ISAAC ABARBANEL.

THE family of Abarbanel, one of the oldest and most illustrious in our history, belongs to those Jewish refugees who, at the establishment of the Inquisition in Spain, fled for their lives to Portugal. Members of the family dwelt in Seville as early as the twelfth century, and Ibn Verga, in his *Shebet Jehudah*, a history of Israel's sufferings that may be likened to Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," mentions an ancestor of Abarbanel as a distinguished scholar living in the time of the good and wise King Alfonso VI. This Abarbanel offered to Thomas, a learned Christian friend of his and a confidant of Alfonso, an explanation of a Hebrew word much misunderstood both then and since, and this explanation averted imminent persecution from his brethren in faith, and obtained for Abarbanel himself the personal friendship of the King. As the matter is not without interest even at the present day, I give the translation of the dialogue between Thomas and the King.

Thomas.—"I have had a dispute about this matter with an eminent member of the family of Abarbanel; (further on he terms him 'that great sage'). He has come from Seville, his native town, and he tells me that he who knows Hebrew, will find no difficulty in it, viz., in the use of the word נכרי in the Talmud. For there is a difference in meaning between the terms נכרי 'a stranger,' נוצרי 'a Christian,' and גוי 'a heathen.' The נכרי is he who has estranged himself from his Creator, and does not acknowledge even the fundamental principles of religion; whilst the Christian, believing as he does in the creation of the world, in miracles and in providence, is not, and cannot be, called נכרי."

The King.—"I am very pleased with you, and even more so with Abarbanel, for this explanation. I shall be delighted if you can induce him to come to our court."

Don Isaac ben Jehudah ben Shemuel ben Jehudah ben Joseph ben Jehudah, as he is in the habit of describing himself, of whose life, and to some extent works, I intend giving a sketch, though originally of Spanish extraction, his ancestors having all resided in the Kingdom of Castile, was

himself born in Lisbon, in the year 1437, more than 450 years ago. He traces the descent of his most noble family, like that of Ibn Daud's, in a direct line to the royal House of David. He speaks of himself, not once or twice, but repeatedly, with a perfectly intelligible and pardonable pride, as "Isaac of the root of Jesse, the Bethlehemite, of the holy seed, of the family of the House of David," or as it is sometimes varied, "of the seed and stem of David, the leader and commander of the peoples."

In his commentary on Zechariah xii. 7, after remarking with approval, that the words "the House of David" occurring there are explained by the Commentators as meaning "the seed of David and his family," he continues thus: "'To Spain also after the destruction of the first Temple,' so writes R. Isaac ben Jehudah ibn Giat, 'there came two families of the House of David, one, the family of the children of Daud, which settled in Andalusia, the other, the family of the children of Abarbanel, which settled in Seville, of which is my humble family.'"

Of his celebrated ancestors, whom, as we have seen, he counts upwards to the sixth generation, whose names, glittering stars as it were, in his family coat of arms, he so often joins to his own, but little worthy of note has come down to us.

His grandfather, Don Samuel Abarbanel, who also lived in Seville, and who was one of the two envoys sent by the Jews of Spain on a mission to Pope Martin V., was a distinguished statesman, as high minded as he was esteemed, in the service of Henry II. (1369), of Castile, the conqueror and successor of his half-brother, Don Pedro (1350).

He was a generous and noted patron of Jewish learning, and it was in his honour that R. Menachem ben Aaron ben Serach, so miraculously saved at the massacre of the Jews in Estella, and who in his flight met with a most welcome reception in Don Samuel's house, wrote his valued work, Tsadda Laddarech ("Provisions for the Way"), a compendium of Jewish Law, theoretical and practical. The same too, doubtless, it was who, on his forced conversion to Christianity—ostensible and temporary of course, as usual in such cases—at the persecution in Seville, Ash Wednesday, 1391, had his ancient and venerable name changed into that of Juan di Sevilla.

For reasons not given, but yet not far to seek, Don Samuel's son, Don Judah, the father of Don Isaac, emigrated from Spain to Portugal, and established himself in Lisbon. He was not there long before he attained to honour and

consideration, due in part, no doubt, to his wealth. The influence, powerful as it was, which he thus had over the great of the land, he used in favour of his coreligionists.

He was made Treasurer to the Infante Don Fernando, brother of the King Duarte, who, with his small income, very often stood in need of Don Judah's riches. Before undertaking, in 1473, his journey to Moorish Tangier, and with a presentiment of his approaching death, he made his will, and ordered that "the Jew Abarbanel, inhabitant of Lisbon" be paid in full the sum of 506,600 reis blancos, which he (the Infante) had received from him as a loan.

Don Judah gave his son Don Isaac a careful education, suitable as well to his means as to the circumstances of the time. We are not told who his master was, but there can be no doubt that the then Rabbi of Lisbon, R. Joseph Chajun, exerted a material influence over the direction of Isaac's mind.

Rabbi Joseph Chajun, like Don Isaac Abarbanel, a native of Lisbon, was a most pious and God-fearing, as well as a learned man. He held the Rabbinate of the congregation of Lisbon for a quarter of a century, irrespective of the short time during which he was compelled by a ravaging plague, to leave the capital and to stay in Evora. He there finished at the end of May, 1466, his commentary on Jeremiah, which we have in MS., and, four years later, that on the Ethics of the Fathers. He also wrote commentaries on many other books of the Bible, such as the Psalms, Proverbs and all the Prophets. This same Rabbi, who was succeeded in the Rabbinate by his son Moses before 1490, Abarbanel, even in his maturer years, regarded as his teacher, and he may have taken him as his model and pattern in his exegetical philosophical commentaries. Later on however, when residing in Toledo, the capital of Castile, and when he must have been 47 years of age, it would appear from an incidental remark of R. Joseph Caro's, that he attended and heard the lectures of his friend Rabbi Isaac Aboab II., the then Rabbi of Toledo. Now this Rabbi, though bearing the same name as the author of the "Menorath Hammaor" cannot, as Zunz has conclusively shown, be identical with the latter, who lived nearly two hundred years before. He was, however, the successor, in the Chief Rabbinate of the Jews of Spain, to his teacher, R. Isaac Campanton in Oporto, and the author of many learned and valuable works. Abarbanel was of precocious nature, of clear and penetrating judgment, animated by a burning love of learning, and ardent enthusiasm for Judaism, its lofty and sublime conception of God, its glorious and ancient history.

In his youth he gave promise of his future greatness, a promise that he fulfilled beyond all expectation. When but twenty years old, he formed the plan of his commentary on the Torah, beginning, however, with that on Deuteronomy. He had evidently already won fame for his statesmanlike qualities. For whilst yet composing his second work, "The Crown of the Elders," of which he invariably says "which I composed in my youth," he could boast that "he had amassed more riches, wisdom and greatness than anyone before him, men and women servants, who ate his bread, and clothed themselves in his woollen and linen, and that he, called into request by various affairs and concerns, was unsettled and fugitive, now here, now there, like a practised man of business."

He read the works of Aristotle, whom, like his predecessors, he speaks of as "the philosopher," as well as those of the Arabian writers on the Stagyrite, Ibn Roschd, Ibn Sinai, Algasali and others, all, naturally, in Hebrew translations, for he knew neither Arabic nor Greek. He was familiar with Maimonides' "Moreh," which served him for a time as a chief guide, with Jehuda Hallevi's "Cusari," and the philosophy of Gersonides. He wrote, with the aid of these and other writers, his first work—more properly, a small pamphlet, consisting of but a few leaflets—on "The Original Form of the Elements." This was soon followed by a second, and, in every way, more important work, under the title of "The Crown of the Elders;" wherein, taking for his basis and starting point, Exodus xxiii. 20, "Behold, I send an angel before thee," &c., he discusses, in twenty-five chapters, and in a pleasing and intelligent way, some of the most momentous questions of religion—God's special providence of Israel, prophecy, and many others.

Alfonso V. was then king of Portugal, and his reign has been truly described as "the last golden age of the Jews of the Pyrenean Peninsula." He was called "The African," from his victories over the Barbary Moors, and succeeded to the throne in 1438. Himself cultivated, gentle, and amiable, he was appreciative of the like qualities in others, and therefore sought to attract to his court the rich, educated, and graciously sociable Abarbanel. To one with such great warlike enterprises on hand, so often exceeding his means, a man like Abarbanel must have been a perfect godsend. He entrusted him with the care of the finances, consulted him on all important questions, and bestowed his confidence on him.

Abarbanel soon became the favourite of the whole court, and won the regard of the grandees, within and without the

royal circle. He was on friendly terms with the members of the house of Braganza, especially with its head, the powerful, but well-disposed Duke Fernando of Braganza, who, as we shall before long see, died on the scaffold for no fault of his, under king Alfonso's successor, John II. The same ruled over fifty towns, boroughs, castles, and strongholds, and could place in the field, 10,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry. Abarbanel also numbered among his friends Fernando's two brothers, the Marquis of Montemar (Constable of Portugal) and the Earl of Faro. Princes and nobles frequented his palatial residence, the learned of Lisbon were his friends and companions, and the scholarly Doctor João Sezira—a man of high consideration at court, and a warm patron of the Jews (in whose behalf he never failed to interest himself)—was one of his most intimate friends. Rich and honoured, he spent in Lisbon, under king Alfonso, some of the happiest years of his life, as he himself, indeed, in the introduction to his commentary on the Book of Joshua, tells us: "I lived in peace in my inherited house in renowned Lisbon, the capital of Portugal, where God had given me blessing, riches, and honour. I built me great houses with large rooms. My house was the meeting place of the wise and learned. I was beloved in the palace of Alfonso, a just and mighty king, under whom the Jews enjoyed liberty and prosperity. I stood near to him, and he leaned upon my hand, and as long as he lived I went in and out of his palace." When, in the thirty-third year of his reign, the king, in the course of his second campaign into Africa, captured the port town of Arzilla, his soldiers brought with them, amongst several thousand Moorish, also 250 Jewish captives of both sexes and of various ages, in the direst distress and suffering, who were sold as slaves all over the country. Jews and Jewesses condemned to wretched slavery, under such circumstances too, was more than Abarbanel's sympathetic heart could bear to see. Accordingly, as soon as the news of their misery reached him he formed a committee, consisting of twelve of the leading members of the Congregation of Lisbon, who set themselves the task, no light one by any means, of delivering their hapless co-religionists from their captivity. To ensure still more the success of the undertaking, himself and another influential colleague, travelled all over the country, raising funds for this pious object—"the redemption of captives."

In a short time, he was fortunate enough to bring together 10,000 gold doubloons (£16,000), with which the liberty of 220 captives was bought, not unfrequently, as may well be imagined, at a high price.

Now, however, their real difficulties began. The ransomed Jews and Jewesses, adults and children, were sorely in need of clothing, shelter, and support, until they had at least learnt to speak the language of the country, and were able to shift and provide for themselves. Yet, where were the means necessary for the maintenance of so large a number of destitute poor to come from? Abarbanel could not again encroach upon the kind liberality of his own Portuguese countrymen, and he therefore addressed himself to the most illustrious Jew of Italy of the time, who was an intimate friend of his, giving him to understand that contributions in behalf of the distressed Moorish co-religionists, would be thankfully received from his Italian fellow Jews.

This Italian Jew, Jechiel of Pisa by name, was a noted capitalist, who, by virtue of his vast wealth, ruled the money-market of Tuscany, and competed with the richest houses in that province. He was more than this, however. As beneficent as he was rich, noble and generous in heart and mind, he was ever ready to assist the poor with his money, to comfort the sad with word as well as deed. To show that there is no exaggeration in my description of him and his character, I just mention that twenty-one years later, in 1492, on the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, when very many of the exiles took refuge in Italy, he took up his fixed quarters, so to speak, at the port of Pisa, and there received them all, rich and poor alike, cared and provided for them, or if need be, forwarded them on to their several destinations, all, of course, at his own sole expense.

Next year, again, 1472, the king had occasion to send an embassy to Pope Sixtus IV. at Rome, both to congratulate him on his accession to the Papacy, as well as to inform him of his conquest over the Moors in Africa. Dr. João Sezira, the friend of Abarbanel and well-wisher of the Jews, was one of its members, and Abarbanel exacted from him the promise to speak with the Pope in behalf of the Jews, at the same time asking him to deliver the above-named letter, and some of his own and others' works, to his friend Jechiel of Pisa.

In this most interesting letter, dated Nissan, 5232—1472, Abarbanel, besides his already-mentioned request to him for assistance for the poor Jewish captives, begs him very strongly to show every attention in his power to the Doctor, and to assure him, as well as his noble companion, who was at the head of this special mission—Don Lopo de Almeida—that king Alfonso's fame had penetrated the Apennines, and that he (Jechiel of Pisa) was greatly delighted to hear how very kind and humane his (the king's) con-

duct was towards the Jews of his country. At the same time, and not forgetting the amenities of life, Abarbanel sent as a present for Jechiel of Pisa, and all by the hands of the Doctor, his "Crown of the Elders," of which mention has already been made, and his then unfinished commentary on Deuteronomy, and from his own wife, for the wife of Jechiel, a trusty Moorish female slave, who had already lived some time in the house of the Doctor. The letter concludes with the following postscript, which speaks for itself: "Have the goodness to let me know whether this Pope is well-disposed towards us, whether there are with him or in the country of Rome, Jewish doctors, and whether the Cardinals have doctors"—Jewish, presumably. As long as Abarbanel enjoyed the Royal favour "he was shield and buckler to his people, delivered the sufferers from their enemies, repaired the breaches, and saved the Jews from the lions"—as his poetical son, Juda Leon, describes him. He "had a warm heart for all sufferers, was a friend to the friendless, and a father to the fatherless." He never forgot his own people, and ever did his utmost to further their welfare, however great and distinguished he became. Happy and prosperous, in the company of an excellent wife and three promising sons, he might have continued undisturbed in the enjoyment of all that makes life worth living, and might have devoted himself with undiminished vigour and energy to his heart's desire, the pursuit of his studies, had not events, which he could neither foresee nor control, interfered with all his plans and arrangements, foiled and crushed all his hopes and expectations. Indeed, so fortunate had his career till then been, that though at the date we have now arrived at, he was already middle-aged (44 years old), the misfortune I am now going to relate is, as far as is known to us, the first but not the last, for it was but the beginning of a whole series of reverses, that befell him.

His patron, the good and wise King Alfonso V., died at the end of August, 1481, after a reign of forty-two years, and was succeeded in the kingdom by his son John II., 1481-1495, a new king who knew not Isaac nor remembered what he had done. This John was the reverse of his father in almost everything, sullen, heartless, and selfish. He strove to put aside the powerful grandees, and to establish an absolute monarchy. He desired to rid himself first of all of the Duke of Braganza, the richest and most popular man in the country, his near kinsman, and like him of royal blood, or as Abarbanel puts it, "flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone." Accordingly, and whilst actually feigning friendship

for him, he charged him and his two brothers with maintaining a treasonable correspondence with the joint Spanish sovereigns (Ferdinand and Isabella), and had them impeached of high treason. The duke, arrested on this, the gravest of charges, was beheaded, and his vast estates and those of the entire house of Braganza were confiscated by John to the crown (1483). His brothers, whom a similar fate awaited, fled abroad. Abarbanel, who, as we have seen, was on friendly terms with these three brothers, all fallen into disgrace, likewise incurred the king's suspicion of complicity in the alleged conspiracy. Commanded to attend at court, and, in his innocence apprehending no harm, he was actually on the point of obeying the royal summons, when on the way he was stopped by an unknown friend, who told him that his life was aimed at and in danger, and advised him to make his immediate escape. Warned by the fate of the Duke of Braganza, Abarbanel followed the friendly and timely advice, fleeing for his life until midnight of the second day, when he reached the city of Segura, on the frontiers of the kingdom of Castile. That he did not escape at all too soon is evident from the fact that, when he failed to appear in obedience to his command, the king at once despatched couriers in all directions, with instructions to take him dead or alive. But these measures, happily for our hero, failed of their object. Foiled in his attempt to get hold of his person, the king revenged himself by confiscating, not only all of Abarbanel's valuable property, including, as we shall see later on, his commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy, but also that of his eldest son Juda Leon, who was then already, though but in his fourteenth year, practising as a physician on his own account. In a respectful but manly letter addressed to the king from his place of refuge, Abarbanel protested his innocence of the crime laid to his charge, and likewise acquitted his friend the Duke of Braganza of all guilt. "From the depths of my sorrow I cried to him, from the place I had then hidden myself in. In a letter I wrote him I cried, 'Save, O king: is it well for you to oppress? Shall the judge of a whole country not do right? Why have you done evil to your servant? Why have you thrust me out? Let me know what you charge me with, why you contend against me? Prove and try me, my lord, and all efforts to the contrary will not succeed in bringing guilt home to me.'" All in vain, however, as might have been expected; the tyrant was too suspicious to attach credence to any assurances, however solemn. As Abarbanel himself puts it, "The king, like the deaf adder that stops her ear, would not withdraw

his hand from destroying. I looked for judgment, but behold oppression, for righteousness, but behold a cry." This was the *first* of the three banishments that he suffered during his career.

Here, in Toledo, the capital of Castile, and his ancestral home, he took up his abode at the beginning of the year 1484, and was received with honour by his brethren in faith, and particularly by the educated amongst them. His fame soon spread, and a circle of scholars and followers gathered round him. Impoverished, Abarbanel reproached himself with having, through affairs of state and worship of mammon, neglected the study of the Law, and in his piety viewed his misfortune in the light of a heavenly judgment. Free from service to the State, and thankful to God that he was once more in the company of his wife and two of his sons, whom the king had allowed to follow him to Castile, the third, however, remaining behind in Portugal, he again devoted himself to the service of God. He began by carrying out a resolve, formed when yet in Portugal, to write a full and detailed commentary on the four historical Prophets, which, by reason of their apparent ease, had been somewhat overlooked by his predecessors. He had first delivered his explanations orally to an appreciative audience, and then, at the instance of his new friends and disciples, wrote them down, and in a surprisingly short time, too. In sixteen days he finished his commentary on Joshua, in twenty-five days that on Judges, and in three months and a half that on the two Books of Samuel.

It was not for long, however—not more than six months—that he was permitted to devote himself to his favourite studies and literary pursuits. The author was soon again to be replaced by and merged in the statesman. When about to take up the pen to begin his commentary on the books of the Kings of Judah and Israel, he was summoned to the Court of the mighty Ferdinand and Isabella, the joint sovereigns of Spain, and entrusted with the office of farmer of the royal revenues, an office which he held for eight years, until the expulsion, 1484-1492. In this capacity he made the acquaintance of Don Abraham Senior, a wealthy Jew of Segovia, who like him, but a long time before him, acted as chief farmer of taxes, and who, a generous patron of Jewish learning, took him immediately, it would seem, into partnership with him.

This Don Abraham, a most intimate friend of Andreas de Cabrera of Valencia, is the same who, on the taking of Malaga, August 18th, 1487, by the armies of Ferdinand and

Isabella, ransomed some 450 Moorish Jewish captives, mostly women, for 20,000 doblas of gold = £15,000, and they were taken away in two armed galleys.

That Abarbanel by his sincere devotion to their service, gained their goodwill and rendered himself almost indispensable to them is evident from the fact that they, the high catholic Sovereigns, under the eyes, too, of the venomous Torquemada, and notwithstanding the canonical laws, and the repeated resolves of the Cortes forbidding the admission of a Jew to any public office whatever, did entrust him, Isaac the Jew, with the sinews of the very life of the State.

For eight years he enjoyed his new fortune till that terrible persecution, the most memorable in history, broke out, a persecution by which no one has lost and suffered more than the country itself that was the chief seat and origin of it, and from the evil effects of which morally, intellectually, and materially, even Christian historians admit it has, to this day, not yet recovered. How many services Abarbanel rendered his co-religionists during his eight years' administration, has not been preserved in their grateful recollection, owing doubtless to the calamity, the Inquisition, that fell upon them before long. There can be no doubt, however, that in Castile, as elsewhere, he was their protecting angel.

Their bitter enemies the Dominicans, or Black Friars, to whose hands was committed the duty of detecting and punishing heresy, took care that there should be no lack of the most atrocious, if utterly groundless, accusations against them. Now it was said that the Jews had reviled a cross; now that they had at La Guardia, a village about nine leagues from Toledo, kidnapped a Christian boy three or four years old, and crucified him; that they had attempted the same atrocity in Valencia, but were prevented from carrying it out, 1488—1490. Again that the Jews of Castile did not succumb to the fury of the Inquisitors, for the aid they rendered to the hapless Marranos—Jewish-Christians—was undoubtedly due to the work of Abarbanel. He himself relates that whilst in the service of Ferdinand and Isabella, he acquired wealth; marked honour and consideration were shewn him on the part of the court as well as of the leading grandees. As far as his occupations would allow him, he applied himself to study, and, forgetful of past misfortune, would, during the eight years that he spent in their service, have passed a contented and happy life, had not the future filled him with anxious apprehensions. Indeed, the horizon of his co-religionists in Spain, as well as in Portugal, was overcast with dark thunder-clouds.

In the following year, 1492, the joint sovereigns succeeded in taking the kingdom of Granada, after a war of eleven years duration, from the Moors, and made their solemn entry into the capital on January 2nd. "Elated with the conquest, and instigated by the Inquisition first introduced into Spain in 1480, they resolved," as a kind of thankoffering for their success, "that Spain should no longer afford an asylum to, or its soil be polluted by the tread of, anyone not professing the Roman Catholic religion." Thus, determined either to convert the Jews to Christianity, or else to expel them from the country, they issued their terrible edict, dated Granada, 30th March, 1492, that within four months, all Jews of their kingdom, without distinction of age, rank, or sex, should, on pain of death, depart from their country. Abarbanel, who from his position at court was one of the first to hear of the approaching publication of the cruel and tyrannous decree, plunging thousands, aye, and tens of thousands, into wanton and indescribable misery, did his utmost, exerted all his influence, to obtain its revocation, but all in vain. He even went as far as tendering (I quote now advisedly Prescott in preference to Lindo the Jew) "a donative of 30,000 ducats [600,000 crowns, Lindo] towards defraying the expenses of the then just concluded Moorish war. The tempting offer caused the cold-hearted calculating Ferdinand to hesitate about revoking it, when Torquemada, the Inquisitor-general, rushed into the royal presence, and drawing forth a crucifix from beneath his mantle, held it up, exclaiming, 'Judas Iscariot sold his master for thirty pieces of silver; Your Highnesses would sell him anew for 30,000. Here he is, take him, and barter him away.' So saying the frantic priest threw the crucifix on the table, and left the apartment. The sovereigns, instead of chastising his presumption, or despising it as a mere freak of insanity, were overawed by it."

The Jews, astounded though they were by the bolt which had fallen so unexpectedly upon them, had yet as a body no hesitation as to the course they were to adopt. They resolved that, sooner than give up what was dearer to them than life itself, their religion, they would quit the country, however strong and dear the ties that bound them to it. Accordingly on the 9th of Ab, 160,000 families, as Lindo puts it, or as it is usually stated, 300,000 souls, half as many as left Egypt with Moses, left, never again to return to, the home of their fathers, and the happy scenes of their youth. Some of them went to the kingdoms of Portugal, Navarre and the Provence, all so near to them. Others fled to Africa and Asia, and others again to Turkey, Greece and Italy. To this last-named

country, when all hope of the repeal of the decree was gone, Abarbanel and his family also repaired, and he, 55 years old, was one of those who quitted Spain before the expiration of the appointed time. He arrived on board ship at the beginning of the year 1493 with his wife and children and the wreck of his fortune at Naples. Naples was then under the dominion of King Ferdinand I., at whose hands he met with a welcome reception, and to whom he rendered important service.

Most of them, notwithstanding their seeming hopelessness, remained true to Judaism, while a few, actuated by a love of gain and worldly honour, went over to Christianity. Amongst these latter was the farmer of the revenues, Don Abraham Senior, the friend and partner of Abarbanel, and who on the taking of Malaga exhibited such extraordinary zeal for the ransom of Jews condemned to slavery. How great does Abarbanel appear in comparison with such men!

The news of Abarbanel's presence in his dominions, came to the King from the Catholic Sovereigns themselves. After informing him that rich Spanish Jews had fled to his country, they had the insolence to request him to condemn them to death and to surrender to the representatives of Spain, in behalf of the Spanish Exchequer, the residue of the fortune thus obtained. Regardless of their Spanish Majesties' threats, Ferdinand I., humane and high-minded, sent for Abarbanel, received him well, and kindly entrusted him with an office in court, probably with that of the finances, in the management of which we know he was particularly skilled. During his lifetime Abarbanel enjoyed happy days, gained fame and fortune, lived at rest and peace, and had joy and plenty of all things. Not for long, however, was he permitted to be undisturbed in this, his renewed prosperity. At the beginning of the following year, the King died, and was succeeded by his son Alfonso II., who, like his father, befriended him and retained him in his service.

On the invasion of Naples, however, in 1495, by Charles VIII. of France, then scarcely twenty-two years old, Alfonso II. had to leave the town, make his escape and abdicate in favour of his son Ferdinand II. He sought refuge in Messina, in Sicily, and hither Abarbanel, who alone of all his ministers had remained true to him in his misfortune, accompanied him as his friend and adviser, staying with him until his death, which occurred soon after in June, 1495. Abarbanel was at this time fifty-seven years of age, and this was the third and last of the three banishments that he suffered. He now felt quite forlorn, because of the loss not only of his royal patrons, Ferdinand I. and Alfonso II. of Naples,

and of his property, but also and perhaps still more, of his valuable library, dearer to him than all other worldly goods. During his stay with the King in Messina the French had plundered his house in Naples, and all his property, including even, as we have just seen, his books, in short, all the wealth that he had acquired whilst in the service of the Portuguese and Spanish monarchs, was gone. With want instead of plenty, and sorrow instead of joy, he thanked God that, after a fatiguing journey, he was enabled to settle in Corfu.

No one who can put himself in Abarbanel's sorrowful place, can fail to be moved by a deep sense of pity for him, sorely-tried and thrice banished, sexagenarian as he was. In his highly poetical preface to his *Zebach Pesach*, written in 1496, he speaks thus of himself: "My wife and my sons are away from me, and in another country, and I am left by myself, alone, an alien in a strange land." Forsaken, as he thought, by all, he sought comfort and recreation in study, and found his rest in the quickening and consoling prophecies of the Prophet Isaiah, which he began expounding on July 1st, 1495. A special circumstance nevertheless was the cause of his laying this work aside, for a time, unfinished; he, namely, recovered in Corfu, to his indescribable joy, his commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy, which, begun in his youth when twenty years old, and taken from his study on his flight from Portugal, he had long ago given up as lost. He now determined to continue it with renewed zeal, and on an enlarged scale. In his own words on the subject, in his preface to the commentary: "Ten years after my flight from Lisbon, whilst Israel was dwelling in safety, and in prosperity, in all parts of Spain, God determined to drive them all into exile, cast them into another land, and amongst a nation whose language they did not understand. I amongst the exiles came to Naples, where however we had likewise no rest, for the King, Charles VIII. of France, ruined us. His soldiers plundered all my property, and leaving the country I embarked on board a ship, and by God's mercy came to the island of Corfu, and whilst there got hold of what I had before written on this book (Deuteronomy) and joyfully resolved to enlarge it." After a short stay in Corfu—he remained only till the departure of the French from Neapolitan territory—he settled in his sixtieth year at Monopoli, in Apulia, in the kingdom of Naples. There he spent eight years, 1496-1503 in his theological studies, and displayed a most remarkable literary activity, for many of his works were either written or re-written there.

In January, 1496, he finished his commentary on Deutero-

nomy; about two months later, that on the Haggadah of Passover. In July of the same year, and at the request of his youngest son, Don Samuel, he completed his work on the Ethics of the Fathers, and in December, 1496, that on the Book of Daniel--a work of which he himself had a very high opinion. Then followed in rapid succession, his treatises on single chapters of, as well as his commentary on, the *Moreh*, on Prophecy, the Messiah, and Redemption, on the Articles of the Creed, the Resurrection, Reward and Punishment, and his commentary on Isaiah, which was also finished in Monopoli.

At the end of that time, in 1503, he went at the instance of his second son, Don Joseph (whom Graetz, for some inexplicable reason, persists in calling promiscuously both Isaac and Isaac II.) from Monopoli to Venice, where he passed the last years of his life, happy and serene. Here in the rich city of the Doges, he was once more drawn into the whirlpool of politics. The Senate, considering his able and clever statesmanship, took him into its counsel, and was guided by his advice, and even went as far as employing him, foreigner and Jew though he was, to negotiate a treaty between the Republic and Portugal, his native country, respecting the spice trade. Here too he had the fortune to be joined for a time by his eldest son, Don Judah.

Three years later, in 1507, when sixty-eight years old, and whilst his eldest son Don Judah was still staying with him, he received from a learned Cretan or Candiot of German origin, R. Saul Haccohen Ashkenazi, a disciple of Elia del Medigo, twelve questions on matters philosophical in the Moreh Nebuchim of Maimonides. These he answered at the beginning of the next year, with the graceful elegance peculiar to him. To the very last he worked hard at his studies, and was unremitting in his painstaking endeavours to elaborate the truths he had acquired, and to make them common property. His commentaries on the Books of the Prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and on the twelve Minor Prophets, as well as those on the first four books of Moses were all written and re-written in Venice, shortly before his death. In the summer of the year 1509, he died in Venice at the age of seventy-one, beloved, esteemed and mourned by Christians as well as Jews. In the presence of a large following of principal and representative men of Venice, his body was taken to Padua, and there interred in the ancient burial ground, outside the town. Five days later died Rabbi Juda Menz, the Rabbi of Padua and was buried beside him. The last resting place however of the one as of the other was, unintentionally let us hope, disturbed and destroyed. A fierce battle took place

outside the walls, between the army of the Venetian Republic, to which Padua belonged, on the one hand, and that of the Emperor Maximilian I. of Germany, acting under the League of Cambray, on the other. The latter laid siege to the town of Padua, and its surroundings suffered severely, the tombstones set up on the graves of both were demolished, and they have to this day not been identified. Thus was he pursued by adverse fate, even beyond the limits of his earthly existence.

It is most noteworthy that, in the midst of so many and engrossing occupations, in the service of different sovereigns and States, he should yet have found time to write so many works, all of them proofs of high intellectual power and profound scholarship, above all, however, of a high and genuine enthusiasm for Judaism. One can but marvel at the extraordinary fertility, and at the seemingly inexhaustible richness of his mind, particularly in the decline of life, when signs of physical decay were already perceptible, and in circumstances which would have tried and paralysed the capacity of the strongest and most robust. During the greater part of his literary activity, he was actually without books and other means of assistance, and almost wholly dependent on his memory. Most of his works, as we have seen, he wrote after exiles and troubles had come upon him, and after he had been thrust from his high and lofty station. In his above-named letter to R. Saul Haccohen Ashkenazi, containing answers to the other's questions, Abarbanel confesses that it was only in the vicissitudes of fortune that he recognised his true destiny as a theologian and exegetist, and not as a statesman and politician, after he had spent the best part of his life in vain endeavours after earthly perishable goods, riches and honour, all so cruelly and suddenly snatched from him. "Now all these commentaries and works I wrote after I had left my country. Before then, all the time that I was in the courts and palaces of the kings, engaged in their service, I had no leisure to study, and knew no book, but spent my days in vanity, and my years in trouble, in getting riches and honour; and now those very riches have perished, by evil adventure, and the glory is departed from Israel. It was only after I had been a fugitive, and a wanderer in the earth, from one kingdom to another people, and without money, that I sought out of the book of the Lord, according to (and parodying) the words of him who says in the Talmud, חסורי מחסרא וחכי קתני, 'He is sadly in want, and so he studies.'"

As an expositor of the Bible and of its purely historical books, the first Prophets in particular, he simply stands alone

and without equal. Besides his knowledge of the language, as complete as it is accurate, of the Talmud and Midrash, and of Kabbala and its symbolism, in which he is quite at home, he is remarkably well read in general literature, especially theological and exegetical, and in philosophy, Arabian and other. This is not all, however, for, in addition, he possesses the truly inestimable and essential qualification of the successful expounder of Scripture, knowledge of the world, and a correct insight into political situations and crises. His commentaries, especially those on these Biblical books, throw light upon points otherwise difficult beyond comprehension, and he succeeds in clearing up obscurities, and in supplying deficiencies in matters which the older commentators regarded as of too subordinate and secondary importance. Add to this his perfect scientific treatment of his subject, copied, no doubt, from Christian exegetists, but yet first introduced by him into Jewish commentaries, namely, the habit of prefacing to each book a special and luminous introduction, as well as a table of contents, and to each section or chapter a string or series of questions, occasionally, it would seem, somewhat superfluous and redundant, and started only to be answered; his pure and elegant language, his easy and clear style, so persuasive that Popes forbade Jews even to read his commentary on Isaiah; his fondness, in his exegetical writings, for symbolical and numerical allusions, his thoughtful and happy explanation of many of the so-called ceremonial observances in the Torah, as well as Scriptural passages in general; his frequent references to events and incidents in the past life of Israel; his introduction, by way of illustration, of many a new, striking, and piquant remark, taken from other fields of knowledge—and we know how it is that Don Isaac Abarbanel has become one of the most popular and attractive commentators on the greater part of the Bible, quoted by Jew and Christian alike, and why his commentaries have won a place in the affection of his co-religionists, from which none of those of his predecessors or successors has been able to dislodge them.

ISAAC S. MEISELS.

THE POSITION OF FAITH IN THE JEWISH RELIGION.

WHAT do we mean by the word "faith"? It is sometimes objected to employ this term in connection with Judaism. Is Judaism a faith, or is it only a code of rules and regulations? This question is one of great consequence to the future of Judaism. Faith is one of those words which have many meanings, and it is therefore essential, for the purpose of making these observations clear, to state what is here meant by the expression. Let us then define faith in two ways—first, as a faculty by which mankind is able to apprehend truths which do not lie completely within the sphere of ordinary demonstration; and secondly, as applied to Judaism, the word is to represent the particular body of truths which compose that part of Judaism which does not lie within the sphere of demonstration. This kind of statement seems necessary, because Judaism contains much that does appeal to the ordinary methods of understanding. A vast number of its rules and regulations can be reasonably justified by the common test of expediency and practical utility. But there is yet behind all these a group of ideas which cannot be explained in the same way. Throughout the Pentateuch and the Bible generally, not to mention the entire range of literature which has gathered round it and holds a place of sacred authority in the minds of most Jews, there are ideas and views which must necessarily be called dogmas.

It will be obvious to which set of thoughts I refer. The belief in God, and in the moral perfection of God, and in the doctrine of man having been created in the divine image; and then again the election of Israel, and Israel having peculiar relations to God and to the world—all these are matters that stand out quite apart from other things which belong to Judaism, such as the latter six of the ten commandments, the dietary laws, and numerous other regulations, all of which appeal straightway to our common sense

rather than to this faculty of faith. There is no doubt that Judaism, as understood by a large majority of adherents, contains rules and regulations so numerous and minute, that they appear almost to stand in the place which, in the case of Christianity, is filled by faith. Faith in other creeds means something more than the apprehension of truths that lie outside the sphere of ordinary demonstration. The difference in this respect between the claims of faith in the case of Judaism and in the case of Christianity is that in Judaism it assumes only what is not inconsistent with reason, though logically undemonstrable; whereas in Christianity faith claims a function altogether independent of reason, and sometimes hostile to it. The propositions contained in the Athanasian creed are all more or less capable of being submitted to the tribunal of reason or logical test. Reason and logic can say Aye or Nay to the question as to whether there can be three undivided parts in one uncompounded whole. Yet faith here claims to be the sole arbiter of the question. But in the case of Judaism reason can neither affirm or deny the presence of a Divine Being, nor the other propositions which grow out of that one. The ordinary methods of logical test and demonstration have nothing whatever to say to assertions of this kind. And it is precisely these matters with which faith in the case of Judaism is called into exercise. Wherever there is a point in which mathematical or other demonstration is possible, faith has no function in Judaism. For this reason a Jew can, consistently with his adherence to Judaism, accept every fully established teaching of literary criticism in respect to the interpretation of Scripture, and in regard to the notions of miracles, whereas the strict adherent of Christianity in any of its forms cannot do so. Faith in regard to Judaism and faith in regard to Christianity have different claims, and do not hold in all respects quite the same place. But it is none the less true that Judaism without faith is as unreal as Christianity without it. Judaism is quite as dependent upon faith as Christianity is, although its faith has other claims, and in no case conflicts with reason. The fundamental teaching and profession of Judaism in Deut. vi. 4, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, etc.," is one that could bring neither comprehension nor acceptance without at once making a claim upon the faculty of faith. To a man without faith, such a command could convey no meaning. It is quite otherwise with many other statements and commands contained in the Pentateuch. "Thou shalt not steal," or "Thou shalt not kill," are perfectly intelligible to a person whose

faith is entirely dormant, and might be obeyed without reference to the faculty of faith.

Professor Graetz, in his instructive article in the first number of this Review, wrote: "In order not to mistake the essential characteristics of Judaism, one must not regard it as a *faith*, or speak of it as 'the Jewish faith.' The application of a word is by no means unimportant. The word often becomes a net, in which thought gets tangled unawares. From an ecclesiastical standpoint, the word 'faith' implies the acceptance of an inconceivable miraculous fact, insufficiently established by historical evidence, and with the audacious addition *credo quia absurdum*. Judaism has never required such a belief from its adherents." True! but would it not have been more explicit if Professor Graetz had gone on to state that the *credo quia absurdum* was just the difference between the use of the word faith in the two different systems of Christianity and Judaism, rather than to have expunged the word altogether? For on another page he proceeds to explain that "the positive side (of Judaism) is to regard the highest Being as one and unique, and as the essence of all ethical perfections, and to worship it as the Godhead—in a single word, monotheism in the widest acceptation of the term." Then he goes on to remind us that the divine perfection gives the ideal for the moral life. "'Be ye holy, even as I am holy,' is the perpetually recurring refrain in the oldest records of Judaism," says Professor Graetz. To what faculty then of the human mind does this "idea of divine perfection" appeal if not to the faculty of faith? And what is the belief in the Supreme Being at all, and in the "ideal for the moral life," if it be not a faith? Surely to deny the use of the term "faith" in such a case as this is to rob our vocabulary of the only word which can adequately express our meaning. It is just possible that the aversion of Professor Graetz and other Jews less scholarly to the use of the word faith in connection with Judaism may be accounted for by two considerations. First, on account of the different use to which the term is applied in Christianity. Faith there is made to reconcile propositions that are so much at variance with the Jewish religion that there may be a lurking fear that if "faith" is once admitted into the Jewish vocabulary it may serve to raise up dogmas that are opposed to Judaism. Surely the more satisfactory way of dealing with the question is to define clearly what the special province of faith is in regard to Judaism, and thus to present the clear contrast between its functions in the two systems. Secondly, what may be called the religious genius of the Jewish race may

induce people to mistake the true cause for their acceptance of truths which do not lie within the sphere of ordinary demonstration. The beliefs in the Supreme Being and in the election of Israel are so deeply rooted in the Jewish mind that it may be supposed that these two propositions are acceptable to the Israelite by mere intuition or hereditary mental habit, and have been acquired by the individual Jew without any reference to the exercise of the faculty called faith. That, however, appears to be a somewhat loose way of getting rid of precise terms, and is altogether a shifting of the ground. It would be much more accurate to say that faith is a faculty with which the Israelite appears to be endowed in such a remarkable degree that the dogmas of his race present themselves with so much force that they look like axioms, and seem to be imbibed from his birth without any extraordinary effort at seeking to believe. That, no doubt, is true, as to the mental assent which nearly every born Israelite seems to give to certain propositions. But what shall we say about the application of those beliefs throughout the history of Israel, and throughout an individual career? There is something more than credulity required to make particular propositions, like the existence of the Supreme Being, and the relation of man to God, act as living forces upon human character. Here something is called into action which cannot be expressed in the English language by any other word than "faith." It is something much more than the intellectual process of belief that has led so many thousands of Jews to die for Judaism. No mere mental process would reconcile millions of men to lives of oppression and martyrdom, and still less would any opinion have the force about it to give them the necessary endurance and patience under all kinds of suffering. Something is called into exercise which is fraught with saving power, something that has in it not only the intellectual element of assenting to or dissenting from certain statements, but the higher or spiritual quality which we recognise as love and devotion. Faith is the exact and only word which conveys all this meaning, and my contention is that it is at least as tremendous a factor in Judaism as it is in Christianity.

In order to appreciate the true value of faith as a factor of Judaism, it is necessary to contrast the two distinct functions which it is intended to perform in regard to Judaism, and in regard to Christianity. The reason for this necessity arises from the fact that popular notions attach certain meanings to words which do not always represent their exact significance. Faith is popularly supposed to do service by reconciling the

supernatural or the miraculous, and in this sense Professor Graetz is right when he defines it "from an ecclesiastical standpoint" as the word which "implies the acceptance of an inconceivable miraculous fact, insufficiently established by historical evidence." In this respect faith has an enormous province in Christianity, whereas in Judaism it has none. Christianity is structurally founded upon "an inconceivable miraculous fact," and Judaism is not so founded. Miracle belief is a necessity in Christian theology, but it is by no means indispensable in Hebrew theology.

Professor Graetz appears to have fallen into the not uncommon error of dismissing a particular term because that term has many applications, some of which are not those that Judaism requires. I have thus attempted to show what Judaism does not require of faith. Let us now see the part that faith has to take in the Jewish Religion. First the very apprehension of the Supreme Being is an act of faith; secondly the conviction that the Supreme Being has decreed that one particular group of people shall be for all time his "Kingdom of Priests" or "Holy Nation" for some special purpose is another act of faith. And here faith becomes transformed, as it were, from a passive to an active state. The Israelite being convinced much more by faith than by mere reason that he is in actual fellowship with a commission divinely appointed, his life is conducted entirely with reference to that commission, and nothing but faith enables him so to conduct himself. Here the idea of faith as an abstract word becomes the name of a particular factor in human nature, and is thence a virtue. It embraces within itself many other virtues. It creates or calls into play virtues that were otherwise hidden or inactive. As an example it is pregnant with courage, with hope, with patience, with determination, with self-sacrifice, sometimes with inventive power, and in its highest form, beginning from the starting point of the sacred commission, it fructifies into an enthusiasm of humanity—that is a love of mankind, an unquenchable desire to labour for the good of fellow men. Such an enthusiasm as this Jewish faith is capable of working is the exact reverse of what it might vulgarly be supposed to have commenced from. The separateness of race and the thought of God having made a particular choice, bear a totally different colour under the elevating influences of faith. The separateness means distinct obligations specially incumbent, and the particular choice signifies one out of the many ways of Providence for bestowing good and blessings upon mankind. To the mind of a strictly religious Jew, the history of his race presents one

vast spectacle of a discipline, namely, the discipline of faith. From the bondage in Egypt to the wandering in the desert, and from the destructions of the two Temples, the exile and the dispersion, to the latest sufferings in South-Eastern Europe, he traces the hand of God refining him in the furnace of affliction, and perpetually equipping him with a greater and holier gift of that which he considers the highest of all gifts, namely, the gift of faith. This is the most impressive illustration of the power of faith which history has yet supplied. The history of the Jewish race is the history of faith in a sense more remarkable and striking than any other history. Faith as a great human virtue is thus exalted in the life of Israel, and stands out as the most brilliant example to mankind. So far from Judaism being without the factor of faith it rather appears to be the one Religion of all others in which faith in the sense of a virtue—not a mere mental process—plays the fullest part. Where is there faith so highly developed as that which enables the European Jew of the nineteenth century to see in a record of thirty-three centuries of the most varied and varying detail—one unbroken continuity, one unbaffled plan, a single destiny, an eternal truth?

Since writing the foregoing, I have had the advantage of reading the luminous article on "English Judaism," by Mr. Israel Zangwill, in the July number of this Review. That article appears to be a comprehensive survey of the numerous different conceptions of Judaism which Mr. Zangwill has observed among his fellow Israelites in England. He has tabulated these conceptions under thirty-two different labels. Perhaps that is a needless multiplication, seeing that some of them lie outside Judaism altogether, and that many of them, according to the very labels employed, are no conceptions at all. With regard to Mr. Zangwill's multiplication of labels, it might be observed that his industry in that direction could have been spared if he had made the simple observation that there is a vast variety in human temperament, and there are many shades of mental and spiritual character among all men, and, therefore, that no two men see things exactly in the same way. But the object of my reference to that article here is, that it being an impartial essay on the question, "What is Judaism?" written with large resources of information, and conceived throughout with critical power, I regard it as a valuable confirmation of my own proposition, that faith is an indispensable factor of Judaism, and that a particular kind of faith is its special and distinguishing characteristic. The apparent despondency as to the future of Judaism with which Mr. Zangwill's paper concludes does

not appear to me to be the necessary result of his investigations. Nor am I convinced by his arguments, on page 400, that the transition of Jewish conceptions from one age to another, and from one mind to another, does either "historically" or "logically" suggest a change of name, because that very characteristic faith belonging to and distinguishing Judaism is of a kind which indicates the singular power of adaptability inherent in it. If Judaism were only a code of regulations and not a faith, it would hardly be necessary to despond about its future now, because it could not have lasted beyond a very limited period, and then only within quite restricted conditions. It is just because it was a faith, and pre-eminently a faith above all things, that it has endured up to the present—not only over a vast span of time, but under numerous different conditions of extraordinary and exceptional variety. Where there is no faith, that is no spark of trust and confidence in the divine purpose respecting Israel, the Jewish religion is undistinguishable, even though there is ample evidence of racial identity. On the other hand, where there is this faith, that unquenchable thirst for the waters of spiritual life, together with the unshaken conviction that the "Guardian of Israel slumbers not nor sleeps," the Jewish religion may be equally recognised in the minyan room of a Polish city, or in the "reformed" synagogue of Western Europe. The unity of Israel is established by reason of that common faith far more than by the uniformity of traditional observances. Here, again, Mr. Zangwill has shown that so-called "orthodox" adherence to ceremonialism may be observed among Jews of different opinions upon religion itself. In other words, religious diversity is possible with ritual resemblance. Diversity in ritual practice is surely of much less consequence to the future of Judaism than diversity in religious conviction. It can truly be said that some of the worst Jews are among the most observant, but it cannot be said that the best Jews are among those who have no religious convictions and are without faith. From the first calling of Abraham to be the father of a great nation, in whom all the families of the earth would be blessed, to the sanctification of the emancipated groups at the foot of Sinai, two distinct propositions were made apparent: 1. That Israel had a divine call, and 2. That that call was to have consequences which concerned mankind at large. Both these propositions are of the nature of religious beliefs, and are essential to any description of Judaism. Far more essential are they than any dogmas as to the manner of the revelation. Whithersoever literary criticism may lead us in respect to

the interpretation of statements touching the circumstances of what is understood by revelation, there remains the hereditary impression among Jews that their distinct existence as Jews signifies a highly spiritual purpose, affecting the religious aspect of civilization. They are Jews in consequence of their conviction about the great event to which they owed their nationality. They have continued throughout the ages to be Jews by reason of the continuance of that conviction, and Judaism will cease when that conviction evaporates, but not before. No amount of ceremonialism can keep the Jewish religion alive without the faith that constitutes it. With that faith present, Judaism will not merely survive, but operate as a potent force among the religious influences of mankind. It will thus operate under, or in spite of, conditions of ever varying adhesion to ceremonialism. It will exist amid very much ceremonialism, and it will also exist with comparatively little. The ceremonialism is in part incidental to Judaism, in some measure it is indeed a mere accretion. In no case can Judaism be intelligently defined as a composition of ceremonialism. Every thoughtful person is bound to distinguish between the rules and regulations of an institution and the object for which the institution exists, and the source of its vitality. A mere outward observance, however rigid and minute, whether traceable to the "Auld Lang Syne" motive or any other not based on spiritual conviction, is no pledge whatever of the future of Judaism. But the form of Jewish adhesion which Mr. Zangwill says "gladdens the simple heart of the Russian pauper as he sings the hymns of hope and trust after his humble Friday night's meal," is not of the dead nature of mere outward ceremonialism, but it is the *living faith* which "gladdens the simple heart" of that Russian pauper. It is not ceremonialism by itself but the *living faith* behind it, which, as Mr. Zangwill truly says, "still solaces the foot-sore hawker, amid the jeers and blows of the drunkard and the bully, and transfigures the squalid Ghetto with celestial light." Where there is this vital faith among the members of the Jewish race there is Judaism, and it is the same in the villages of Russian Poland as in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; the same in New York City as in the East End of London, provided always that we are sure of the presence of that vital faith, and that those who are conscious of it are equally conscious of their fellowship with the great mass of Israel, scattered though it may have been through all historic times and through all known regions. The Jewish claim to the guardianship of eternal truth would never have

been established without the corresponding claim to the power of universal adaptability. The power of assimilation which is so remarkable in the Jewish race, their absolute capacity to become patriots of every country and to acquire every cast of mind, together with the fact that Judaism is present to-day, with equal evidence of organization, in Jerusalem and in Paris, in London and in Constantinople, in the Polish Ghettos and in the cities of the United States, are without doubt abundant testimony wherewith to establish this claim to the possession of eternal truth.

In conclusion, whatever may be the opinions of individuals as to the desirability or the obligation of certain views or observances from a Jewish point of view, Judaism is essentially a faith of the highest spiritual character. And although that faith does not make claims of the same kind as faith does in other religions, it does demand the most steady and resolute adherence to truths enunciated three thousand years ago.

OSWALD JOHN SIMON.

THE LETTER OF CONSOLATION OF MAIMUN BEN JOSEPH.

It was, I think, Abraham Mendelssohn who said that, up to a certain period of his life, he was the son of his father, but afterwards he was the father of his son. The latter part of this happy remark might be applied, but with far less justice, to the subject of this paper. All who have any pretence to a knowledge of Hebrew literature know something about Maimonides, or more correctly Maimunides, but few have heard of his father. And yet his father deserves a niche in the history of his age and of Judaism. The letter, of which I publish the Arabic text[1] and an English translation, bears evidence to his simple faith, to the warmth of his affections, to his enthusiasm, and his confidence in the future of Israel, and of Israel's religion.

Of the life of Maimun[2] ben Joseph, we know but little. His name is Arabic, and is derived from the verb Yamana, and means Felix, Benedictus, a translation, perhaps, of the Hebrew Baruch. We must remember this when we meet with the name Maimun. It is not an unusual name, and several persons have borne it. Azariah de Rossi[3] speaks of a Maimun, the author of a commentary on the Astronomy of Alfergani, but Steinschneider has shown that the author of this commentary was a certain Maimun of Montpellier.[4] I think I may say of our Maimun that he was a pupil of Joseph Hallevi Ibn Migash. His grandson, Abraham ben Moses Maimonides tells us this in his Kitab Alkifayah.[5] Ibn Migash was head of the school at Lucena, and his pupil followed in his footsteps, for we find that he bore the title of Dayan, a title probably equivalent to Ab beth-Din.

---

[1] The Text and Appendix will appear in No. 6.

[2] Should be spelt with *u* in last syllable, not *o*.

[3] מאור עינים (ed. Cassel), page 331. [4] *Hamazcir*, 1879, p. 110.

[5] Steinschneider Catalogue of Bodleian Coll., 1865, p. 55. Dr. D. Joel, in his *Aberglaube und die Stellung des Judenthums zu demselben*, ii. 63, throws some doubt as to the relations which existed between Ibn Migash and Maimun.

That he was learned in Talmudical literature may be proved from the number of times he is quoted by his illustrious son.[1] He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch in Arabic, fragments of which are known to us from the commentary of his grandson on Genesis and Exodus, which fragments we publish in the Appendix. I trust that, perhaps, the publication of these fragments may be the means of unearthing the commentary itself. Some of the comments are very beautiful. Noticeable, for instance, is Maimun's remark upon the prayer of Jacob, that his grandchildren might be called by the name of his fathers. "So long as they deal righteously," Maimun says, "they will be worthy to bear the name of their ancestors; if they sin they will be called the princes of Sodom and Gomorrah."[2] We know, too, that he wrote in Arabic commentaries on the Dinim, concerning the ritual and the festivals.[3]

But his greatest work, because it is still complete, is the letter which he composed for his co-religionists who were suffering from the persecution of the "Unitarians" in Fez. Geiger was of opinion that this letter was identical with the Iggereth Hashemad which is generally attributed to Maimonides, and the opinion was supported by some words of Saadiah ben Maimun ibn Danan.[4] Graetz was distinctly of opinion that such an identification was impossible, basing his conclusion on the Hebrew marginal notes which are appended to the letter, and the Hebrew verses which are quoted in it.[5] And Graetz's view was undoubtedly correct. There is not the slightest likeness in substance or in the manner of treatment between the "Letter of Consolation," by the father, and the

---

[1] Introduction to Commentary on *Mishna*:
Bechoroth, viii. 7.
Eduyoth, iv. 7.
Eduyoth, i. 3.
Shebuoth, vi. 7, a valuable passage, proving that Joseph Hallevi was the teacher of Maimun.
Yad Hachazahah Hilchoth Shechita xi. 10, an interesting passage.

[2] Steinschneider refers (in his commentary on *Hamazcir*, vi. 1863, p. 114) to the fact of Maimun being quoted by his grandson. The passages commented on by Maimun, which, as we have said, are given in the Appendix, are the following: A long commentary in his own words on portions of Exodus xxxii. and xxxiii.; Genesis xxi. 16, 30, xxiii. 2, xxvi. 3, xxxiii. 17, xxxiv. 7, xxxv. 4, xxxviii. (the dream of Joseph, and his being sold to the Midianites), xli. 25, 34, xlii. 13, 22, xlviii. 16, xlix. 16, l. 2; Exodus iv. 16, xiv. 8, xix. 22, xx. 24, xxi. 29, xxiii. 14, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 13, xxviii. 28, xxx. 7.

[3] Azulai Shem Haggedolim s. v. Maimun. Responsa Simeon Duran, I. 2.

[4] Geiger, *Moses ben Maimun*, Anmerkung 17.

[5] Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, Vol. vi., 2nd edition, 293; Edelmann *Chemda Genuzah*, Introduction lxxxiv.

"Letter of Apostasy," which is assigned to the son. Nay more, there is no comparision possible between the minds of the father and son. The son was not unemotional, but he was a philosopher first of all. The father is all enthusiasm, full of faith, longing to dwell in the beautiful stories of Hagadah, not afraid of believing in angels, not desirous of making God an abstraction, or the apostle of God merely a deep thinker. We have been taught to appreciate the great religious revival in Islam which was brought about by the Almuwahhidun or the strict Unitarians, and for this better appreciation we must be grateful for the work done by Prof. Goldziher of Vienna in publishing the Paris MS. of the Mahdi Book of Ibn Tumart. But though the Unitarians brought about a great religious reform, yet the fanaticism, which is almost inseparable from any deep religious feeling, caused much misery to non-Moslems who were dwelling in Moslem states. "In our country," said boastingly a great historian of the time, "there is no church and there is no synagogue." Maimun endeavoured to strengthen the faith of those who were wavering, and he sent an open letter to one of his brethren in the year 1160. In that year Maimun and his son Moses were in the "land of the West," and it is to the inhabitants of Fez that his letter applies.[1] In the year 1165 they left Africa for Palestine, and arrived on Sunday, May 16th, at St. Jean d'Acre. There they met Jephet ben Elijah, whom Benjamin of Tudela visited before the year 1173. Jephet seems to have accompanied them to Jerusalem, where they arrived on October 12th, 1165. Jephet ben Elijah returned to Acre, and Maimonides journeyed to Egypt. Whether Maimun accompanied him thither or remained in the Holy Land is doubtful. Geiger has published the letter which Maimonides wrote to Jephet ben Elijah, the Dayan, in which he speaks of his father's death, but we cannot glean from it where he died. All Maimonides says is this: "After we had parted a few months, my father died, and letters of consolation came to me from the extreme ends of the Magreb, even from Christian Spain, but thou didst give no heed." If we might make history, instead of telling the simple truth of history, we should let him die in the land to which he hoped that one day all nations would flow, believing in God and in God's apostle.

I think I have now recounted all his works known to us. He may have written a commentary on the book of Esther. There is a reference to a comment on a verse in Esther in a Yemen Arabic manuscript referred to by Steinschneider;[2] but

---

[1] Geiger, *Moses ben Maimun*, 20.

[2] *Hamazcir*, 1880, 63.

his reputation must be based upon his letter. There is little need for me to give an abstract of it, as I have translated it in full; but I cannot refrain from praising its simple style. There are parts where the reader who is but slightly acquainted with the beauties of the Arabic language, as the present translator, is carried away by it. He writes in parts as Jehudah Hallevi might have written. It has sometimes been asked why, if Maimonides wrote the Iggereth Hasshemad, did he not refer to his father's work? The answer is that he could not. The objects aimed at by the two letters were different. Perhaps the difference lay deeper still, as the father, to use the words of Maimonides, was one of those who forbade, while the son was one of those who permitted.[1] I do not think that I should be wrong in asserting that, at any rate, when the Letter of Consolation was written, Maimun had no intention of embracing Islam, even in appearance.

One point is striking in the reading of the letter: it is the very strong influence which Moslem phrases exercised upon Jewish theology. Maimun's perpetual insisting upon belief in God and his Apostle, and in that with which he was sent down, seems almost like an echo from the *Qur'an*. Abraham is called without hesitation the Mahdi of God, and perhaps the great stress which is laid upon the greatness of Moses may be intended as a set off to the greatness of Mohammed. At least this is clear, that there is much greater affinity theologically between the parent and the younger daughter religion than between the parent and its elder daughter. Imagine a Jew in Russia writing to his persecuted brethren and using terms identical with those of Christian theology.

Possibly the portion of the letter which will prove most interesting to some readers is the commentary on the 90th Psalm, with which the letter concludes. It will be interesting to find how this Psalm was applied, not so much to the shortness of life as to the shortness of God's anger, and the ultimate deliverance from captivity. This Psalm apparently possessed great attractions for those who suffered calamities in the days of persecution. We are told that Judah Hadassi, the Karaite, wrote a commentary on it, which reminds the reader very strongly of the commentary of Maimun.

Goldberg translated a great portion of the text into Hebrew,[2] but I trust that the letter in its English dress will be, to use the words of its author, "a source of consolation and of comfort" to those who are inclined to waver in faith, or

[1] *Hilchoth Schechita, ad loc. cit.*

[2] *Lebanon*, 1872.

to yield to difficulties; and that something may have been done to place before the reader a man who has been almost unknown, but who was more than the mere father of his son.

I cannot conclude without expressing my sincere thanks for the valuable assistance I have received from the distinguished editor of the *Book of Roots*, and of the Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. at the Bodleian, Dr. Neubauer; from Mr. S. Schechter, whose wonderful knowledge of the whole field of Rabbinical literature has been at my disposal; and to Mr. Shâker Geohamy, of Mount Lebanon, from whom I have received invaluable aid in the editing of the Arabic text.

L. M. Simmons.

Maimun's Letter.—English Translation.

In the name of the Lord, the God of the Universe, the letter of our teacher and our master, Maimun, the son of our teacher and our master, Joseph (the memory of the righteous for a blessing), which he composed in the town of Fez, in the year 1471, of the Seleucid Era. The author sent this letter to one of his brethren, that it might be a source of consolation for himself, and of delight to many souls perplexed on account of the sorrows of captivity, and grieved by the delay in the fulfilment of divine promises, and by hopes long cherished being deferred, for day succeeded night, and night day, and still they were slain for their obedience to God, and for the fulfilment of his will. But the multitude of our troubles gives us hope that God will grant us that which he has bestowed upon us, and makes us expect the fulfilment of that which he has promised us. Surely the words which God has spoken in his own name are true (Isaiah xlv. 23), "By myself have I sworn," and there is no oath greater than my name, my memorial assures redemption. And the words which I speak are words from which there is no return, since I am exalted above return and beginning, for unto me bend the knees of all creatures, by me do all tongues swear in purity, and nought is sworn by me unless it is done; how much more will the promise be fulfilled which is sworn by myself, and which I swear to fulfil myself!

(*End of Introduction.*)

The author of the letter writes as follows:—

May God lead thee in the way he desires, and remove thee from that which he abhors. May he direct thee in the straight

path, and may he make the angels of his people an assistance for thee, assisting thee to do that which he desires, and which the law demands of thee in accordance with that which he has promised his saints by the hands of his prophets. "The Lord is good and upright, and therefore he shows sinners the way." (Psalm xxv. 8).

Know then that it is clear and distinct through that which is proved from the writings of the prophets and the comments of the rabbis, that God is true, that the messages which he has sent to us are true, and that which generation after generation has handed down to us is true. In these there is no doubt, no defect, no lie, no deception. God knoweth that which exists before it came into existence, and all events pre-exist in his knowledge. He does not desire a thing and then change it; he does not favour and then reject. It is only man, from whom the knowledge of the future is hidden, who desires a thing, and then when something happens which he did not anticipate, his desire is changed. But how can he, whose knowledge of every event precedes the happening of that event, and who establishes every event in accordance with his will, how can he wish a thing and then change it? how can he first distinguish a people and then reject them? This is impossible for God, and so God spake to one who asserted its possibility, "God is not a man that he should lie" (Numbers xxiii. 19). And Samuel also said, "The strength of Israel will not lie" (1 Samuel xv. 29). And now that we have seen that God chose a people, and distinguished them, and inclined to them, and showed to them his favour, and drew near to them in a manner that he drew near to none of his creatures before or afterwards, we know that God's knowledge of his people preceded his choice, and that he knew that they would have faith, and stand firm to his commandments in the beginning and at the end. I mean to say that all the events which happened between the beginning and the end (God's choice of us, and his receiving us back into his favour) are unessential, without stability, and without permanence. We may compare the life of Israel to the life of a healthy man. At first he was young, and advanced from one thing to another; then he arrived at middle age, and remained for a long time in the best condition; then diseases came upon him and maladies, and his health is undone, and his visage is marred, and it is as if he had never been healthy at all, and it is almost as if nought were left to him of his former appearance, for all is changed, and he is left for a time despaired of, until his condition improves, and the body begins to recover perceptibly; it heals little by little, he returns to his health, and it is as if he had never been sick at all. So God knew beforehand Israel's firmness in obedience, and that they would turn neither to the right hand nor to the left, as it is said, "And all the people answered with one voice" (Exodus xxiv. 3, 7), and God knew

that the children of Israel would remain faithful even at the end of time, therefore he emphatically pronounced, "And also in thee they will believe" (Exodus xix. 9). And God describes the corruption of our condition between these two periods in the words, "And it shall come to pass if thou wilt not hearken" (Deut. xxviii. 15), and threatens Israel with every possible calamity and misfortune; but he declares at the end that, in spite of their corruption and of his punishing them, he would not hate them, or cast them off, and that God's anger was but a chastisement and a punishment for disobedience, for scripture calls calamities corrections in the well-known verse, "As a man chastises his son" (Deut. viii. 5). Here the apostle says, Understand ye, and be firm, and know that God's punishment of you is not like his punishment of the nations, but the distinction between them and you is clear, in that the punishment of a rebel, who is a stranger to us, is not the same as the punishment of a child. For when a stranger is rebellious against us, we cause a heavy punishment to descend upon him, we are incensed against him, we desire to root him out; but when a child is rebellious against us, we punish him in a gentle way, giving him instruction, inflicting pain upon him, the effect of which, however, will not be permanent, with a thong which gives pain, but leaves no trace, and not with a whip, which leaves a permanent mark, but with a rod, which indeed makes a mark for the time, but cleaves not the flesh, as it is said, "If thou beatest him with a rod, he shall not die" (Proverbs xxiii. 13). And it is said of him who was beloved by God above all his other creatures that when he was rebellious, he corrected him with a gentle punishment, or with such a trial as man could impose, which is no trial, as it is said, "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men" (2 Sam. vii. 14). And God, the exalted One, proclaimed in this sense to his first apostle, and said, "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them to destroy them utterly" (Leviticus xxvi. 44), and he also said, through those who came after the first apostle, "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished" (Jeremiah xxx. 11), and if God had desired to hate us when we rebelled against him, he would have cast us off altogether, or have left some mark upon us as our enemies assert; and if what they assert were true, they would have been presented with that which has been given to us, and they would have had assigned to them the position which was assigned to us. Dost thou not understand that when a king is angry with one of his favourites, he changes him for a second, rends his garment, and gives his decorations to his successor, and places his successor in the same position with respect to himself as he

occupied? And when a husband is angry with his wife, he changes her for a second, and gives the second one the position which had been occupied by the first, as it is said, "And he placed the crown of the kingdom on her head, and made her queen instead of Vashti" (Esther ii. 17)? And where is the religion over which God has placed the protection of his clouds, placing his Shechina in the midst of its followers, apparent to all beholders, according to his word in the law, "And the glory of the Lord filled the sanctuary" (Exodus xl. 34). And so in several other passages, "For the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord." And what prophet is there like the greatest of the prophets? and what clear signs, and miracles, and wonders, and supernatural appearances like those shown to us? And also if God had brought them near to him, and had revealed to them our law, it would perchance have been said that God had changed us for an obedient people, in that we were disobedient. But our law is not like their law, desiring to-day that which it did not desire yesterday, and loving to-day those whom it hated yesterday. And if God had left us in dispersion, promising, threatening, and saying nought beyond (the promise holding good so long as we did his will, the threat being fulfilled when we disobeyed it), and uttering no explanation, even the restoration would have been possible, for God has a beneficent intention, which is proved by his not having changed us for another people, nor did he bestow on them any of our gifts. And he could not do so when he filled his book with many clear promises of what he would do for us after our misfortunes, using first the words, "If ye will not hearken," but afterwards, "Ye will surely hearken." The first prophet referred to all this in language brief, concise, and comprehensive, when he said, "(At the end of days) thou shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice. . . . then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost part of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee. And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it, and he will do thee good, and will multiply thee above thy fathers. . . . For the Lord will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy fathers" (Deut. xxx. 3).

These verses can best be explained by the commentaries of later prophets, by such explanations as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, the twelve minor prophets, and Daniel, who was the seal of all the prophets, assigned to them, as well as by the promises which are contained in the Book of Psalms. All later promises are an interpretation of those which had been uttered by the first prophet. We may make our meaning clear

by the following illustration. A man speaks thus to his vizier, "Say to my subjects, The king will do you a favour, and will clothe you, and will honour you with positions of dignity." Then the king's vizier goes away, and in process of time other messengers arrive. Each new messenger speaks of the commands which his master had given him with reference to the promised favours, and tells his hearers that so and so many of them will partake of them. Then the souls of those who hear are refreshed, and filled with gladness. And again another messenger reports that there will be such and such a garment for every one who is present. But each new messenger describes how all these details were contained in the first declaration. Thus God sware by his holy name that he would confirm everything which those who had come from him had promised. And if there had been an earthly king who had promised and sworn to be faithful to his promises, those to whom the promises had been given would have rejoiced; but such a joy is illusive, and doubtful in two respects; first, the executing of the promise is assigned to another, and secondly, his own life is in the hand of another. If he live, he is often prevented from performing his promises through contingencies which had not been foreseen, or through unexpected obstacles; or death, as we have said, may cut him off, or even he to whom the promise has been made may not live to see its fulfilment. But the Creator, in his greatness, is independent of all events. In his way there is no difficulty. He is not subject to death, or to space, or time. How then shall he not pay that which he has promised even without an oath, and how much less when he has promised with an oath? Even an oath by the name of God compels one of his creatures to be faithful to his promise, as it is said, "He shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth" (Numbers xxx. 3), how much more must such an oath compel God himself? And if he had sworn by any of the things he has created, since all these things come to an end, and all these things are in his power, it would have been said that there was no oath, but he sware by his own name, which passes not away, and changes not, and this is the meaning of the words of God, "By myself I have sworn, saith the Lord" (Genesis xxii. 16). And the prophet said to God when he was angry, and wished to annihilate Israel for what they had done, "Remember Abraham, Isaac and Israel thy servants, to whom thou didst swear by thine own self" (Exodus xxxii. 13). And he said, referring to his promises to us, "I have sworn by myself; the word has gone out of my mouth" (Isaiah xlv. 23). And these are clear sentences, and self-evident truths, and enduring signs that God does not hate us, and that he will not cause to pass away from us the name of children, whether we please him, or anger him against us, whether we believe in him, or whether we turn away from him, in accordance with his words, "Ye are the

children of the Lord your God" (Deut. xiv. 1); "My son, my firstborn" (Exodus iv. 22); "Children in whom there is no faithfulness" (Deut. xxxii. 20); "Children that are corrupters" (Isaiah i. 4); "Sottish children" (Jeremiah iv. 22). And he promised to be gracious to us when he said, "It shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God" (Hosea ii. 1); "For I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn" (Jeremiah xxxi. 9), and many other promises of the same character. And it is necessary that we should rely upon God, and believe in him, and not doubt his promises, just as we do not doubt his existence, nor should we doubt whether he will cast us off when he has promised to draw us near unto him, nor should the glorious condition of the nations terrify us, or what they assert, or what they hope for, because we confide in God, and have faith in his promises. And in spite of their gaining supremacy over us, and their being angered against us, and their conquering us, and the variation of our calamities with the variation of day and night, (in the day we fear their dealing treacherously with us, and that which may happen to us in the course of the hours through their taking counsel against us, and we hope that we may be to-day in the same condition as we were yesterday when we slept at rest; and we say with the lengthening of the day, "O that we could be at peace from them to-day as we were yesterday; no misfortune has happened to us," and when the night comes, we say, "Who knows to-night what may happen to us? O that this night could be like the day which has passed away," and it is this wherewith our prophet threatens us, "In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even, and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning" (Deut. xxviii. 67).), we must still reflect upon that which he has promised us, and upon that which we hope, and then the weary souls will have rest, and their fears be quietened, for there must needs be repose and healing after this unhappiness, there must needs be enlargement after this straitness.

And a man must strive his best secretly and publicly in whatever he has to perform of the law and obey of the commandments, whether those commands refer to the duties of the heart or to external duties, to lay hold of the cord of the law and not loosen his hand from it, for one in captivity is like one who is drowning. We are almost totally immersed, but we remain grasping something. Overwhelmed with humiliation, and contumely and contempt, the seas of captivity surround us, and we are submerged in its depths, and the waters reach our faces, and we are left in the worst condition, such a condition as David (peace with him) describes when he says, "Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul" (Psalm lxix. 2). The waters are overwhelming me, but the cord of the ordinances of God and his law are suspended from heaven to earth, and whoever lays hold of it has hope, for in the

laying hold of this cord, the heart is strengthened, and is relieved from the fear of sinking to the pit and to destruction. And he who loosens his hand from the cord has no union with God, and God allows the abundant waters to prevail over him, and he dies. And according to the manner of his taking hold of the cord is his relief from the fear of drowning. He who clings to it with all his hand, has, doubtless, more hope than he who clings to it with part of it, and he who clings to it with the tips of his fingers has more hope than he who lets go of it altogether. So none are saved from the toils of captivity except by occupying themselves with the Law and its commentaries, by obeying it, and cleaving to it, and by meditating thereon continually, and by persevering therein day and night in accordance with the words of David in Psalm cxix. 92. In this verse David says, "If thy law had not been my comfort, and the desire of my soul, I should have perished in the days of my affliction." He foretold the state of Israel in captivity and their entanglement in its toils, and how, if they occupied themselves with the law and obeyed it, they would be saved and would escape from the snares of the enemies amongst whom they had been driven into captivity. It is necessary that a man's intentions should be perfect, that his heart should be sincere, having faith in God, that God is true, and that his promises to us are true, believing in the first apostle and in that wherewith he was sent to us, confessing that God is the Lord, and that the message of his apostle is true, saying with a perfect heart free from deceit, free from doubt, "Moses is true and his law is true." And man should not follow his animal nature, or allow his natural dispositions to prevail over his intellectual, so that he destroy his religion and his life hereafter, and be deceived by this unstable world. For it is the love of this life wherein man is tried with two trials, which are the cause of his being overcome. The first of these trials is the love of women, the second is the love of this world and its hopes and its aims, with a desire which prevails over all men, a desire through which we were created, a desire which pervades everything, and none other than the prophets and saints are proof against it. And the world is like a beautiful woman whose appearance is pretty, whose features are fine, whose garb is attractive, whose perfumes diffuse their odour, whose gait deceives the lookers on, whom all men regard with loving desire, whose speech is pleasant and sweet, whom men are entranced to hear, so that their hearts are inclined to her by her words, she spreads her nets in the highway, and lays her snares on the high road, hunting those who desire and covet her, beguiling them until they fall, they go to her, coveting her, and while she flees from them they still covet and follow her, and they do not know what is under them. They are like birds descending in

freedom, the snare is laid for them, the grain is spread, and now they turn from it, now they incline towards it, they descend to gather the grain and the snare catches them and they are entangled in it, they desire to be free, but they are no longer able to fly away. Solomon compares this world to a woman (Proverbs vii. 14), and he describes woman's deceitful ways towards those who incline to her (Proverbs vii. 23). Beware, therefore, of the deception of this world and of seeking after your own earthly desires.

And reflect upon the approach of death which comes between man and his desires, think of his departing from his place, and of his being cast away from his abode. Man is perpetually at unrest in the place where he ought to have rested, till he went forth from it, and till those who were near to him were removed, till those who were united with him were dispersed, and till he is left alone confined in his grave. Then he leaves everything which he has gained. Then he gives an account for every sin which he has committed, and the reckoning is made up, and he is doomed to punishment, punishment hidden from the eyes, not understood by men. But the prophets have made us understand it, and they who feared God have taught it us, and the saints have made us yearn for it, but the wicked give no thought to it.

And he who is careful, does not lay stress upon the events of this world. If all goes well with him he is not overwhelmed with joy, and if things do not go well with him he is not afflicted, for he is without understanding who desires this world with a desire which destroys his position with God. What health can there be for him who is not whole with his Master? What pleasure for him who is not warned by punishment? And what rest for him who has no continued existence in the world? And how can man hope for the attainment of his desires in a thing in which lies his own death; or how can he hope to attain them by pursuing ends which stand as a separation between himself and his Master?

And he who is cautious looks to his Master, and strives by means of union with God to be happy, cleaving to God, being contented in this world with a little, when it is difficult to attain much, at any rate being contented with a mere trifle. Should we however wish for plenty we should seek for it in the manner which God has impressed upon us, although the making of the limit is in our own heart. Therefore reflection and firmness are necessary, and that man should toil and strive for himself and not for anything else.

And one of the strongest means of union between man and his Creator is his being faithful to the obligation imposed upon him of praying three times every day, in the morning out of gratitude to God for sending the dawn, in the mid-day the time of the declining of the sun from the east to the west, and also at the end of the day. And of this we find traces since the

existence of day and night. And our Rabbis hand down traditions[1] concerning the first fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that they used to offer up these three prayers. Our father Abraham (peace be with him) used to lay stress on the morning prayer. He watched for the coming out of the sun, and then placed himself before God, as it is said, "And Abraham got up early in the morning" (Genesis xix. 27). And Isaac laid stress on the afternoon prayer. He used to watch for the beginning of the seventh hour of the day in order to pray, as it is said, "And Isaac went out to meditate in the field at the eventide" (Genesis xxiv. 63), and Jacob laid stress on the evening prayer when the stars appeared, as it is said "And he lighted on a certain place, and tarried there all night" (Genesis xxviii. 11). But still all of them offered up the three prayers, for although every good man performs all the commandments of God, there is still some one upon which he lays special stress; Abraham laid special stress on the morning prayer because he was the first of the true believers, and because it was he who as giver of light to the world, and Mahdi, was the means of bringing the dawn. And Isaac, the second of God's messengers, laid stress on the second prayer, and Jacob the third, on the third; and the pious of our faith never neglect the three prayers, and he who is good prays the three, or two, or one at least as it happens to him, but no one ever desists altogether from uttering prayer, and when David knew the excellence of prayer he described himself and those who like him were diligent in prayer, seldom neglecting it, as follows, "Evening and morning, and at noonday will I complain" (Psalm lv. 18). And Daniel (peace be with him) describes his own laying stress on these three prayers, when he says "And he kneeled upon his knees three times a day and prayed" (Daniel vi. 11), and he risked his life by praying when the Persians and the Medes prohibited all prayers on his account, hoping that he would fall, and he did fall, but God did not allow any harm to come to him. The King had given orders that none should pray for thirty days but that all should implore aid morning and evening from the King not from a god, and not from Allah, and Daniel risked his life and prayed in accordance with his wont. He was watched upon the roof, he was discovered, he was seized, and accused before the King, and it is understood that it was this which was aimed at by them, because Daniel was the King's Vizier, elevated above them all, and his rivals could find no other means of accusing him before the King except on grounds of his devotion to God. The attainment of the hopes of his rivals was painful to the King, and the Viziers (cursed be all of them) prevailed upon him to have Daniel thrown into a pit full of hungry lions, which the King had prepared for whomever he desired to punish with an evil death. And

[1] Talmud, *Berachoth* 26*b*.

Daniel was cast into the pit, and the King was grieved thereat, and Daniel spent the night therein, and a stone was placed at the mouth of the pit, and it was covered, and the King put his seal upon the place where it was closed. They said to the King—"Take care lest the stone be away to-night so that Daniel come forth from the pit, or that any one tamper with it." And when the time arrived for Daniel to go down into the pit, Gabriel (peace be upon him) came and sat with him and shut the mouths of the lions, and bound them so that they did not move from their places or their dens, and he sat with him comforting him so that he should not be afraid; and when the day dawned the King arose, for his slumber had fled from him all that night, and he did not break his fast, and no maiden came in unto him, and no jester, and he was covered with sadness; then he arose as soon as the morning came, and he went covered with grief to the pit, every one following him who met him, and when he drew near to the pit, he exclaimed in a voice full of sorrow, and said, "O Daniel, O servant of God, the living, the eternal God, tell thou me, has the God whom thou worshippest continually the power to deliver thee from the lions?" And Daniel answered him from the pit while it was still closed, and said, "My God sent an angel and closed the mouths of the lions, and they did not kill me as a reward for my deserving well at the hands of God. Moreover I have not disobeyed thy command, for had I been disobedient to thee I should not have found good favour in thy sight, for God has insisted upon obedience to the King and the limit of that which God imposes upon men towards the King is obedience, and as for worship that belongs to God and not to thee, and he who does not render to thee obedience, rebels against God and against thee, and he who does not worship thee obeys God, and commits no sin against thee, and on this account I was delivered."

And then Daniel was brought up from the pit in the presence of the whole cursed multitude and others who accompanied them, and his body was stripped, and it was seen to be pure and clean without a single wound on it, for his faith had freed him. Then said the King, "Let every one be taken who has spoken against him to me." Then they were all brought into his presence, they, their wives, their children, and they were seized and cast into the pit and not one of them reached the ground, but the lions opened their mouths, caught them and tore their limbs, and made an attack upon those who were at the top of the pit, and if it had not been for his firmness in prayer Daniel would not have risked his life; nor did prayer in his heart while he was sitting down in silence content him, but he prayed kneeling and prostrating himself according to custom, for the sake of shewing his obedience to God.

And when prayer was in this state the three later prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (peace be with them), with a hundred and twenty elders, arranged for us a prayer, in which

the learned and the ignorant might be equal, the learned adding nothing to it, the unlearned omitting nothing from it, and this prayer is the "eighteen blessings"; but this prayer is arranged for those who are in a condition of safety, but as for times and places of danger, they also arranged a short prayer that men might not be left without prayer entirely, and they made a difference between this latter prayer and the "eighteen blessings." The latter prayer is to be prayed towards the Qibleh, while the worshipper is standing, or sitting if there be an excuse to do so; and with regard to the shorter prayer, it is to be prayed in places of danger, whether the worshipper is standing, sitting or walking, and towards any Qibleh, and this prayer may be uttered at any one of the fixed times; but should the worshipper arrive at a place of safety, having uttered the prayer three times, he need only repeat the evening prayer, not those of the morning or afternoon; and if he reaches a place of safety in time for afternoon prayer, he should say that prayer before saying the "eighteen blessings" of the morning service. And he who does not know the whole prayer should pray the abridged one at the appointed time, and not remain without prayer altogether, for those who do not join the practice of prayer and those who separate themselves from religion altogether are alike.

Moreover, he who stands up to pray without knowing what he says, does not pray at all. The only recognised prayer is that which our holy men composed, viz., the "eighteen blessings" for those who understand, or the abridged prayer for those who do not understand, or the still more abridged one. And he who is able should utter the abridged prayer in Hebrew, as follows, the whole first part "O Lord, open thou my lips," till the end of "And thou art holy," and the last three blessings in full, but the middle blessings abridged, after the following reading of our Rabbis:[1] "Give us understanding, O Lord, to know thy ways, and mould our hearts to fear thee; pardon us, that we may be redeemed. Keep us far from disease, and grant us the bounteous fruits of the earth; gather our outcasts from the four corners of the earth; they that stray from thy wishes shall be judged, and over the wicked wilt thou stretch thy hand; the righteous shall rejoice in the building of thy city, and the establishing of thy temple, in the springing up of the house of David thy servant, and the reparation of the lamp of the son of Jesse thine anointed; and thou wilt hearken to our prayers; blessed (art thou) who hearest prayer."

This is sufficient in time of necessity as a substitute for "And thou graciously bestowest knowledge," and the following blessings, and it may be uttered by the worshipper whether

---

[1] *Berachoth*, 29*a*. Notice the reading in the accompanying text. Cf. Rabbinowicz, *Variæ Lectiones, ad loc.*; Maimon, *Tefillah*, III., 2.

standing or sitting, if there be an excuse to sit, but there is a still more abridged prayer for times of pressing danger in the well-known words of our Rabbis.[1] If we utter this prayer, we need not repeat either the first three or the last three blessings, and he who does not know it in Hebrew may pray it in Arabic, and such prayer is sufficient for him, because prayer is permissible in any language, especially if the contents of the prayer are those prescribed by our Rabbis, but translated into Arabic. But to pray in Arabic without regard to the ideas prescribed by our Rabbis is not permissible. For instance, it is not permissible to offer up instead of an obligatory prayer such a prayer as this, "O God, have mercy upon me, and grant me such and such a thing," even if the worshipper utters it after the manner of prayer, walking, lying down or sitting. And this is the context of the prayer of which we have already spoken as being permissible in times of danger, "O God, our God, and the God of our fathers, behold thou knowest that our desires are great, and our speech is scanty. May it be thy will, O God, to grant to each one of us our due necessities, and provide our bodies with sustenance, and accept our prayer, for it is thou who acceptest prayer. May thy great name be blessed." This is sufficient for him who is ignorant, so that he may not remain regularly without prayer. In the sight of God there is nought more powerful than prayer, for when the intention of a man is sincere, the heart pure, believing in God and his apostle, then his faith is sound, his belief correct, and he finds favour in the sight of God, and God averts from him misfortunes, and he obtains mercy from God, and consolation, and his end is assured him, and he escapes from the fire, and he is worthy of resurrection and the obtaining of a reward, and the beholding of divinely promised bliss. And this is true even if he were one who could not read and was ignorant. But for those who know and read the law, and occupy themselves with understanding its lessons, there are degrees and rewards. As he increases in goodness, his reward increases if, in addition to knowledge, there be religion and true faith in God. Dost thou know the dignity of him who was sent to thee, and of the message with which he was sent, for it is indeed great? For if thou knew but a portion of the majesty which God bestowed on him, and how he favoured him above all mankind, thy faith in him would be sound, and through thy faith in him thou wouldest be fair in the sight of God.

Moses was a prophet in whose creation there was the evidence of the strength of God, for God created him in the most beautiful form, as the Scriptures bear testimony,[2] "And she saw that he was a goodly child" (כי טוב הוא) (Exodus ii. 2). And the name of God is *good* (טוב), in accordance with his word, "The Lord is *good* to all" (Psalm cxlv. 9); "The Lord

[1] *Berachot*, 29*b*. [2] *Sotah*, XII*a*.

is *good* to them that wait for him" (טוב יי לקוו) (Lamentations iii. 25); "Thou art *good*, and doest good" (Psalm cxix. 68). And the name of light is טוב, in accordance with the word, "I will make all my *goodness* (טובי) pass before thee" (Exodus xxxiii. 19); "I had fainted unless I had believed to see the *goodness* of the Lord" (Psalm xxvii. 13); "How great is thy goodness." And besides being created beautiful in form, the light of God was clear in his face from the very first, in accordance with God's words כי טוב הוא. Wherever he went, his light increased, till a great fire was kindled, and in the time that "the Lord passed by before him" (Exodus xxxiv. 6), the light of his face grew stronger than the light of the sun, but more brilliant than it, and it was impossible that the light of the sun should be like the light of his face, because the sun is created from a light which God created, whereas the light of the face of our master Moses was from the light of the glory of God, which is uncreated; and that light was so terrible that no man was bold enough to approach it, and would only look upon him when he veiled his face, and nought but a part of the inside of his eyelids could be seen. How magnificent were the eyes which gave forth a light which not Michael, or Gabriel, or the holy *chayoth* could look upon. Over the face of Moses God had caused to pass the light of his splendour, in accordance with the words of Scripture, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee."

Moses was a prophet whose body was purified till it became as the body of Michael and Gabriel, but stronger, for those were of light, not of flesh or of blood, or of sinew or matter; but this mortal man entered among thousands and tens of thousands of angels of fire, one of whom would have put the earth in flames, how much more all of them? And he entered amongst them in accordance with God's word (Psalm lxviii. 18).[1] The most exalted one revealed himself to Moses, accompanied by all these. He cleared his way amongst them, and ascended above them, and beheld the light of God in ways which if I were to describe even approximately no intellect could grasp. And to this God himself bears testimony in the words "And Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was" (Exodus xx. 21).

And the hands of Moses were pure, for they took hold of the throne of God's majesty, for the holy *chayoth* were unable to carry the throne till God placed a partition between their heads and the feet of the throne, as God bears testimony. "And over the head of the living creature there was the likeness of a firmament, like the colour of the terrible crystal . . . . And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne" (Ezekiel i. 22, 26). The explanation of these verses is as follows:—Ezekiel says, "After God

[1] Pesikta Rabbathi xx.

revealed himself to me during the time of slumber and showed me the throne of his majesty, I saw those who carried the throne which apparently carried him. But it was the throne which was carried through the power of God. He carried the throne, but the throne did not carry him. And I saw above their heads a sky of pure crystal, terrible and fearful, and above this the form of a throne shining like a sapphire, and above it was the indescribable light of his majesty." Now that which the carriers of the throne could not bear, the hands of Moses bore, because God elevated him above all creation, above the angels, and certainly above mankind. And this is also sufficient proof for thee of the sublime position of Moses, that when Moses placed his hands upon the head of Joshua, God caused instantly to pass into his brain such deep knowledge of the law that he understood in six months (from the time of the imposing of the hands of Moses on the head of Joshua till the time of the departure of Moses from life was six months) more than those who had learnt from him during the previous thirty-nine years and six months. God bears testimony to this when he says, "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom" (Deut. xxxiv. 9). And light passed into the face of Joshua from the hands of Moses, whom God appointed in succession to Moses, as it is said, "And thou shalt put of thine honour upon him" (Numbers xxvii. 20). And the congregation of Israel obeyed him in accordance with his words, "And the children of Israel hearkened unto him" (Deut. xxxiv. 9). And Scripture bears witness to this when it says, "And they feared him as they feared Moses" (Joshua iv. 14).

The feet of Moses were pure, so that he was enabled to tread the clouds of sacred light, as God bears witness when he says, "And Moses entered into the midst of the cloud" (Exodus xxiv. 18).

The body of Moses was strong, inasmuch as he dwelt among the angels, and the light of God surrounded him forty days and forty nights, and in like manner he stood afterwards another forty days, interceding for us with light surrounding him, and the last of these forty days was the day of the Atonement fast,[1] that is the time described in Exodus xxiv. It was a great sight which Moses saw, for he saw that which it was impossible for an angel to see, much more for man to see, as God bears witness (Exodus xxxiii. 13), and also (Exodus xxxiv. 6), And the light of God passed over his face and God proclaimed to him, teaching him that he was the exalted one, and that there was no God beside him, that he was "gracious and compassionate," and the rest of the thirteen attributes by which the exalted one described himself, and which he included in this verse. And when

[1] Seder Olam vi.

Moses saw what he saw, he knelt down worshipping before God, as it is said, "And Moses hastened to prostrate himself" (Exodus xxxiv. 8). These are his attributes which are here related generally without each one being explained specially.

Moses was a prophet in whom was the strength of God. The stature of every ordinary human being is four cubits, measured in accordance with his arm, but the stature of Moses was ten cubits, as Scripture bears testimony when it says, "And he spread the tent over the tabernacle" (Exodus xl. 19), and the height of the sanctuary was ten cubits, as it is said, "Ten cubits shall be the length of a board"[1] (Exodus xxvi. 16).

Moses was a prophet physically powerful, because he was able to remain without food one hundred and twenty days. During the first forty days, the first two tables were revealed to him; during the second, he interceded with God that the destruction of the nation might be averted; and the last forty, he interceded that God might forgive those who were left of his people, and not take away his light from their midst, and God accepted his intercession.

If any one doubted the apostleship of Moses his life was consumed, and he perished while his body remained untouched, as it happened to the erring Korah and his two hundred and fifty followers, "And fire came forth from the Lord, and devoured the two hundred and fifty men" (Numbers xvi. 35). Whoever, too, called him a liar was burnt even in life, and he went down to the fire of Gehenna even in life. Such were the two cursed unbelievers Dathan and Abihu, their children, their wives and their followers, and all those who doubted him, their number amounting to two hundred and fifty, who sank down into the earth and were burnt. And those who were left of the fourteen thousand and seven hundred, who doubted, but not in the same manner as the others, died by the plague on the following day, because they had called those who perished "the people of the Lord" when they were not "the people of the Lord." Only those are the people of the Lord who have faith in Moses, and the Scripture describes this when it says "And all the congregation of the children of Israel murmured" (Numbers xvii. 6). And the plague came down upon them as it is said, "And behold the plague is begun" (Numbers xvii. 11). And Moses helped them at the right time by saying to Aaron: "God is angry with the congregation; go quickly, take the censer and put therein the fire of the altar, and put the incense which thou usest every day before God morning and evening; behold God has taught me that incense taketh away the plague, and the angel of death[2] has acquainted me with this, and said to me, 'When the incense descends into the censer I shall be

[1] *Sabbath* 92*a*.

[2] *Sabbath*, 89*a*.

driven away.'" Then Aaron made haste and did that which he was commanded. He stood between the living and the dead, while the angel stood up killing them in great numbers. Then Aaron said to the angel, "Turn thou backwards, that I may place my censer here." But the angel replied, "God has commanded me." Aaron answered, "But Moses commanded me, and the command of Moses is the command of God." Then the angel desisted, the censer was put down and the plague was stayed. And God said to him "The command of my apostle is my command," and it is said "And he stood between the dead and the living" (Numbers xvii. 13), and the number of those who perished amounted to fourteen thousand seven hundred, beside them that died in the matter of Korah. Consequently the apostleship of Moses was verified, and proof was established that the commands of Moses are from God, and that he who doubts Moses doubts God also. Those who sank down into the ground, cried from the bowels of the earth while they were descending "Moses is true and his Law is true," but their cry availed them nought. And if this had happened before the earth opened its mouth it would have availed them, for Moses foretold it, and threatened them with the greatness of God's punishment, but they withstood him obstinately and called him a liar. So Moses said "Know ye, children of Israel that if these people die the common death of all men, or if God judges them with the judgment of all men who die and are buried in the earth, whom God raises from the dead and judges, and causes those who deserve it to descend into the fire—if he does with these men after this manner and they die without your seeing anything extraordinary, then what they say is true, and I have not the authority of God for aught which I say to you, and what I say is an invention of my own as they assert; but if God creates a new thing which has not been before and will not be afterwards, and these men are judged before they die and before the hour of resurrection, and the earth opens its mouth and swallows them, and they descend alive to the fire of the earth, to the place appointed by God, fixed as the place of punishment, then ye may know the truth of my word, and that he who denies me does not deny me, but denies God who sent me, and he himself bore testimony to me that it was he who sent me, and spoke to me and ye heard, and it was ye who said to me, 'We believe in thee in all that which thou bringest to us'" and these thoughts are comprised in the words "If these men die the common death of all men . . . . then the Lord hath not sent me" (Numbers xvi. 29). And Moses did not finish speaking before the earth which was under the erring multitude was opened, and all Israel had just removed their tents from the spot which seemed to whirl round with them because the apostle had said to them "Depart, I pray you, from the tents of these wicked men" (Numbers xvi. 26), in accordance with that which had been commanded to him

(Numbers xvi. 24), and they did thus, and they got up from the Tabernacle of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and when they saw that they actually were in the jaws of the earth and that it was swallowing them gradually they cried out, but their cry did not avail them, just as confession will not avail on the day of reckoning, for God will cast down those who confess only then into a fire which burns everlastingly, for confession avails us only before calamity has happened to us, in accordance with the words of Solomon (peace be with him), "Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might" (Ecclesiastes ix. 10).

The explanation of this verse is as follows :—Solomon said, directing him whom God directs, 'All which thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might, striving to obey God, and repent at a time when repentance will avail, and work where work is possible, and render to thyself an account in whatever thou gainest or whatever thou losest, and know that which thou needest to know and to understand before thou go down to Sheol to meet the punishment of thy sins, because thou meritest to go down thither. When thou art there thou wilt be able to attain naught wherewith to defend thyself, "for there is no work" (*ib.*) ; thou wilt be able to do no work there, nor wilt thou be able to reflect, or know, or understand when thou goest down into the earth, into Sheol whither descended all those who doubted or denied the best of creatures, the greatest of men, the noblest of apostles. Therefore awake, O thou who slumberest in the flood of thy desires, for thou art in this world as one who slumbers dreaming of things delightful to him, dreaming that he possesses and does whatever he fancies ; but when he awakes he finds nothing of that which existed in his dreams, and so are the hopes of this world and the attaining of its desires. At the awakening of death and the hour of judgment thou wilt find naught of that which thou hast done in this world, and if its pleasures were permitted pleasures, they will all vanish and thou wilt find naught of that which thou didst treasure up. Pleasures are not good deeds that thou mayest find them ; and if the pleasures which thou hast treasured up in this world are prohibited, thou wilt be doubly affected with the calamities they bring. First, thou wilt find naught, and secondly bitter anguish will overtake thee on account of these pleasures. The body which takes pleasure in secret in those things which God does not desire, is cast down into a burning fire in the darkness of hell, which is fashioned in accordance with the will of God. Therefore awaken before thy death, and repent before thou leavest this world, and mend in the time of youth that which remainest to thee of old age ; and just as if thou loved him who loved thee not, and neglected a dwelling in which thou didst remain, and held possession of a dwelling which belonged not to thee, so thou lovest this world. For this world is hateful. It gnaws away thy life by

day and by night. When the day is passed thou rejoicest in the night in that which thou hast acquired for thyself, and when the night is passed thou rejoicest that thou art in possession of another day in this world, and all the days and nights we pass do but diminish our life and shorten its duration, and no man of intellect would give predominance to that state in which thou art, to that life which thou hast wasted. Thou art in this world like one who is called to a feast, and who knoweth for a certainty that he will under no circumstances spend the night there, but that when the day is finished he will leave. And the intelligent man is he who is able to enjoy the pleasures of eating and drinking, but still thinks about his departure and still turns to his own abode. He lives at ease, and gives himself at eventide no anxiety concerning that which exists; he finds in himself strength for the rising, and when the night cometh he arrives home in health, and is at rest. And he who is light-witted cares too much about the feast and gets intoxicated, and oversteps the bounds of moderation, and continues to enjoy himself, and when the night cometh he is expelled by force in an unseemly condition, and is thrown outside into the lowest place. He is not left where he was, nor does he ever reach his abode. Lo! how weak is such an intellect. Therefore in this world we must bear in mind whither we are tending and journeying, so that we are not deceived or beguiled by it in the manner in which we have been speaking. All that we have been saying refers to one who has been seeking lawful desires, striving to attain legitimate hopes, endeavouring not to waste his time in laziness; how much more must this be the case with one who expects to attain these things by disobedience, and by finding pleasure in idleness. Therefore let naught deceive thee, and no temptation seduce thee.'

Contemplate the prophet who was sent to thee, and that with which he was sent, and his position. And what was the aim of his message? that he might be an apostle to thee, and urge thee to obedience. And if the law which he promulgated had to be believed merely on account of his own greatness, which we have already described, it would still have been necessary to believe it; how much more must we believe it when that law contains the commands of the Creator and his ordinances. And gratitude and cleaving to God are necessary, on account of him who sent and him who was sent. And this love is a virtue; so let not him whom God brings near make himself afar off, and let not him to whom Moses is the apostle neglect himself; and in the greatness of the apostle thou mayest understand the dignity of him from whom he was sent. If thou art a great man, he sends unto thee a messenger like unto thee, and according to thy position with him who sends will be the position of the messenger. And none are greater in the sight of God than Israel, and he sent unto them an apostle like whom there is no other apostle, and owing to the greatness of God's

love for Israel he made him an intercessor between him and them ; but in spite of his position before God and his nearness to him, he was the gentlest and most humble of mankind, as the Scripture bears testimony, when it says of him in the name of God, "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men who were upon the face of the earth" (Numbers xii. 3). And Moses was more jealous for Israel than he was for himself, and he loathed his own life on their account, and he would willingly have been blotted out of the company of the just on their account, since he said, 'O God, O my Lord, they have sinned a great sin, but thy forgiveness is greater ; if their sin is pardonable forgive them, but if thou wilt not forgive and wilt cut me off, then cut me off in this world and the next. Is not the great pre-eminence to which I am to attain, only on their account ? And if they are to cease to exist, then blot me, I pray thee, out of thy divine "Book of Life," for I do not wish to be left alive after them'; so the Scriptures repeat his words "and if not, blot me out of thy book" (Exodus xxxii. 32). And God was filled with pity, with compassion, and with mercy, for the congregation.

And when the approach of death was announced to him, this did not terrify him, nor did he consider it a great calamity, but he devoted himself to his people and said to God, "Let me not die till thou appointest over them those who shall lead them, for I am jealous on their account, lest I should die and not know who shall be the leader to superintend their affairs." Then God said to him, "Appoint Joshua," and Moses appointed him, and he rejoiced thereat, for he knew his character, and he strengthened him and he presented him to the people, and began to charge him concerning them.

And when the song (Deut. xxxii.) was revealed to him, and in it there was made known all that would happen to Israel in the long captivity, as it is said, "They shall be burnt with hunger and devoured with burning heat" (Deut. xxxii. 24), and all that God had threatened, "The sword without, and terror within shall destroy" (Deut. xxxii. 25), he was deeply impressed, and when he saw that at that time there would be no one to intercede, no one to pray, no one who would be fit to pray, and that no man of learning would be left among them, and that all would be equal in their wickedness, he was troubled. It was as God had described their condition when he said, "And he saw that there was no man" (Isaiah lix. 16). The explanation of this verse is as follows : When he saw that there was no man amongst them who could avail to intercede for them, he was astonished ; and when he saw that there was no one to pray [1] for them he had mercy and assisted them. And God also said, When I shall see that there is no pious man amongst them, and there is no aid to be expected from these virtuous men, for they

[1] Double explanation of the verse.

have all perished, then they will be assisted. And when Moses knew their degraded condition, and it was said to him when he had recited his prophecy concerning Israel, "Go up to Mount Abarim and die there, then Moses (peace be with him) arose and prayed for all Israel who should be driven into captivity, and when he saw that there was no good man fit to bear the name "the man of God," he said (Psalm xc.) "The prayer of Moses, the man of God." He included in it a prayer for all the vicissitudes which should befall Israel from the beginning of the captivity till its end, and a hope that God would deal gently with them, and cause their punishment to descend in gentleness and not in wrath, and that he would not root us out, nor let us pass away from him, but that he would forgive us, and return to us even as he was in times gone by, and that he would gladden our hearts and give us patience to bear our calamities during the length of the captivity, and that he would repel from us the evil the nations would inflict upon us, and the evils of every persecutor, and that he would still the waves of the seas which surround us, for the nations among whom we are dispersed encompass us about. And he included in this prayer a reference to all which had been, and all which was to be during the existence of the world. If we consider attentively every verse of this prayer we shall find that all God's promises to us and all his prophecies are contained in it. And after God had accepted his intercession on our behalf he made every prophet who came after to prophesy the same prophecies, showing thereby that God had accepted his request, and he sent prophets to us telling us of those favours that Moses desired, and he promised that he would grant them. And this prayer refers to the greatest calamities, and it has been for us an assistance, a support and a refuge, a reliance upon which we could rely, a perfect protection, an impregnable fortress to which we could escape in the hour of sorrow, for we are like a lamb which erred, which went astray amongst the thickets, or which forgot the place of its pasture, or was lost in the forests. And in these thickets there were a lion, a wolf, and a leopard, and they were hungry and ravenous, and they came forth all of them and they saw this lamb without a shepherd of whom they need be afraid, and that it had no power to rise, much less to run. Then they pricked their ears, they gazed intently, they ground their teeth greedy to devour it, for they had resolved to attack it. So God compared Israel when he said "Israel is a scattered sheep, the lions have driven him away" (Jeremiah l. 17). And the intercession which the best of creatures interceded for us stood before God, therefore their limbs were fettered, their feet entangled, their mouths closed, and the attack against her was prevented.

One day one of the kings of Rome[1] (cursed be all of them

[1] *Midrash, Esther*, x.

except the distinguished Antoninus who lived in the days of Rabbi Jehudah the prince) said to Rabbi Joshua ben Chananyah, "How strange it is that a lamb sees lions and walks amongst them without fear, though without a shepherd to help it"; and the Rabbi said to him, "It is because of the strength of the unseen shepherd who fetters their limbs and breaks their teeth, and prevents them from attacking it, because David our prophet prayed and said, "Break their teeth in their mouth, O God" (Psalm lviii. 7). The explanation of this verse is as follows: "Behold, O Lord, thou seest the beasts of prey that attack Israel; break their teeth in their mouths, O God, and shatter the grinders of all the lions, O Lord." And God himself has said; "Their redeemer is strong, the Lord of Hosts is his name" (Jeremiah l. 34).

And I have for many years taken upon myself the duty of reading every day "The prayer of Moses, the man of God" (Psalm xc.) before the reading of the hundred blessings before the prayer ברוך שאמר, thereby drawing near to God in the very words used by the best of creatures, and imploring a blessing from him in his very language, and uniting myself to God in the very prayers used by the best of those who were ever born. And I used to reflect why this prayer came to be inscribed in the Book of Psalms, and how it came to be handed down from generation to generation, even to the days of David, who gave it a place in the book of praise with the prophecies of the ten elders, some of whom were his predecessors, some his contemporaries—for instance, the sons of Korah, who lived in the time of Moses, and they were Asir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph, of whom our Rabbis have handed down that because they fled from the error of their fathers, and followed the righteous apostle, they were inspired, and made to speak. Hence it is said, A Psalm of the sons of Korah, and Heman, and Jeduthun, and Maschil, and Ethan, and Asaph, and others. And I did not know why this prayer should be taken from the remaining prayers of the apostle, and placed in the Book of Psalms even till our day. And I commented on the portion of Haazinu (Deut. xxxii.), in accordance with that which I found handed down by our Rabbis, that when Moses came to the words, "For the Lord shall judge his people" (Deut. xxxii. 36), then he uttered "The prayer of Moses, the man of God," in which occur the words, "Return, O Lord, how long yet" (Psalm xc. 13). Then I considered the whole of the Psalm, and its secret was made clear to me that Moses had uttered it for the time of captivity, and that David had placed it in the Book of Psalms, that it might be a source of comfort and consolation to the followers of our faith. Then I commented on the whole of the Psalm, through God's help and guidance, and I placed it in the volume of my composition, upon the portion Haazinu, with which our commentary on the Torah concluded. And I said at the end of this Psalm that there was no doubt that he

uttered it on the day of his death, and left it as a legacy to Israel, and I did not know this as a matter of fact, but only as a conjecture, but after a while, when I commented upon the portion וזאת הברכה (Deut. xxxiii., xxxiv.), I found this conjecture fully verified by the words of our Rabbis, for in Sifre,[1] at the end of the commentary on the Torah, they say eloquently that our master on the day of his death uttered this prayer, and afterwards blessed Israel, and that he said וזאת הברכה, with the conjunctive *wav*, because this *wav* signifies something preceding it, and that that which preceded was "The prayer of Moses, the man of God." Then I rejoiced greatly, because I was led to a true conjecture of that which was handed down by our Rabbis amongst other traditions, and I rejoiced also to find the contents of all this prayer in the declarations of the prophets, and I have commented on it in order that it may be a source of comfort to the souls which are desolate in the desolation of captivity, and it is also a source of contentment to weary hearts which are wasted by the intense fear of the nations, and a correction of knowledge, and a strengthening of faith to the pious, and the steadfast, and the repentant, and those who have trust, and those who grasp the strong cord which unites them to God through their faith in our honoured apostle, elected above all mankind.

And the following is a commentary on the well-constructed words of his prayer, peace be upon him and upon the Rabbis who received the traditions from the prophets, and they in their turn from their master and the master of all mankind, peace be upon him. How nobly did he speak when he stood and offered this prayer for us.

"A prayer of Moses the *man of God.*" The man distinguished by God. God has in this world no other since him. And every prophet, great in his own age, who arose after Moses and resembled him in possessing one or more of his characteristics was called, "The man of God," and they were ten, the first of them was the master of all mankind, and the last of them was Elijah, and these are they: Moses, Elkanah, Samuel, David, Shemaiah, Iddo, Elisha, Micah, Amoz, Elijah.[2]

O Lord thou hast been our refuge. O God, our God, thou art our refuge to which we fly, generation after generation, because when we have been conquered and dispersed amongst our enemies, and when misfortune overtakes us, and there is no king to order our affairs, and no adviser to guide us, and no fortress in which we can be intrenched, and no place of safety whither we can flee, and no army wherewith we may be protected, and no provision and no power even to speak, for we are deprived of every resource, the victories of our enemies and our inability to answer them have made us

---

[1] *Sifre*, Friedman, 342.

[2] *Sifre*, ibidem.

dumb. We are silent as if we were speechless. We are unable to open our mouths. And so David describes us (Psalm xxxviii. 14), "I am as if I were deaf, that I could not hear," etc. And when all resources are cut off and all our hopes are frustrated, there is no protection but with thee. We call and thou assistest; we cry and thou answerest, for thou art our refuge, as it is said, "O Lord, thou hast been our refuge."

And here Moses describes the reasons why God accepts our prayers and answers them. These reasons are repentance, obedience and confession to God, and if we possess these merits he assists us. And when God knew that we should sin, and that we should be overcome by the inclination to evil which was to be created in man, he ordained, even before he created man, amongst the seven things to be brought into being before the creation of the world, that repentance should be accepted.[1] The first of these seven things was the law, the last was Messiah, the son of David. And amongst these was repentance, because it is conducive to the happiness of the world. And our apostle had repentance in view, when he described our captivity, and desired it for us, as he said, "Before the mountains were brought forth . . . . . thou didst turn man to contrition and say, Return, ye children of men." The meaning of this is: Before and after thou didst create the mountains, and form the earth and the world, thou wert from eternity to eternity, and then thou didst desire repentance when thou didst say, "Return, ye children of men," and if we repent, then thou answerest.

And that which necessitates our remaining in captivity is the fact that a thousand years, though many for us, are but few for thee. "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday, which is passed." The explanation of this verse is as follows: Behold a thousand years in thy sight are as yesterday which has passed, or like a watch which is the third of the night. And when the period of the captivity is completed, we shall be as one who had slept one third of the night and then awoke. And in spite of its length, when its torrents have flowed and passed, it is as if it had never been. And so he said, זרמתם שנה יהיו, "Thou carriest them away as in a torrent, they are as in a sleep." זרמתם is derived from זרם, which means torrent; and so the nations are compared to a torrent in the words, "As a torrent of hail, as a torrent of mighty waters overflowing" (Isaiah xxviii. 2), and it is said, "The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters" (Isaiah xvii. 13). The meaning of this last verse is that when the nations are united against Israel they rush upon them like mighty waters when they receive an addi

[1] *Pesachin*, 54*a*.

tional torrent. But in great tempests some regions often remain unscathed, the most weakly constructed building or the most fragile object will be saved, while walls will be overturned or stones carried away. In the same way captivity will crush and shatter powerful batteries and destroy strong walls, but God saves the weak and feeble nation, for the storm does not carry them away, and when the waves of the sea of captivity are agitated God calms them. If this were not so they would overwhelm us so that no trace of us would be left. Dost thou not see the abounding waters of the waves, black in colour, uplifted to their very height, advancing rapidly so that thou wouldst imagine that if they reached a ship they would sink and wreck it, or if they reached the dry land they would desolate it? Then thou seest one wave broken and multitudes follow continually, but still they are obedient to the command of God and do not pass the bounds he has assigned to them. Thus arise the mighty waves of distress in captivity, so that thou sayest, "None can now escape"; but at last thou seest how God stills them, and calms them, and delivers us from them; and thus spake David, "Which stilleth the roaring of the seas, the roaring of their waves, and the tumult of peoples" (Psalm lxv. 8). The explanation of this verse is as follows: O thou who stillest the tumult of the peoples when they rush over Israel. And when the period of the captivity is over, and when the waves have been poured forth and are arrested, it is as if it were the sleep of the slumberer in the words of the Apostle, "Thou carriest them away as with a torrent, they are as in a sleep."

"In the morning it flourisheth and groweth up" (Psalm xc. 6). The meaning of this verse is as follows. In the morning deliverance cometh after the night of captivity. He compares the darkness of captivity to the darkness of the night, and the morning of help to the dawn which brightening gradually, refresheth souls distressed by the anxieties of the night. He compares our position to that of a man who, like one who is blind, is lost in a desert, and the darkness of the night comes upon him, and he walks in dread of every possible calamity. Now he walks securely, now he is covered in darkness, now he has to be on his guard, for ditches are beneath him and precipices surround him. He knows not where he may fall, and if he be safe in his walking, then he is not secure from the injury of wild beasts which might seize him, or of the enemies lying in ambush for him on the road. Alas! in what sad straits is he, in what sore perplexity. The night drags on till the dawn ascends, till the light appears and men's minds are a little at rest, till the light bursts forth, and the sun is seen and light is given to the world, then the sorrow flies away, the eye of the traveller discerns the country around him, and he sees where to walk and whither he is going. David said,

referring to this, "Weeping may tarry for the night but joy cometh in the morning" (Psalm xxx. 6); and also, "It shall be as the light of the morning when the sun riseth" (2 Sam. xxiii. 4); and with the light of the day of our deliverance the sun of our dynasty shall arise as Isaiah promised us, "Then shall thy light arise in darkness" (Isaiah lviii. 10); and another prophet says, "But unto you that fear my name, shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth and gambol as calves of the stall" (Malachi iii. 19). And when our light breaks forth the nations will covet our position and will come against us in the manner described by the prophet, "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle" (Zechariah xiv. 2); and this is the war of Gog and Magog and their followers, which has been described by all the prophets. There is no prophet who has not foretold it.

But when they covet our position, and an opportunity presents itself to them of harming us, and we fear their attacks, God will bring their affair to naught, and they will be as if they had never been. God compares their position to that of a man who dreams that he has eaten and drunk and is satisfied, but when he awakes he is still hungry and thirsty. Thus are all the nations. They see that the city is surrounded by the peoples of the earth, desiring to swallow us, and we are besieged and the city is conquered and half of us are taken captive, and at that moment God grows angry and is enraged against all of them, as it is said, "My fury shall come up in my nostrils" (Ezekiel xxxviii. 18). And God will cause a great shaking through which the mountains shall be thrown down, and buildings and walls shall fall, and the wild beasts shall die through fright, even the fishes of the sea shall tremble and flee. And a voice shall come forth from God saying, "Your own swords shall pierce you," therefore will every one turn his sword against his neighbour, and heads and corpses shall fall, and the horses and their riders shall be annihilated, the rider struggles on, his eyes fail, his tongue cleaves to his mouth; he is seen but sees not; and so it is declared and explained by all the prophets. So the nations are as grass, the verdure of which just begins to be seen, and it is then dried up and withers. All which we have said is included in the one verse "In the morning they are like grass which groweth." In this very manner God foretold and said that the nations should be like unto grass; still not like the grass of the earth which has roots, branches and soil, moisture and other materials, which, although it is unstable, still has material and roots. But they shall be as the grass on the roof tops which has no roots to supply it, and no soil to nourish it, but it is blasted and immediately withers. So says the Psalmist, "They shall be as the grass on the roof tops," שקדמת שלף יבש (Psalm cxxix. 6). The meaning of these last words is, "Before it is drawn forth from its covering it

withereth." Then Isaiah the prophet of God spoke in the same sense (Isaiah xl. 6-8). The meaning of these verses is thus, A voice came to me saying, "Cry," and I said "What shall I cry." The voice said "Cry that all mankind is in my sight as grass, and their works, and that which in their opinion is their excellence, is but as the flower of the field which will mature into no fruit or seed. At one moment it seems beautiful to you, but it has no permanence; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God and his promises stand for ever."

"On the high mountain" (Isaiah xl. 9). 'O thou prophecy, which bringest good tidings to Zion, upon a high mountain lift up thy voice with strength; O thou prophecy, that bringest good tidings to Jerusalem, raise thy voice, fear not, say to the cities of Judah, "Behold your God."' And our apostle, referring to these matters, exclaims בבקר יציץ וחלף. On the morrow this one will blossom and will produce new sprouts, but in the evening it will be annihilated and withered. And so will those be who arise in the morning to fight against us; God will darken their days as it is said, "A day of darkness and gloominess" (Zephaniah i. 15), and it is also said that it will be a day which is neither day nor night (Zechariah xiv. 7). "And darkness and gross darkness shall cover the earth" (Isaiah lx. 2), and they will fight against us, and there will be a great slaughtering amongst them from midday, and all of them shall perish, and at the approach of the evening the day shall brighten, as it is said "The Lord shall arise upon thee" (Isaiah lx. 2), and with respect to this, it is also said, "At the time of the evening there shall be light" (Zechariah xiv. 7), and at eventide not one of them will be left alive, as our first prophet said, "In the evening it shall be cut down and wither" (Psalm xc. 6).

And after the apostle finished describing the events which had taken place, which would take place, and that to which these events would lead, he again prophesies and laments over our condition in captivity when he says, "For we are consumed in thine anger" as thou hast threatened; and it is said "Ye shall be left few in number (Deut. iv. 27); and it is also said, describing our condition, "For we are left but a few of many" (Jeremiah xlii. 2), and there are many other such descriptions. So we are consumed in the anger of God, and we who are left are amazed in that we are cast into captivity in accordance with that which is said, "And we are consumed in thine anger." And the prophet describes that which necessitated this, "Behold all this is on account of our sins." When they multiply God places them before him, and looks at them, and according to their sins he punishes, as it is said, "Thine iniquity is marked before me" (Jeremiah ii. 22), and whatever we do secretly or openly is before his light. Naught is hidden from him, as it is said, "Can any hide himself in secret places that I

shall not see him" (Jeremiah xxiii. 24). Can any hide himself in secret places and rebel against me, so that I see him not; doth not my light fill my heavens and my earth. For I exist in every place, and no place is void of me, and that which will be is not hidden from me, and whither can one flee from me? And when God knew and saw he decided and pronounced sentence, thereby confirming in truth the description of our apostle, "Thou hast placed our iniquities before thee, our hidden sins before the light of thy countenance." "For all our days," etc. (Ps. xc. 9). Behold all our days vanish in the heat of thine anger, our years pass away like a word which is spoken. A word is spoken and is finished. And so in captivity it is said, "A son or daughter is born to such a one," and while the father hopes that the child will grow up, it dies; and we hear naught else than that a little child is dead as thou hast threatened, "Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but they shall not be thine" (Deut. xxviii. 41), and it is said, "Though they bring up their children, yet will I bereave them that there be none left" (Hosea ix. 12). But some will be excepted who will live, and in this manner our number decreases daily. And the prophet wept for this when he said "For we are consumed by thine anger." We desire perchance that deliverance may come in our days, though the lives of all of us vanish like a spoken word, and if some do live, how long do they live? The limit is seventy years, the extreme limit is eighty years. And so Moses said, "The days of our years are seventy years." Moses meant of our captivity; in short the sorrows of the heart, in addition to paucity of help, and want of strength, and cutting off of hope, make the heart sick, weaken our powers, shorten our lives, and bring death near, and we are all of us in this sad plight.

And those of us who exceptionally are in happier circumstances, gain naught except after great difficulties, and when we attain that which we strive for, means are found of taking it from us unjustly and with enmity. The prophet said, describing all this: "And their increase is but labour and sorrow," and even when we attain that which we strive for, it comes to us only with difficulty, because by attaining worldly goods man does not gain power over his own life, and even when we attain them, injustice will find causes for depriving us of them, as God decreed at the very first, "And I will hide my face from them, and they shall be devoured" (Deut. xxxi. 18), and it is also said כי גז חיש ונעופה, "For we are soon cut off and we fly away." כי גז Behold it shall be cut off quickly, and that which is in our possession shall fly away, for we have no endurance, no stability.

Then the prophet is again perplexed and amazed at the darkness of our captivity, which is distressing, which is obscure, which is severe, without any opportunity for Israel, and without any information as to its length, either from

useful analogy, or by means of correct calculation, or by means of clear proof, without good tidings, and without near hope. And we are perplexed, like a man who is sleeping in the middle of the sea, or on the top of a mast, and how can his sleep be comfortable when the roaring of the sea disturbs him? how can he be still when the water shakes that upon which he is lying? How can life be pleasant to him that is on the top of a mast, which is a very narrow and confined position, with the winds blowing vehemently, and terror and assured death beneath him? Such is the life of all of us in captivity. And Solomon said, "Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast" (Proverbs xxiii. 34). The Hebrew word חבל is a mast. And we are in this plight. And if the length of our captivity were determined, and we knew from what time the calculation began, there would be some relief for us. You see that the captivity of Egypt lasted four hundred years, but with respect to that captivity there is also doubt as to the date from which we are to begin the calculation. Is it from the covenant between the parts, or from the birth of Isaac, or from the hour when Israel went down into Egypt? God calculated it from the birth of Isaac to amount to four hundred years, and from the time of the covenant between the parts it amounts to about four hundred and thirty years, and had God desired to increase our captivity, it would have begun from the date of our entering Egypt. But God dealt gently with us, and left us in Egypt but two hundred and ten years, and then hinted at it in the words spoken to Jacob רדו שמה (Genesis xlii. 2), "Go down thither," for the number contained in the letters of the word רדו is two hundred and ten.[1] And as regards the captivity in Babylon, it is said to be seventy years, and this is subject to doubt. Is it to commence from the beginning of the Babylonian dynasty, or from the captivity itself? Between the two there is a difference of twelve years. The matter was obscure except to Daniel, who said, "There remains a little time before the dynasty of Elam shall be completed, then Media shall follow, and deliverance will be at hand,"[2] and this was so, and the seventy years were completed. But with regard to the present captivity, which is foretold to last many days, the apostle said until when, and the signs which were given to Daniel were obscure, and when he asked for an explanation, God said, "Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end" (Daniel xii. 9). When deliverance cometh, thou wilt understand all that God said in the Book of Daniel. And when Asaph perceived this great darkness, he wept, and said, "We see not our signs, there is

---

[1] *Seder Olam*, Cap. III. and parallels.

[2] The author seems in error in referring to Daniel. See Isaiah, Cap. xxi., Meguillah, 11*b*.

no more any prophet, neither is there among us any that knoweth how long" (Psalm lxxiv. 9). And when the best of mankind saw by means of the wonderful inspiration which was granted him, and by means of his magnificent powers the innermost meaning of things, but still was unable to comprehend the captivity, he exclaimed, "Who knoweth what will be the power of thine anger, and just in proportion as man should fear thee, so is thy anger?" And when we shall be sunk in the deep mire, do not cut us off entirely. The knowledge that our chastisement is fixed is enough for us, this is sufficient sorrow. Therefore do not deprive us of the light of thy law, and give us wisdom as a substitute for a prophet, who shall prophesy unto us, and supply us with a wise heart, whereby we may understand thy law, and be at rest in it. The apostle, summing up all these prayers, said, "Teach us to number our days" ונביא לבב חכמה, "and a heart of wisdom for a prophet."

And God so decreed it. The wisdom of our Rabbis and that knowledge to which each one of them attained are sufficient for thee, and the subjects they spoke about, and their books and their compositions are matters which we can understand through the study of many years only. I mean to say for instance that the Mishna and the commentary of the Talmud thereon, and the books of Midrashim are works which require a year or more in order to read even one of them; how much more time would be required to understand them? We can but employ ourselves for the rest of our lives with a few pages of their easiest works in accordance with the command of Moses ונביא לבב חכמה. Owing to that which has been read and taught in the days of our Rabbis in the days of captivity there is no less knowledge to be gained of the Torah now than in the days of the prophet himself.

"Return, O Lord, how long?" (verse 12). O God, when thy mercy is turned to us, it is enough. How long yet? In these words "how long" David implored for aid on behalf of Israel in captivity. "O Lord, how long shall the wicked, how long shall the wicked triumph, having naught to perplex them, how long shall the workers of iniquity utter vain things and boast" (Psalm xciv. 3). God decreed that as a recompense for the night when we rebelled against him, the night of the spies, the night of the ninth of Ab, that we should implore for aid with the words "How long yet?" When God was angered against us and said, "How long shall I bear with this evil congregation" (Numbers xiv. 27) he determined to cast upon us the worst of calamities, on a similar night, the night of the ninth of Ab, and that we should be in sore distress and implore for deliverance from that distress with the words "how long yet?" And David made clear to us that we should use the words "how long yet" by repeating four times the words "how long" (Psalm xiii.) in correspondence with the similar expression

used four times by God "How long do you refuse?" (Exodus xvi. 28). "How long will this people provoke me?" (Numbers xiv. 11). "How long will they not believe in me?" (*ibid.*) "How long shall I bear with this evil congregation?" (Numbers xiv. 27), and by using the expression four times God showed that he would cast us into captivity and disperse us in four empires.

And when the thought of the long period of the captivity was too sad for Moses, he exclaimed "Return, O Lord, how long?" "Turn away thine anger from us" as if God were a man who repented on account of that which happened to a beloved one against whom God was angered, and so God promised us by the mouth of his apostle, "For the Lord shall judge his people and repent himself for his servants" (Deut. xxxii. 36), and Moses relying upon this promise prayed "And let it repent thee concerning thy servants."

"Satisfy us in the morning" (verse 14). O God, satisfy us in the morning of the dawn of our deliverance, and favour us with thy grace. For God is "abundant in mercy," and he favours us as he has promised, "With everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee" (Isaiah liv. 8). And it is also said, "How precious is thy lovingkindness, O God" (Psalm xxxvi. 8), and also, "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting" (Psalm ciii. 17). And it is also said of the Messiah, "And my mercy shall not depart from him" (2 Sam. vii. 15). And it is also said, "The sure mercies of David" (Isaiah lv. 3). Therefore the Apostle prayed, "Satisfy us in the morning with thy mercy, that we may rejoice and be glad all our days." And it is said, "Rejoice, ye righteous, in the Lord" (Psalm xxxiii. 1), and also, "Then our mouths shall be filled with laughter" (Psalm cxxvi. 2), and Isaiah said, "Break forth into joy, sing together" (Isaiah lii. 9). And a prophet said, "Sing with gladness for Jacob" (Jeremiah xxxi. 6). Therefore Moses exclaimed, "Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us" (verse 15). O God, cause us to rejoice in accordance with the days of our punishment. This the prophet sought from his Lord, and all men were ignorant, I mean the men of our own age and the men of preceding ages, as to the meaning of his request. It is impossible that Moses, our master, should pray that our days of joy should be in accordance with the number of our days of calamity. We do not find in preceding captivities this slight compensation, nor has God given any hints that he compensates in this slight measure. Job suffered in his body, in his wealth, in his children. No one maltreated him. He was not despised, or sold, or enslaved, and his punishment endured only twelve months,[1] and he was rewarded by receiving

[1] *Seder Olam* II.; *Mishna Edyot* II. 10.

twice as much as he had before in money and in children, and he lived a hundred and forty years. Since he received of all things twice as much as he had before, it seems as if he were seventy years of age at the time his trial began, therefore his whole life lasted two hundred and ten years. And as for us who have been slain, and taken captive and ruled over by our slaves, and our lives made miserable, and we and our children sold, and held in bondage eleven hundred years and more, not knowing how long that bondage will still continue, would our prophet who was filled with solicitude for us, and who stood so near to God as to reply to him when he said, "Michael should alone go with us" (there are the same letters in מלאכי and מיכאל), "If thy countenance go not with us, bring us not up hence"—would he have prayed to his Master for so slight a compensation as that contained in the words, "Make us rejoice according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us." For if this prayer were granted, what would happen afterwards? Shall we again return to misfortune? No, for God has sworn, "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me" (Isaiah liv. 9), and he also said, "The Lord hath sworn by his right hand and the arm of his strength" (Isaiah lxii. 8).

The captivity in Egypt lasted two hundred and ten years, but of these years not many more than a hundred were spent in servitude, humiliation, and punishment. Yet the recompense for this was eight hundred and ninety years. And the captivity in Babylon lasted seventy years, and our happiness after that four hundred and twenty years, what then should recompense us for a captivity of eleven hundred years and more, perhaps hundreds of years more? How could Moses pray, "Make us rejoice according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us." He prayed to God to grant us days of happiness corresponding to days of misery, measured by such days as are days in God's sight. And God compared the period of our captivity to a moment, as it is said, "For a small moment have I forsaken thee" (Isaiah liv. 7). "In overflowing wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment" (Isaiah liv. 8). "Hide thyself for a little moment" (Isaiah xxvi. 20). "There is but a moment in his anger" (Psalm xxx. 6). All these verses are clear examples that the period of the captivity is a moment, and a moment is one part out of many hundred parts of an hour. So Moses prays to God to grant us hours and days, months and years, according to the length of the captivity in moments, so that for each moment there might be bestowed upon us a thousand years or more, and how many these will amount to God alone is able to tell. Thousands and myriads of years God will give us, for it was he who said a year will contain thousands and thousands of years, as it is written, "I will gather thee with great

mercies, and with everlasting mercy will I have compassion on thee" (Isaiah liv. 78). And it is also said, "To eternity and to eternity" (Daniel vii. 18), that is to say, a person who lives will live thousands of years, he will build buildings which will crumble to dust, while he exists, as the Prophet says, "And my chosen shall wear out the work of their hands" (Isaiah lxv. 22).

And I am firmly persuaded that when Isaiah said "For as the days of a tree shall be the days of my people" (Isaiah lxv. 22), he meant by tree the tree of life which was in the midst of the garden. God had given an assurance that every one who ate of the tree would live eternally, and God would not create anything in vain, and since Adam was driven forth from Paradise without eating the fruit, there is no doubt that it will be eaten at some future time, and the reason why the time seems delayed is that God does not wish that man should become thoroughly righteous till the end of time, as he himself has promised. "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (Isaiah xi. 9), and it is also said "They shall all call upon the name of the Lord, and serve him with one consent" (Zephaniah iii. 9). Since it is proved that no created being, as the world is now, is created perfect, it follows that when the new heavens and the new earth are made, that the influences of the heavens and the nature of the earth will be totally changed, and that there will be a light which will eclipse the light of the sun and the moon, and then those of Israel who are worthy will eat of the tree of life, as it is said, "He will eat and live for ever." And this is the intention of that which David said of the Torah, "It is a tree of life to those who take hold of it" (Proverbs iii. 18). And he did not exaggerate, for the word of God is the exact truth; and if we had seen that any one who had studied the Torah had lived for ever, it would at once have been clear that God's word was truth, but since we have seen that Moses the master of all the prophets died, and do the prophets live for ever? (Zechariah i. 5), we ask where is the tree of life? But the words are meant here with reference to the distant future only, according to the words "Which if a man shall do, he shall live in them" (Ezekiel xx. 11) in the future, and therefore the author of the Targum, who knew the secrets of the word of God, translated the words "He shall live by them to all eternity," and David meant that for those who took hold of the Torah it would be a tree of life, and through it they would find favour in the sight of God, and through it they would become worthy to see the fulfilment of the divine promises, and merit to partake of the tree of life and live for ever. And the verse "Make us rejoice according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us," is an evident Biblical authority for all the assertions which have been made by those who explain the Scripture after the manner of a Midrash, including the verse in Daniel (xii. 3), "And they

that turn many to righteousness shall be as the stars for ever and ever."

And the prayer of Moses was answered. Moreover God made the following declaration by his prophets in answer to the prayer of Moses, "Let thy work appear unto thy servants openly and publicly." "They shall see eye to eye when the Lord returneth to him" (Isaiah lii. 8). "And ye shall see it, and your heart shall rejoice" (Isaiah lxvi. 14). "And your eyes shall see and ye shall say, The Lord be magnified" (Malachi i. 5). "And nations shall see thy righteousness and all kings thy glory" (Isaiah lxii. 2). And God, who is the most faithful of promisers, himself said, "And all the nations of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord" (Deut. xxviii. 10). And with respect to the words והדרך על בניהם they may be rendered thus, "Let thy beauty be upon the face of their children." It is to be noticed that the condition of a generation to whom deliverance came in their own days, was in no manner changed, except in respect to their bodily strength, their form and their bodies remained as they were heretofore, as it is said, "Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing." But with regard to the generation which shall grow up after the future deliverance, God will increase their stature, as it is said, ואולך אתכם קוממיות,[1] I will lead you קוממיות. Our Rabbis explain this verse to mean double the stature which Adam had when he was driven forth from the Garden of Eden, that is to say, one hundred cubits. And God will strengthen their forms so that the strength of God will be apparent in their faces, as it is said "And their seed shall be known among the nations" (Isaiah lxi. 9). This is the meaning of the prayer of the prophet "May God and his favour be with us." And this also was the prayer for the accomplishment of which David strove all the days of his life, namely, that God might purify him to see the great good with which the souls of the pious are refreshed, and that through them he might attain the knowledge of the Law, when he said, "One thing have I asked of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord," etc. (Psalm xxvii. 4). So we should read and pray that we may be purified to see the light of God, and to hasten to his temple early in the morning. Here לבקר in this verse means to visit early in the morning, being derived from בֹּקֶר morning, not from the word which means "to distinguish, to search" as it is used in the verse, "He shall not search, whether it shall be good or bad" (Leviticus xxvii. 33). Therefore God assured him, and announced to him the good tidings that he should live and return to the House of God continually and for many years, and so David said joyfully, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life" (Psalm xxiii. 6).

---

[1] *Sanhedrin*, 100*a*.

I shall not be missing at the house of God during the whole of my life, and I shall sit again and again in the house of God, to the utmost length of days, that is to say days without number. The Hebrew word ושבתי means, "And I shall return." And it occurs twice in Scripture in this sense, namely ושבתי בשלום "And I shall return in peace" (Genesis xxviii. 21), and in the verse we are now considering. And David means to say that he will live in this world during his natural life, having enjoyed the goodness of God and his favours, that he will then pass from it to the next world, and that then again he will return to the House of God at the resurrection, dwelling in it and visiting it early in the morning to the utmost length of time (Psalm xxiii. 6). "O Lord, to the utmost length of time" (Psalm xciii. 5). And the pious men of Israel will live in the House of God to the utmost length of days, and in like manner God promised those who read his book, "Length of days and years of life and peace, they shall add unto thee" (Proverbs iii. 2).

"And establish thou the work of our hands upon us." In this world. Because if the help of God is granted to the pious he improves his work in obedience to him. For if man inclines to obedience God and his angels will assist him, and if he turns to evil, God permits evil to come to him, and will not turn him from it,[1] and if God is pleased with his servants, he assists them in doing good. And if man does one good action God causes that action to bring forth for him many rewards which he did not expect, and if perchance the יצר הרע should once overcome him, God will make difficult for him the opportunities of rebelling against him, and he will defend him against it, and he will deliver him just as he delivered Joseph, and Boaz, and Paltiel ben Laish, and many others like them. It was in this sense that the prophet prayed and said, "Establish thou the work of our hands upon us" that we may be proved worthy to receive the promise contained in the words, "He has established the work of our hands upon us." God has guaranteed to us that when he shall be pleased with us after the redemption he will correct our manners, establish our religion, and direct us in obeying the law, as it is said, "I shall put my spirit among you" (Ezekiel xxxvi. 27), and with regard to the knowledge of the law, God guarantees "I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their hearts I will write it" (Jeremiah xxxi. 32, 33). In these verses God says, "I will put my Torah in the heart of each one of them, and it shall be written in their hearts so that no one will teach his neighbour how God is to be worshipped, but they shall all know me, from the least of them even unto the greatest," and this is what our great prophet prayed for on our behalf before his death. And when we say his "death" we must not liken it to the death of other mortal men. His corpse remained

[1] Josua xxxviii.*b*.

pure even in death. His eye did not grow dim, and its moisture did not abate. He was as if he were in a sleep, for God appeared to him as usual. The light of God kissed the pure mouth with which he had so often been addressed and the pure words of which he made binding even upon himself. He thereby made our prophet a light to teach us his words. His spirit was taken from him in such a manner as God willed, not as the spirit is taken from the bodies of other men, but without the bitterness of death, and it was at once united with the angels, and clothed with the body of angels like Michael and Gabriel, and he in his turn sang praises and thanksgiving to God even as they did. And even when he was amongst the angels his power was not less than theirs. It was not less when he was clothed in bodily form, surely it was not less when he was clothed in the form of angels. This too is what our Rabbis say who realised the mission of Moses, and how correct was their opinion when they said, "There are some who say that Moses our master is not dead but standeth and serveth God in heaven."[1] And this too is our opinion. And after he presented his intercession on our behalf he recited his blessings, and when he finished them, he said farewell to Israel and ascended heavenwards, and his Creator hid him till a time shall come when he shall be pleased with this world,[2] and then he will send him back to it, to assist the king who is to reign in the strength of God, that beloved one of God to whom testimony is borne in the verse "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee" (Psalm ii. 7). And this intercession has smoothed for us all the rugged ways of captivity, and it is the strong fortress in which we can take refuge in the time of misfortune until the time shall come which God has appointed for our deliverance, for the fulfilment of his promises to us.

Therefore reflect upon our letter, and what it teaches. May thy faith be perfected. May thy knowledge be corrected. The fundamental truths which we have placed before thee are sufficient for thee to rely upon. Reflect, then, upon what they demand of thee, so that thou mayest become righteous in the sight of thy Creator. It is necessary that this prayer which I have commented upon should be treasured up by thee, and that thou shouldest read it before ברוך שאמר, seeking a blessing for thyself in its pure words, and uniting thyself to God by means of the prayer which was offered up by the best of men and the greatest of prophets, and there is no prayer better than it. And if men had only known its contents, and the fundamental truths which God has established in it for the strengthening of our religion and the correcting of our faith, they would have made it obligatory upon themselves every day, just as they did

---

[1] *Sotah*, 26*b*.

[2] See *Targum*, Jerushalmi, to Song of Moses, MS. (British Museum), additional 18,690, p. 219*a*.

the reading of the Shema. I have therefore briefly made clear to you its contents, so that you may be guided in that which I have pointed out to you, and that you may imitate that which I have made clear to you, and may God guide all of us to understand its contents and to know his wishes ; and may he cause his redemption to draw near in our days, and establish in our time that which he has promised us, and may he enlighten our darkness as he has assured us, and his assurance is indeed faithful. " The Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee " (Isaiah lx. 2). And so may it be God's will.

This was written by Emanuel, the son of Rabbi Yechiel נבתויא.[1]

---

[1] " His soul shall dwell at ease, and his seed shall inherit the land " (Psalm xxv. 14).

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

HISTORICAL NOTICES.

I.

Alexander and his gold-lettered Scroll.—An old and unimpeachable tradition[1] tells of a personage who, wishing to mark the esteem in which he held the Law in a special and unique manner, had all the names of God in his copy of the Pentateuch overlaid with gold. He must have been a very wealthy individual to have been able to pay for so expensive a work. In the original sources, whence this tradition is taken, Alexander is given as the name of this person. This Alexander could certainly not have been Alexander Janneus, the king, for he is never referred to in Talmudic literature by the Greek name Alexander, but always as ינאי, the abbreviated form of his Hebrew cognomen ; and, in the second place, his title *king* is never omitted. He is always styled ינאי המלך or ינאי מלכא. The Alexander of our tradition is clearly, therefore, not King Alexander Janneus. Though not royal, this Alexander must, nevertheless, have possessed a royal fortune, which circumstance points to the famous Arabarch, Alexander Lysimachus, brother of Philo, the philosopher, as the hero of the story. Concerning him the following facts are known :—

(1.) He was the possessor of great wealth, and this, combined with his noble descent, placed him in the foremost rank among his contempo-

---

[1] This tradition appears in two sources in precisely the same form, and in a third somewhat varied. In *Massechet Soferim*, I. 9, and in *Massechet Sefer Torah*, I. 10, it reads : אין כותבין בזהב ומעשה בתורתן של אלכסנדריים שהיו כל אזכרותיה כתובות בזהב ובא מעשה לפני חכמים ואמרו תגנז. It may at once be noted that a manuscript in the possession of Halberstamm has the variant בתורתו של אלכסנדרוס. In Schönblum's edition of the *Massechet Soferim*, II., 7 (Lemberg, 1877), the passage runs differently : ספר תורה שאזכרותיה תלויות בזהב לא יקרא בו ומעשה בספרו של אלכסנדר שהיו אזכרותיה תלויות בזהב ובא מעשה לפני הכמים ואסרו אותו עליהן. The reading אלכסנדר (Alexander) is certainly more correct than אלכסנדריים (the Alexandrians). For, though an individual might have indulged in such an extravagant luxury, it is hardly credible that a community should have done so. This would be the correction of the conjecture suggested in my History, Vol. III., p. 135.

The phrase תלויות בזהב is deserving of notice. כתוב בזהב is not quite intelligible. Can one write with gold ? Can gold be fluidized sufficiently to serve this purpose ? But the word תלויות emended to טלויות offers a solution of the difficulty. The expression טלי, in the Talmudic dialect, signifies a patch. The golden letters of God's name would thus have been written characters, covered with gold plating into alto-relievo.

raries.[1] Agrippa I., while still a princely adventurer, borrowed of him 2,000 drachms[2] = over £6,000.

(2.) He managed the estates which Antonia,[3] daughter of the triumvir, Marcus Antonius, sister of Augustus, had inherited from Cleopatra. This lady was the reputed wife of Nero Claudius Drusus, and mother of the Emperor Claudius. Alexander's excellent management of Antonia's estates secured him the friendship of her son Claudius. Like King Agrippa I., Alexander was adopted into the Julian family, and received the honourable name of Julius Alexander. Alexander occupied so high and distinguished a position, that he was deemed not unworthy of an alliance with the royal family. His son contracted an engagement with the king's eldest daughter, the celebrated but infamous Princess Berenice.[4]

(3.) He had the new gates of the Temple of Jerusalem, which Herod had left unadorned, ornamented with massive plates of gold and silver.[5]

All these considerations clearly prove that Alexander Lysimachus must have been enormously wealthy. It was he, then, who freely lavished his wealth on the production of a work of piety, which compelled attention by its dazzling beauty. Only this particular Alexander could have afforded the cost of a scroll so elaborately prepared that every name of God, wherever it occurs—and it recurs pretty frequently in the Pentateuch—was overlaid with letters of gold.

The "wise men," however, spoilt the pleasure he felt in the work which his wealth, magnificent tastes and piety had suggested to him. They decided that the scroll could not be used for public reading. It was to be laid aside, and declared apocryphal תגנז ;[6] *i.e.*, it belonged to that class of books which have indeed a sacred character, or contain valuable doctrines, but are still not to be used for synagogal purposes. The wise men declared themselves against the employment of such a scroll, probably because they thought that the expression וכתב meant strictly and literally that the Torah had to be written, and raised letters of gold could not be called writing in the strict sense of the term. A few historical data may be determined in connection with this incident, which are not without a certain interest of their own.

Who could the wise men have been who forbade the Arabarch, Alexander Lysimachus, the use of his splendid scroll? Alexander was a senior contemporary of Agrippa I. In his reign, Hillel's grandson, the patriarch Rabbi Gamaliel, the supposed teacher of Paul the Apostle, was the leading authority. He and his college, then, were probably the "wise men" who issued the prohibition.

How did they come to know that a wealthy and distinguished Alexandrian was in possession of a scroll which did not quite meet the requirements of the law?

There is sufficient warranty for affirming that Philo, Alexander's brother, was at one time in Jerusalem, and offered up a sacrifice in the Temple. His description of the Feast of the Baskets (*de festo cophini*), *i.e.*, the solemnity in connexion with the bringing of the Firstfruits, affords clear evidence that he was present in Jerusalem on the occasion of such a feast, and personally witnessed the ceremony. In the *Monatsschrift* (1877, pp. 432, *sqq.*), I have demonstrated convincingly, I

---

[1] Josephus, *Antiqq.*, XX. v. 2. [2] *Ibid.*, XVIII. vi 3.
[3] *Ibid.*, XIX. v. 1. [4] *Ibid.* [5] *Wars*, V. v. 3.
[6] Compare *Gittin*, 45*b*, ספר תורה שכתבו מין ישרף בתבו נכרי יגנז.

believe, that Philo paid a visit to Jerusalem during Agrippa's reign, probably in that year when the entire people brought their firstfruits to the Sanctuary with jubilation and solemn pomp, in gratitude to God for having averted the desecration and dishonour with which Caligula had threatened the Temple. Philo might have come to Jerusalem to take part in this rejoicing, and perhaps also to greet Agrippa, who had returned from Rome, laden with honours by the Emperor Claudius, and proclaimed ruler over the whole of Judæa.

The Arabarch Alexander may have accompanied his brother Philo with the same object. The fact that he had the gates of the Temple ornamented with gold and silver certainly indicates a visit on his part to the Holy Capital. The Jews of that time looked upon the rescue of the Sanctuary from the pollution Caligula intended for it by the murder of that madman as a kind of miracle, an emphatically clear mark of divine interposition. This episode may have suggested to him the idea of adorning the Temple that enjoyed the Almighty's special protection, and thus testifying the high reverence in which he held it. For the Alexandrians, too, venerated the Sanctuary of Jerusalem as a sacred fane.

If, then, Alexander was in the Holy City with his brother Philo at the time when the rescue of the Temple from violation and Agrippa's coronation had made all Judæa happy, he may well have come into contact with the synhedrial body and its president, Gamaliel. They were probably told that he had had a costly scroll prepared, in which the letters of God's name were relieved with a plating of pure gold. In this sense we must understand the expression ובא מעשה לפני חכמים, "The matter came to the notice of the sages." Their decision that he could not be allowed to use his splendid scroll, which must have come to Alexander as an unpleasant surprise, was probably communicated to him personally. It is difficult to believe that after a scroll had been prepared at so much cost, the question whether it could be used would have been sent in writing all the way from Alexandria to the authorities at Jerusalem. It is more likely to have come up for discussion in a cursory manner. The Halachic rule that a Torah scroll should not be written in letters of gold, or, following the better reading, that golden letters must not be used for ornamenting God's name, originates in the time of the Arabarch Alexander and his contemporary, the patriarch Gamaliel. The decision of this single instance was made a general law. Most Halachas, not formally proposed as theses for discussion, may be conceived as having had a similar genesis. They are decisions of isolated cases that became accepted as universally binding laws.[1]

II.

Burning the Talmud in 1322.—Dr. Neubauer once communicated from a Bodleian codex (Oriental Canon 496, now No. 1,061), a Hebrew elegy, which has for its theme the burning of the Talmud in 1322, and the author of which styles himself in the poem, acrostically, Joab (Frankel-Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, 1872, pp. 376, etc.). Its superscription reads as follows : קינה על התלמוד אשר שלח בו יד (בוגד) ואיש (יין יוסף) עלינו רעות שָׂמָנוּ לרעות בשנת פ״ב לפרט. The burning of the Talmud is

[1] Compare Mishna, *Yebamoth*, XV. 3, לא דברו חכמים בקציר אלא בהוה.

repeatedly mentioned in the elegy, and its refrain is יבכו את השרפה. That in 1322 the Talmud was publicly burnt somewhere has hitherto been unknown. History only records the destruction of numerous copies of the Talmud in France during the reign of Louis the Pious in 1242 and 1248, and again in Italy, under the fanatical popes from 1553 onward. However, we have other confirmation of the fact on which the poem is based. In the Postscript to a Talmudical commentary of Todros ben Isaac (Cod. Bod. No. 448, catal. MS., p. 96), the fact, as well as the date, are explicitly stated.

The author tells us that he completed the Commentary in 1322, a time of great trouble. The close of the year 4081 [=1321] was a season of oppression. It witnessed the massacre of Jews by hordes of shepherds, and another slaughter of our people on account of the lepers. In this year calumniators came before the Pope to annihilate the law of truth. They burnt books, and they still audaciously boast that they will quench Israel's light. פרשתי מסכתא זו בשעת הדחק בשנת פ״ב · ויציאת פ״א היא שנת צר ומצוק נזרת המצורעים אחר יללת הרועים · שנת שהקיפונו מרעים ·· ולפני האפיפיור מלך הגוים עלו מרשיעים · נשרפו ספרים ועוד עתק מביעים · Another passage of this epilogue explains that the books which were burnt were volumes of the Talmud. לשום התלמוד גלמוד ולהשבית תורה מכל פה The fact and the date of the year are accordingly attested. Some details in connexion with this event can also be determined; the name of the ruler who condemned the Talmud; the land where, and the month when, its destruction took place.

In another passage the commentator Todros singles out the King of Rome among the potentates of the time as an especially fanatical persecutor. גם מלך רומי ברגז וחמה קם לשומנו ככלי ריק למזמה כתב ויעץ וזמם I have elsewhere proved (*Monatsschrift*, 1886), that by the King of Rome at this period the rival monarch Frederick is to be understood. He it was who incited a persecution of the Jews and condemned the Talmud. בפיו ושפתיו אמר (מלך רומי) אפאיהם ועוד ידו נטויה לשום התלמוד גלמוד ולהשבית תורה מכל פה In 1321-22 this ruler obtained an advantage over his rival, Lewis of Bavaria, which he retained till September of that year. He was on good terms with Pope John XXII., who regarded his rival with disfavour. Frederick it was then who strenuously strove to destroy the Talmud.

From the circumstance that a poet of the name of Joab composed this elegy, the conclusion is forced upon us that the event which it commemorates happened in Italy, where a family of this name, with numerous branches, gained literary distinction.[1] Outside Italy we do not meet with the Biblical name Joab. At this period there lived in the Southern Peninsula two literati, both called Joab. They were contemporaries of the poet Immanuel of Rome, who eulogises one and satirises the other. The Kinah, moreover, affords internal evidence that the burning of the Talmud, to which it refers, occurred in Rome.

Towards the end we find the following section of a Biblical text. והעיר תהיה אשר שם כהן הבעל וכו׳, "The city which belongs to the priest of Baal"= the Pope. The then head of the church, John XXII., had, indeed, in consequence of the disturbed state of Italy, transferred his seat to Avignon. But, nevertheless, Rome continued to be the papal city. The day and the month are given in the superscription of the

[1] Compare Zunz in Geiger's *Zeitschrift* III., 146.

elegy, ומרוב היה ביום מתן תורתנו, and in its last strophe but one, ושרף תורתנו ביום אשר נתנה לנו נהפך לאבל חגינו.

There are still, however, some missing links which will have to be supplied before we can be said to possess clear knowledge of the tragic events that occurred in Rome at this time. The dates in contemporary authorities do not quite agree with those in the elegy. Joab's elegy gives, as already stated, the year 82, *i.e.*, 4082 = 1322, and the month of Siwan as the date of the conflagration of the Talmud. This year it also indicates mnemonically in the last stanza but one, וראה חרפתנו מני נבל כלנו The word נבל, which is punctuated, besides its allusion to the instigator of the persecution, also numerically suggests the year 82. On the other hand, we know that in 1321 a persecution of the Jews by Pope John XXII. was imminent, and was only prevented through the good offices of King Robert of Naples. Profiat Duran's זכרון השמדות is our original source for these events, and from it Samuel Usque, Ibn Verga, and Joseph Cohen have borrowed their accounts. These secondary authorities give us no additional details of the threatened persecution. That it was imminent is proved by the authentic notice that the Jewish community of Rome kept a strict fast day in the month of Siwan, 1321, when its delegates were preparing to "go to court" to avert the danger. According to Joab's elegy the Talmud was burnt a whole year later. What happened in the interval?

Todros ben Isaac gives the close of the year 4081 = 1321 as the date of the persecution. But it may have been protacted till the following year. He also, however, states that in Tebet, *i.e.*, either December, 1381, or January, 1382, the persecution had already ceased. ומושיענו אלקים השקיט בחודש טבת זעם אפו · · · ותשקע עת הצרות. It had, we gather from his account, two sides. In the first place it was directed against persons who were only threatened; and, in the second, against the Talmud, volumes of which were really destroyed [נשרפו הספרים] between Ellul, 1321, and January, 1322, according to Todros. But the persecution could not really have finally ceased at that date, for the elegy tells us that the Talmud was burnt Nissan, 1322. Todros says that the King of Rome wished to continue his hostile activity against the Talmud, but his evil design was frustrated by divine interposition. ומגיננו יתברך גזל חניתו ויחלש לבלתי עשות אשר חרש לשום התלמוד גלמוד The Talmud, accordingly, was not burnt after the first-mentioned date. Yet the elegy speaks of a conflagration which took place in Sivan, 1322. Details are needed of the events that transpired in the Roman community during the twelvemonth from the spring of 1321 till the recurrence of that season the following year. Perhaps the gap will be filled up from material that still remains in manuscript.

H. Graetz.

Jewish History in Arabian Historians.—The following notices, from a publication in the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. VIII., No. 3, in a work entitled "Fragments of Syriac and Arabic Historians," edited and translated by Fr. Baethgen, are of some interest for Jewish history. As it is possible that they will be overlooked in the mass of valuable material there given, I venture to call attention to them.

(Page 108), V. year began on Monday the 2nd Hezîrân, 937 according

to the Greek reckoning. In it the Jews made a compact with the Beni Qureis to fight against Muhammed, son of 'Abd Allah. Muhammed went out and fought with them at a place called El Handaq (the ditch), and defeated them, and 'Alî, son of Abî Tâlib, killed 'Amr, son of Adûr. ("Chronicle of the Kings of the Arabians.")

(Page 111), XX. year began on Thursday, 21st Kânûn I., 952 according to the Greek reckoning. In it 'Amr, son of 'Âs, conquered Alexandria and Egypt, and 'Omar, son of El Hattâb, expelled the Jews from Nagrân and settled them in Kufa. In the same year Hareklius (son of Heraklius), Emperor of the Greeks, died, and his son Constantine succeeded him. (Îsô'denah, Metropolitan of Basra.)

Year 101 began Sunday 23rd Tammûz, 1030 according to the Greek reckoning. In it 'Omar, son of 'Abd el 'Azîz, died, and was succeeded by Jezîd, son of 'Abd el Melik, on Friday the 25th of Ragab. In the same year Leo, the Emperor of the Greeks, ordered all Jews within the limits of his empire to be baptized. (Hawârazmî.)

(Page 141), year 309 began on Saturday the 12th of Iyar, 1232 according to the Greek reckoning. In it there began between the Western and the Eastern Jews a difference in reference to the date of their festivals. The Western Jews began their year on Tuesday, and the Eastern Jews on Thursday. (No sources are mentioned.)

(Page 193), year 400 began on Thursday the 25th of Ab, 1320 according to the Greek reckoning. In it Hâkino, the ruler over Egypt, commanded the great church in Jerusalem to be destroyed; he began the persecution of the Christians and the destruction of their churches, and did not allow a church of the Christians nor a synagogue of the Jews to remain in his empire.

CYRUS ADLER.

Joseph Sambary and Benjamin of Tudela.—Valuable extracts from a mediæval chronicle by Joseph Sambary, form one of the interesting items in the recent volume of "Anecdota Oxoniensia," edited by Dr. Neubauer. The MS. from which these passages were taken is stated by the learned editor to have been completed in 1672. Hence Sambary may have had Benjamin of Tudela's *Itinerary* before him when he wrote. That he made occasional use of his predecessor's materials is evident, even from a casual examination of Sambary's remarks. In fact, several passages are almost verbatim excerpts from Benjamin's account of his journey. Thus the opening paragraph in Sambary's chronicle may be found in Benjamin, pp. 61, 62 (Asher's edition), though Sambary adds interesting points. With Sambary, page 119 (the four last lines from וממצרים down to משה רבינו ע"ה), compare Benjamin, p. 102. The whole account of Alroy's career, occupying pages 123 and 124 in Sambary's chronicle, is almost verbally identical with Benjamin's well-known narrative of the same incident; the agreement going even as far as the misreading of Alroy's native town (Amaria for Amadia). On page 132 the opening lines of Sambary's remarks on Lunel, containing the statement about R. Meshullam and his five sons, occur almost verbatim in Benjamin, pp. 3, 2. Possibly there are other points of agreement. These identities, of course, concern only a very small portion of Sambary's chronicle, which is full of important information.

I. ABRAHAMS.

A Recent Case of Plagiarism.—Under the title of דרכי ציון appeared in Colomen (in Galicia), 1886, a small brochure, containing two letters, the one by R. Obadiah, of Bartenoro, and the other by an anonymous author, both narrating their adventures on their voyage to the Holy Land. These letters are stated in the title page to be "a valuable treasure, that is now published for the first time from a MS. in the possession of R. Zebi Ezekiel Michaelsohn." But only the first half of this statement is true, these letters being indeed a very interesting piece of the literature of travel. But it is not true that they were now published for the first time, for they were long ago edited in the "Jahrbücher für die Geschichte der Juden" for the year 1863 (pp. 195-284), with a German translation and notes. From the omissions and emendations in the דרכי ציון, it will easily be seen that R. Michaelsohn was only in the possession of this "Jahrbuch," and thence derived the text that he published. This literary piracy occurs in Poland very often, especially when the real author or editor lives in another country. It is necessary to enter a protest against so dishonest a practice.

S. Schechter.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, 1890.

JEWISH PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH.

THE present article does not profess to be a biographical sketch of S. R. Hirsch. I do not think that the time has arrived when such a biography could or should be written. Great as the influence was which he wielded during his lifetime, the real fruits of his activity are only just beginning to ripen. Before an account of his life can be of lasting advantage, his name must have first become more the common property of the Jewish nation at large. Personal animosities, which, although almost entirely silenced, may nevertheless still be lurking here and there, must completely vanish. His works must first become known to a greater circle of readers by translations from the German, partly into Hebrew, and partly into the vernacular tongues of countries outside Germany. Moreover a sketch of the life of S. R. Hirsch would either by far exceed the space which can possibly be assigned to an article in a Review, or it would have to be contracted so as to degenerate into a dry catalogue of accomplishments which were possessed by him, without the possibility of properly illustrating even one of them. All I propose to do is to try to turn the attention of the English Jewish public to a man who is little known to them, whose influence is nevertheless not without effect upon some of them, though they may be unconscious of it; to set in its proper light only one of the many great achievements of this man; namely his mode of procedure in evolving the ideas of which Judaism is the

representative, and to try to recognise the real position he occupies among the philosophers of Jewish religion. All this is only a small but not an unimportant point in his long life, so full of profound thought, of indefatigable activity; but I think it best not to attempt any more for the present. Some readers, on perusing the following pages, will perhaps suspect me of suffering from that disease which Macaulay wittily calls the *lues Boswelliana*, "the disease of admiration to which all biographers, translators, editors, all, in short, who employ themselves in illustrating the lives or the writings of others, are peculiarly exposed." It is a suspicion which I am particularly anxious to rouse. For only by means of such wondering doubt as to who that man may be who is able to awaken such admiration as a hero of thought and action, can I hope to reap the gratification of inducing some of my readers to investigate his works and deeds for themselves. About the results of such investigation I am unconcerned. —Perhaps it is also necessary to mention that I am in no way related to the deceased Rabbi who is the subject of this article. The identity of surname is a mere coincidence.

There is no period in Jewish history in which Jews have not been influenced by external events and circumstances. No man ever fails to be so affected; it is in his nature, it is one of the elements which constitute man. Jews were not, in reference to their human instincts, placed by the Creator either above or below humanity. Whether considered as forming a religion or a race, or both, they are equally with others a factor in the aggregate of beings of which mankind consists. It might therefore be considered as a truth so evident that it were superfluous to mention it, that Jews are and were at all ages, children of their time. How comes it then that this saying nevertheless conveys no truism, that it expresses a fact, the enunciation of which is not mere commonplace, but a truth of which it is necessary that we should now and then be reminded, which has been and may be again disputed? The reason is this. Whatever theorists may advance to the contrary, it is indisputable that the Jews form a factor, a well defined, well distinguishable element in the vast multitude of separate groups of which mankind is composed. Ignore it or avow it, rejoice at it or regret it, the fact is not subject to the views, to the wishes, of this or that philosopher or moralist. Jews have collectively characteristics of their own; they possess them and adhere to them, or rather, they are possessed and held fast by them in spite of the innumerable vicissitudes in their history, in spite of the strongest in-

fluences from without, tending to destroy and utterly efface everything which might stamp the mark of individuality on the children of Jacob. Heaven and earth have combined to amalgamate them with the rest of humanity, to cause them to be as completely lost among the nations of the earth as the Phœnicians and Trojans of old; but neither different climate nor different soil has proved uncongenial to the vitality of that distinctiveness. Crime of the deepest dye, virtuous aspirations in point of intention of the highest order, have combined, have acted separately, to annihilate it, by brute force, by gentle persuasions, by contemptuous degradation, by enticing allurements. But neither could wholesale massacre turn, nor the most degrading laws shame, nor the most flattering prospects decoy the Jews out of their peculiarities.

But are then the Jews an order of beings by themselves? Is the construction of their bodies, the constitution of their intellects; are their moral perceptions, their susceptibilities for pain and pleasure, different from those of the rest of mankind? Certainly not. The Jews are neither more nor less than human. They are, however, one of the many groups, which, though in the aggregate making up the sum of mankind, yet are totally different from one another. But those distinguishing marks are of different strength, of greater or smaller tenacity in the various groups. Many of the latter are so seriously influenced by external events as not to be able to sustain their individuality; they amalgamate with the groups with which they come in contact. The Jews on the contrary are so essentially impregnated by that which gives them their individuality, that no influences, however strong, have hitherto been able to obliterate and finally extinguish their special characteristics. Under such circumstances it is certainly worth noticing that even they must obey the general human law of being acted upon by the modifying influences of time and circumstances. It is certainly worth while to inquire in how far the changes thus wrought are mechanical, in how far they are chemical; and where the boundary lies beyond which no motors from without are able to penetrate. For while it is true that powerful agencies have been constantly at work to deprive them of their peculiarities; these efforts from without are as nothing when compared with the tendencies destructive to that individuality which were unintermittently at work within the body of Judaism. Susceptible of every change which is going on around them, keenly alive to their solitary position whenever it proves a source of degradation or oppression; sensitive to every sneer and gibe so lavishly bestowed on whatever is rightly or wrongly considered by

others to be peculiar to them, highly impressible, whenever it is permitted them, to the revolutions which take place in the religious, social, and political conditions of the people among whom they dwell; there were always men in their midst who thought it to be their duty not only themselves to cast off everything which reminded others of that exclusive and solitary position, but also to induce their brethren to join them in such efforts. They actually believed in the possibility of such a consummation. They saw in that which singles out the Jews only some outer garb, of which it was obligatory and perfectly easy to divest themselves at will, partially or entirely. More than that. The Jews, whenever allowed to do so, have always taken a lively part in the progress of knowledge; they never were behind their time in mental and intellectual movements. Nor have the checks put upon them with the purpose of excluding them from such participation always proved efficacious. Then that universal propensity of imitation has always been especially prominent in them; the desire to be like others has been the cause of many of their excellencies, of many of their foibles. But, however successful such incentives from within were with some individuals, or with some communities, in certain localities and at certain times, it was they who gave themselves up to these levelling influences that were the losers. Judaism was lost to them. They were lost among the nations and their place knows them no more; Judaism in its permanent existence was not affected.

But there were other and greater men than those alluded to, who wanted to bring about a union of that which appeared conflicting between *Judaism* and the high and noble aspirations of *other* nations. Their ambition was to be and to remain Jews, and at the same time to enjoy all those intellectual privileges which were the pride and the glory of the great men around them. A noble ambition indeed! The Jews had been struck by the great efforts of the Greek philosophers in the scrutiny of self, God, and nature. They learnt to recognise all that was divinely beautiful in the Greek forms of expressing thought, both in prose and poetry. The Arab literature with its modifications of Greek philosophy, with its original forms of poetry and style dazzled their eyes. Was it not a noble aspiration to reconcile these elements with Jewish lore and Jewish practices? To reconcile. Did they then conflict, and if so, was a reconciliation possible? They never stopped to inquire. Conflict certainly there was. Foreign elements were sought to be identified with Jewish ideas and customs. Conceptions and views as divergent as possible had to be declared iden-

tical. Only one of three things was possible. The results of extraneous knowledge being recognised as indisputable, the Jewish elements had to yield and make room for the introduction of those intruders who henceforth were to have the predominance or the sole mastery of the field, or a *modus vivendi* had to be found between the two. The foreign elements being assumed to be unassailable, but the Jewish principles and laws equally so, a bridge had to be constructed to span the gap between the two opposite fields of cognition, both had to be brought to one level. Of course neither of the two came off scot-free. On either side many a picturesque hill had to be levelled down to the ground. Many a ravine so useful in saving the country from inundations had to be stopped up. But what will not consummate engineering skill accomplish? Why should not Jews have something to show in the way of philosophy of religion? Were Saadiah, Gabirol, Maimonides less earnest in their adherence to their religion than Scotus Erigena, Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus to theirs? Or were the former less acquainted with the philosophical doctrines of their time; were they of smaller intellectual capacity than the latter? Certainly not. The truth is, the mode of philosophising reached these two groups, independently, by the same law of nature. It never occurred to them to doubt its validity. The one group as well as the other, and many more of the same aspirations and tendencies, proceeded spontaneously, and without knowing of each other, on very similar paths. Both the one and the other group possessed a knowledge of Aristotle at second or third hand. His doctrines were acknowledged by them, but had to be moulded and remoulded so as to harmonize with, or, at least, so as not to be in direct opposition to their religious professions. But neither cared to follow up their positions to their last consequences. And when we turn to that Jewish philosopher, whose philosophical work was really of influence, was read and highly valued by the greatest men in Israel, can he be said to have bridged over the gulf in a satisfactory manner? Are the rational explanations which he gives of many of the precepts of the Mosaic law of such a nature as to satisfy the doubting mind? Would a waverer in the field of religion, hesitating whether to fulfil the enactments as laid down in Maimonides' Yad Hachazaka or to abandon the practice of these precepts as irrational—would he be converted into an ardent observer of these laws merely by taking into consideration the arguments preferred in the philosophical work of the same author? Does not the gap, which

Maimonides would fain have filled up between Judaism and that which at his time was called philosophy, yawn between the Yad Hachazaka and the More Nebuchim of the same man?

This is what many people of his and of succeeding centuries have seen. The third possibility alluded to became a reality in these men. They were not prepared to surrender the faith and the practices of their fathers for doctrines that came to them in foreign garb from without. Nor were they satisfied to balance themselves on the rope which was thought to connect the two opposite banks. They therefore rejected every guidance from philosophy and lived only in their religion. It has become a custom to divide the adherents and opponents of Maimonides into two parties, and to call his followers the lovers of light and knowledge, and his antagonists the lovers of darkness and the haters of science. It will take some time, some centuries perhaps, before such irrational cant will disappear from the books of history; before either of these parties will have its own place allotted it in the mental and religious revolutions of mankind. When Kant, in conscious opposition to all philosophers who preceded him, denies that pure reason will ever be able to demonstrate the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, and nevertheless maintains this God and that immortality, and asserts that the belief in them is demanded by practical reason;—when he investigates one by one the philosophical proofs of these doctrines as given by his predecessors only to reject them, and yet is driven to assume their propositions by his moral consciousness; it will certainly not enter the mind of any sensible being to accuse Kant of being a lover of darkness, an opponent of the free use of the mental capacities of man. How many men are there, even in our days—if any there be—who will subscribe to Maimonides' philosophical doctrines; who will adopt as their own, who will call really rational, every one of the explanations he gives of the various Jewish laws? And why then load with reproaches the men who saw the insufficiency of Maimonides' method, and in the choice between the elements from without and that which was offered them, the Jews, by their own Judaism, declared for the latter? They did not trouble themselves to find a mode of conciliation; some of them from incapacity, some from unwillingness, and some from a consciousness of the impossibility of arriving at any satisfactory result. In a similar manner it has become a custom with a certain section of Jewish scholars to speak in terms of condemnation, and in terms of condemnation only, of the mystical element which played so important a part in the history of the Jewish religion. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, such

Mysticism to be foreign to the doctrines and objects of Judaism. Let us grant that all and every single proposition averred by the Cabbala rests on error. Let us admit that all these profound mystical speculations rooted in Neo-Platonism, and in some other more ancient systems, were imported from without and adapted to the Jewish beliefs and customs. Let it be even so. Are therefore the Jews to be blamed for having done that which all thinking men of Europe have done at certain times? Why should not the Jews be also, in respect to Mysticism, the children of their time? There is certainly nothing disparaging to the Jews in the fact that they were in some respects the forerunners of a time in which Mysticism was one of the powerful weapons by which the authority of the schools was effectively undermined, and the way paved for modern philosophy. For Mysticism is one of the human instincts. It prompts men to seek a profounder knowledge of, a closer communion with things supernatural, with the Deity. Neither the teachings of Aristotle, nor the higher ideas of Neo-Platonism could satisfy that craving. The supposed Areopagite Dionysius, Scotus Erigena, Master Eckhart, Nicholaus Cusanus, Pico of Mirandula, Paracelsus, Giordano Bruno, Jacob Böhme, and many, many more, are treated with the greatest respect by the historiographers of philosophy. A proper place is assigned to each of these men, and to the followers and schools connected with their names. Their teachings are expounded, their greater or lesser importance in the development of intellectual knowledge carefully weighed. Several of these men had taken essential parts of their systems from the Jewish Cabbala. Why then should not the Cabbalists be treated with the same respect, with the same deference, by the Jews? To treat them exclusively in a condemnatory manner, to have nothing to spare for them except sneers and derision, shows little of the true spirit of historical research.

But when we come to consider that which may be called the philosophical portion of this Jewish Mysticism, we meet with propositions of which it may well be doubted whether they reproduce thoughts which are inherent in Judaism, and are consequently evolved out of it, whether they are not rather such ideas which, although in themselves not antagonistic to anything Jewish, are yet the fruits of a cogitation outside Judaism, brought in harmony with its tenets and pronounced objects. But, while in philosophy it depended upon the frame of mind of the philosopher whether philosophy or religion should have the ascendancy in the conflict, in the case of Mysticism it was invariably adopted to make the behests of religion paramount over any opposite conclusions of the

Cabbala. Practically it was the same with the philosophers, and almost without exception with Jews and non-Jews, philosophy was the handmaid of religion. Not a jot was sacrificed, even by the greatest advocates of welding together philosophy with religion, of the latter to the former.

The philosophical researches of the Jews were neither independent nor progressive. Philosophy was as dogmatic as, if not much more so than, religion itself. The philosophy of Aristotle, as far as it could be known from translations and excerpts, had reached its zenith in Avicebron or Gabirol. To him some Christian philosophers of the Middle Ages turned for information, not knowing that they were consulting a Jewish author. In him they found means for harmonising thought, which means Aristotelianism as they knew it, with their particular religious persuasions. For the rest Scholasticism gradually withered; all that was fertile and inspiriting in it having been used up long ago. But it took a long time before philosophy came to be that which is in our days dignified by that name. Humanism had first to show to the astonished eye of Europe the real Aristotle, had to disclose the speculations of Plato. The thinkers of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries had to take account of Neo-Platonism. A general wave of Mysticism, which went, in profundity and intenseness of religious craving, much beyond anything the Neo-Platonists could offer, moved the thinking minds of Germany and Italy, and satisfied the spiritual thirst in a much higher degree than was possible for the decrepit, sapless Scholasticism to do.

Pico of Mirandula had taken the Jewish Cabbala within the range of his speculations. Reuchlin discovered for Christian Europe the Hebrew and Rabbinical literature, and added a branch of research and knowledge to those already existing. Reuchlin stood, in his mode of thought, exactly on the level of his age. In literature he was a Humanist; in philosophy he had a leaning to the Mysticism of his time; but he was distinguished among his contemporaries by the immense extent of his reading, by his overpowering love for his newly-discovered Hebrew literature, and by the keenness and purity of his moral perceptions. He eagerly laid hand on all the genuine and supposititious Cabbalistical books he could obtain, and tried to prove Christianity from the Cabbala and the Talmud in the same manner as previous ages had tried to prove it from Aristotle.

The European intellect had then to undergo the friction produced by the struggles for and against the reformation of the Church. The science of nature took a flight never

attempted before. The investigation of nature commenced to be based on observation and experiment instead of mere speculation. The modern philosophy was being gradually prepared step by step. The way was paved by a Telesius, a Campanella, and above all, by Giordano Bruno. The latter showed himself a product of past centuries in his theory of the harmony of contradictories; yet points in his Pantheism to Cusanus, who preceded him, and to Spinoza, by whom he was succeeded, and in the exposition of the nature of his monads, foreshadowed Leibnitz's theory. And thus it took a long time before German, and more particularly English thought, led up to that new era of philosophy which was introduced by Kant, and has not come to a close yet.

The Jews took little or no part in these movements. The reason is threefold. First, oppression was, especially in Germany, of such a nature as to surpass in cruelty even the sufferings they had to undergo in the Middle Ages. Where the right of their existence was questioned, and the confines in which their enemies kept them apart from the bulk of their fellow-men were most justly blessed by them, because they afforded them shelter against violence, where all the levers and resources of the law were put in motion to keep them in a state of degradation, it cannot be wondered at that they remained excluded from the general march of science; that they were unacquainted with the revolutions in the development of knowledge, which—it must not be forgotten —was not among their Christian neighbours the common property of the every-day labourer, tradesman, merchant, but only of the learned few. The second reason was the nature of the religion for which the Jews suffered, and which alone preserved them from extinction. The laws which they observed kept them in breath from the beginning of the year till the end. Every day, every action of life brought its duties. What with others was a mere gratification of bodily desires was with them the fulfilment of God's will. And thus the satisfaction of having, to the best of their intentions, lived up to their duties, richly compensated them for the absence of the comforts and privileges of others; kept their envy down, appeased their many spiritual instincts, made them contented, and armed them with patience and endurance. And thirdly, as for their rational, moral, and purely religious propensities, who can say that, with their Bible, their Talmud, and Midrashim, their More Nebuchim and Choboth Halebaboth, their Cabbala and Mussar Sforim, their Maassa books, and Tseeno Ureno, their spiritual instincts were dead, their moral perceptions blunt, their intellectual capacities

unoccupied, their longing to commune with God ungratified? There was plenty of material for thought and feeling, which they fostered and cultivated, and explored, and discussed, and which made their forcibly isolated position tolerable, and which kept fresh in their souls everything which is noble and sublime in the nature of man.

But things took another turn. Revolutions took place in the intellectual, the social, the political aspects of Europe, in the world of action and the world of thought. The conditions and the ideas of the Jews affected each other reciprocally. The cry for liberty and equality which resounded in every nook and corner, and which, when artificially stifled, broke forth all the more vigorously, penetrated also the abodes and the hearts of the Jews. They ardently longed to take part in the general movement, and to adapt the aspirations of society at large to their faith. The movement among the non-Jews to attain the summit of liberty and of equality could not but overthrow partly or wholly the boundaries which separated the Jews from all participation in the intellectual and political stir of the age. It seemed as if an era were commencing for the Jews, instigated both from within and from without, such as had never existed since the Exile. But that which happened to society at large happened also to the Jews. In the struggle for liberty and equality there were undoubtedly those who not only understood these words in their noblest conception, but also perceived the limits of their feasibility. These were no doubt the best, and at the same time, the most useful benefactors of their age, but their number was small. From these downwards representatives of every shade, every gradation in the conception of these two sublime ideas existed; even to such, and they were the majority, who grasped at these names with enthusiasm and ardour, but without the slightest reflection. They never thought of the confines within which only liberty and equality can be exercised. The very suggestion that such limits existed appeared to them contradictory to the ideas themselves. Liberty unlimited, unbounded, not listening to reason, not tied to any guiding principle; a liberty pure and simple, as they thought, in politics, in religion, in literature, in social life, in family relations; equality in which the good would balance the wicked, the ounce would balance the pound—a liberty and equality than which no greater slavery can be imagined, subversive of every free thought, of every wholesome principle, of obedience to the laws of nature, to the laws of the human heart. A liberty and equality which could not but end in the most unscrupulous oppression, in the direst confusion.

"The words liberty and equality," Schiller says, "resound, and bands of assassins roam about. Women become hyenas, and make terror their sport." A strange coincidence!

Well, of this terrible drama of the macrocosmos of European and American society, we find a faint reflection in the microcosmos of Jewish life. The new departure, which is most conveniently connected with the name of Mendelssohn, showed in its development every shade and gradation of the adaptation of the general ideas, the general revolutions, the general hue and cry, to their own narrow sphere. Every single grade between the two extremes, from the noblest workers in the cause of general enlightenment of their brethren to the lowest instincts of fanaticism, ostensibly for the same purpose, came to the front. All degrees, from the strictest adherence to the written and oral traditions to the most undisguised repudiation of anything and everything which reminded of Judaism, were represented. In nature as in history, it is difficult to fix strict lines of demarcation. It is doubtful whether the last step on this ladder of opinions must be said to be occupied by those so-called enlightened Jews, merchants in a large way of business, scholars in expectation or actual possession of emoluments and honour, who openly abjured Judaism and turned Christians; or whether we have to think in this respect of those who just stopped short of this last proceeding. The vocabulary employed by the advocates of the new direction against such as insisted upon the maintenance of traditions in theory and practice, was not new. It had been long in use by Christians in discussing differences which had a resemblance to the points at issue between Jews and Jews, and it was indiscriminately adopted by the defenders of modern Judaism. Fanaticism, intolerance, self-deception, deception of others, obscurantism, hatred of knowledge, pious frauds, impious frauds, inconsistency, hypocrisy, and scores more of such flatteries were lavishly bestowed upon the adherents of traditional Judaism. This is not the place to inquire whether the accusations were well founded, nor to prove that the defenders of the new direction themselves deserved these charges. The history of the most recent reform movement among the Jews has not been and cannot be written yet. The time may be long in coming, but the time will come when it will be seen against which side some, if not all, of these charges are most justly made.

However, the Jews had taken up with zeal the opportunities offered them. They threw themselves eagerly into the general contest for fame, for wealth, for distinction, for intellectual superiority. There were certainly some among them who

pursued the new paths without remembering for a moment any links that might attach them to their ancient race, any connection with the religious observances of their fathers. But these formed a minority. That mysterious something which singles out the Jew, and stamps him with its mark, is of too indelible a nature not to make itself known and felt even when all influences combine to efface it. Like Faust, who from a life of study and contemplation in his solitary cell, suddenly thrown into the vortex of worldly enjoyments, was reminded by the gentle, weak Gretchen, "but how about thy religion," so the Jew was always reminded of the fact that he was a Jew, however deeply he had suffered himself to sink in the abyss of extraneous ideas and tenets. He could not hesitate to adopt all the good and noble results of the different sets of systems which he found being built up around him. He adopted the systems themselves, and now was at pains to reconcile them in some way or other with Judaism. As before, he did not inquire whether there was a conflict, and if so, whether a reconciliation was possible. Bridges were built in every direction. But unlike previous struggles, it was not religion that now held sway. This time a mode of living was only secured by indulgence on the side of religion. The Jews showed themselves again true children of their time. Until now philosophy had been the handmaid of religion with Jew and non-Jew; it had had to accommodate itself to the requirements of religious faith. Where a reconciliation was impossible, the philosophers consciously excluded such obstinate religious doctrines from the number of questions with which philosophy was entitled to deal. This was different with the modern philosophers. The religious dogmas were always made a portion of the philosophy that was propounded; no question was withdrawn from contemplation; only in case of conflict it was no longer philosophy that had to yield but religion. Albertus Magnus or Thomas Aquinas had banished such doctrines as revelation, the trinity, incarnation, resurrection, from the regions of philosophical inquiry; this was not imitated by Kant, by Fichte, by Schelling. They brought within the cycles of philosophical reasoning not only religion, but their religion. They wanted religion to be the result and outcome of reason, and of reason only, and managed to make the dogmas of their particular church appear to flow naturally out of their philosophy, each of them in his own way, out of his own peculiar system.

I cannot stop to trace all the shades and varieties in the forms religion assumed, as considered from the variously formed philosophical, social, and political points of view.

The Jews in their own way held pace with the general movement. They formed their opinions, or rather their opinions were formed according to the schemes which prevailed in the circles in which they lived. Their consciousness as Jews demanded recognition, and moulds were easily constructed to which their religious convictions had to adjust themselves, so as not to be out of harmony with convictions acquired from other sources. There is no end to the variety in shapes of such casts. The author of each of them was naturally very proud of his invention. He certainly thought his to be the only serviceable one. He thought himself to be strong-minded, of intellectual independence, free from prejudice, neither influenced by tradition nor by authority. Poor infatuations! He did not see how much he was the creature of influences from without; how the strength of his mind lay in his incapacity to resist, how his intellect, if independent in one direction, was so only because he had been warned off that road by others, and forced into other paths from which he was not even able to cast his glance backwards. He did not see that he was free from one prejudice, perhaps because he was subject to a number of others much more whimsical, that he deemed himself to be above authority, because he was the abject slave of many authorities, that he was uninfluenced by tradition because the contemporary influences held him in their bondage. I do not allude here to such as have altogether thrown off every connection with their Jewish brethren, but to those Rabbis, preachers, teachers of religion, who for about a century have been the representatives of the so-called "Modern Judaism."

This "Modern Judaism" is very, very old. It is as old as Judaism itself. From the very first appearance of Judaism it showed itself; it seems as if it is naturally inherent in it. Whatever form it may assume it always shows the same primary motors; impatience of any authority from within, attachment to everything from without. These elements are constant, whilst the forms in which they find their expression vary with the conditions of the age. If these conditions show many varieties of colour, we shall find most, if not all of them, reflected in the "Modern Judaism" of the time. Whether the variable elements in each case are good, bad, or indifferent; whether they are commendable or reprehensible; whether they are rational or irrational, is not at the choice of the "Modern Jew." Wherever the spirit of the influences that surround him direct he has to follow. The attraction from without is so strong, the attachment to his religious tenets so weak; this strength, this weakness is at the bottom of the

"Modern Judaism" of all ages; and always that which is "Modern" in it varies directly, and that which is "Jewish" in it varies inversely, as the extraneous influences. It is "Modern Judaism" which goes like a red thread through the whole history of the Jews, from the time of Moses down to our own time. The books of the Bible abound in examples; the post-biblical history of the Jews is rich in illustrations.

But if "Modern Judaism" is old in point of time, it is also old in another sense of the word. "Modern Judaism," as it appears in its various phases, is in our time antiquated, it is an anachronism, a relic of discarded scientific procedures, a lagging behind the progress and development of knowledge of modern times. For the characteristic of modern science, that which so visibly and perceptibly marks it off from previous centuries, is this; that it does not try to construe *à priori* that which can be grasped by the senses; that it does not build up from some preconceived notions arbitrarily posited truths about things which can be brought within the scope of observation. Instead of starting from a certain general principle under which everything had *nolens volens* to be forced, modern science, when considering things visible, palpable, perceptible, starts from observation and experiment, and is not satisfied till the subsequent generalisations have as far as possible been verified. The proper use of induction and deduction, the utilising of either of them exactly where it is suitable, the judicial combination of both methods where it is necessary that they should reach each other the hand—this it is which gave such immense impetus to the human mind, which altered beyond recognition the aspect of the civilised world.

This being so, it would be strange indeed if this modern procedure would have remained without reflection on the Jewish mind. The so-called "Modern Judaism" failed, and fails to this day to participate in this progress of the time, to utilise the improved method of reasoning. It continues its attempts to construe *à priori* that which is above all a subject of observation; to ignore phenomena if they contradict the preconceived notions from which it tries to construe a Judaism as it should be. Whatever set of ideas the spokesman of the modern departure may have been wedded to, forms to him the mould into which he casts not only his religion in a general sense, but his Judaism, and not only his own Judaism, but the Judaism which he would fain force upon others. He argues, that if Judaism is the true religion it must be above all—this, that, or the other—and then he takes Judaism, like another Procrustes, and squeezes, and amputates, and stretches, till he thinks it tolerably fits, and does not more than fit, his

own particular frame. If as is sometimes the case, the author of such a scheme is at various times differently impressed, he gets sometimes dissatisfied with the frame first chosen by him. He remodels and reconstructs it, and goes on squeezing and lopping poor Judaism, till it loses gradually every characteristic mark. Dietary laws, Hebrew language, initiation, are one by one discarded. The sanctity of the Sabbath sinks into some meaningless ceremony in the synagogue, which however does not take place on the seventh day but on the first day of the week. And such process is then dignified with the sonorous name of "developing." It is the kind of development which took place in the minds of Goneril and Regan, the daughters of King Lear. When the latter resigned and surrendered everything to his two daughters, he had reserved for himself a retinue of a hundred knights. But the daughters, when mistresses of the situation, began to reflect on the expediency of his having a hundred followers. They thought them to be too many by half. Regan says :—

> "You will return and sojourn with my sister,
> Dismissing half your train."

But whilst thinking further about it she is clearly developing.

> "If you will come to me, I entreat you
> To bring but five and twenty, to no more
> Will I give place and notice."

But however fast she is developing, she cannot keep pace with her sister, for Goneril remarks :

> "Hear me, my lord,
> What need of five and twenty, ten, or five."

Regan, however is not to be outdone in the art of developing.

> "What need one ? "

she says, and poor Lear is driven out in storm and cold without a single attendant.

It is the merit of Samson Raphael Hirsch to have applied to Judaism the improved methods of reasoning, which modern times impose on everyone who undertakes the contemplation of subjects which are within the scope of observation. He did so consciously, deliberately, and consistently. He never swerved from his object. He brought into its service the logical acuteness of a truly philosophical intellect, the glowing enthusiasm of loving devotion, the penetrating keenness of minute observation of details, the vast comprehensibility of mind, which darts with true aim at that which is general in the enormous mass of special phenomena. He brought into its service a knowledge of his times, a knowledge of human

nature, a steadiness of purpose, a power of application, a capacity for organisation and administration, such as are rarely found singly, as are most rarely found combined in one person. He possessed oratorical powers of the highest order, he possessed the most amiable and gentle virtues, the most unbending and stern virtues. He was one of the few imperial spirits, to use Macaulay's words, whose rare prerogative it is to give to the human mind a direction which it shall retain for ages; in this case certainly to the human mind within the narrower circle of Judaism.

Samson Raphael Hirsch was born at Hamburg in 1808. His parents, to whom, as "the guardians of his childhood, the guides of his youth, the friends of his manhood," he dedicated his work *Horeb*, could not possibly foresee what fruits would be produced from the germs of mental greatness hidden in the child. They destined him for a mercantile career, and educated him accordingly. His instruction in Hebrew was not neglected; his mind eagerly absorbed the teachings administered to him, and the explanation of some text in holy writ given him by his learned great-uncle never faded from his memory.[1] Such training, and above all the teaching he received from Chacham Bernays fell on fruitful soil. It is true he entered on his commercial pursuits, but he soon left them to become a Rabbi. "You know," he says in his *Nineteen Letters*, under the *nom de plume* of Naphtali, "how from my earliest childhood these subjects (of religion and Judaism) engaged my mind. Educated by enlightened, religious parents, the words of holy writ attracted me at an early time. My understanding having become more mature, it was from my own choice that holy writ led me to the study of the Talmud. No influence from without, only my own determination prompted from within made me choose the position of Rabbi." He entered the University of Bonn as a student. There he lived on terms of intimacy with Abraham Geiger, a man who was in future days to represent opinions diametrically opposed to those of Hirsch. Geiger wrote about this time: "Samson Raphael Hirsch is one of my friends. He exercised great influence upon me and gladdened my life at Bonn. One evening, when we walked home together after the lecture, we conversed about Goethe's *Wahrheit und Dichting*, which I was reading at the time. We told each other our circumstances, we regretted the isolation of Jewish theologians, and agreed to found a debating society. This brought me in close intimacy with

[1] R. L. Frankfurter, the author of הרכסים לבקעה and קול יהודה. See *Jeshurun*, 1868, p. 133.

Hirsch. . . Hirsch made the first speech, to which I replied on the following Thursday. We had a long debate, in which I recognised and learned to admire his extraordinary eloquence, his acuteness, his clear and quick comprehension. . . . I respected his excellent talents, his strict virtue, and I loved the kindness of his heart." [1]

Hirsch was hardly twenty-two years of age when he became Rabbi of Oldenburg. At the age of twenty-eight he published his first pamphlet, *Nineteen Letters on Judaism;* and in this very first attempt he took up a stand-point from which he had, during his long life, never occasion to recede. He commences with delineating the objections raised at that time against traditional Judaism, putting them in the mouth of a friend in the following manner:—

The object of all religion should be to bring man nearer to his destination. The latter can only consist in bliss and perfection. What bliss is offered by Judaism to its adherents? Slavery, misery, contempt is their lot. The law severs them from everything which adorns and beautifies life. All enjoyments are interdicted. And as to civilisation and culture; what greatness has been achieved by Judaism as compared with Egyptians, Phenicians, Greeks, Romans, Italians, French, English, Germans? Having nothing left of that which constitutes a people, they yet call themselves a nation. And the law itself! It enjoins isolation, which creates suspicion and distrust; it degrades the mind, so that the Jew bears contempt with equanimity; it is opposed to the cultivation of arts; its tenets obstruct the way to free speculation. Its study distorts the mind, encourages subtleties and scrutiny of paltry topics; it disqualifies it for any straight thought. How can any one who is able to enjoy the beauties of a Virgil, a Tasso, a Shakespeare, who can follow the logical conclusions of a Leibnitz and Kant—how can such a one find pleasure in the Old Testament, so deficient in form and taste, and in the senseless writings of the Talmud?

And what effect has Judaism on the heart and on life? The heart shrinks to a timid scrupulousness about unmeaning trifles. It is only taught to fear God. Every affair of life, to the most trivial one, is brought in connection with God. Life itself is an uninterrupted asceticism, a service of praying and ceremonials. That Jew is honoured most who retires from the world which he does not know and which sustains him, to waste his life in fasting and praying and the reading of senseless books.

And in our time forsooth! How is it possible to execute all these precepts while travelling, in social intercourse, in business? And the Reform movement of the time, which cuts away everything that does not accord with the idea of man's destination and the demands of the age, procures no remedy; for it is nothing but stepping outside Judaism. Why not follow up these ideas independently and consistently to their last consequences, rather than lean in such a way against opposing forces, which cannot become after all anything but arbitrary patchwork? Moreover, there is no unity, no magistracy, no authority. Everyone acts separately. The most divergent opinions obtain among Rabbis and

[1] *Nachgelassene Schriften*, v., p. 18.

preachers; from the most enlightened destructiveness to the most dogged persistency in sticking to the old edifice to be buried under its ruins.

Surely there is no shirking here, no connivance. The charge against traditional Judaism is not palliated. We see at once that the author is not the man to overlook difficulties or to mince them; nor will he be satisfied with trying to bind up the wound in one or two places, and to make believe that thereby the illness of the whole body is stamped out.

The *Nineteen Letters* proceed to meet the said charges which in the course of the exposition are further illustrated. The method Hirsch applies has been sketched by me in the introductory remarks. It is this which stamps him as a true son of his age in the noblest sense of the word. To understand thoroughly the new tools and instruments of reasoning that have been brought to a high degree of perfection, to wield them with a master-hand, and to apply them, and them only, to the scrutiny of the highest truths is certainly progress. The keystone to his whole system, to realise which his whole life was engaged, will be found in a few words modestly put as a note under the text.[1]

Two revelations are given us, Nature and the Torah. For the investigation of either only one method exists. In nature the phenomena are facts; and we are intent to spy out *à posteriori* the law of every one and the connection of all. The proof of the truth, or rather, of the probability of our assumptions is again nature itself, by the phenomena of which we have to test our assumptions, so as to reach the highest degree of certainty ever attainable, namely, to be able to say, Everything actually is as if our assumptions were true; or, in other words, All phenomena brought under our observation can be explained by our assumption. One single opposing phenomenon therefore makes our assumption untenable. It is therefore our duty to gather all experience that can possibly be obtained about the phenomenon which is the subject of our investigation; to examine it in its totality. Whenever and as long as we have not been able yet to discover the law and the connection of any phenomenon, which exists as a fact, the phenomenon itself remains a fact for all that. Exactly the same it is with the investigation of the Torah. The Torah is a fact like Heaven and Earth. The Torah, like Nature, has God for its ultimate cause. A fact can be ignored in neither, even if cause and connection is not discovered. We have to trace in it God's wisdom. For this purpose we have first to assume its many particulars to their whole extent as a phenomenon, and to trace out of them their connection among themselves and with the objects they refer to. Our assumptions have to be verified again by the particulars themselves; and here again the greatest certainty obtainable is this: Everything actually is as if our assumption were true. But as in nature the phenomenon remains a fact although we have not comprehended it yet as to its cause and connection, and its existence is not dependent on our investigation, but *vice versâ*, thus also the components of the Torah remain the law even if we have not discovered the cause and connection of a single one.

[1] *Nineteen Letters on Judaism*, page 96.

Hirsch commences his reply to the grave objections by doubting whether man's destination is really bliss and perfection; whether Judaism has to be measured by this principle: but this question is for the present left in suspense. True to his method, he asks the reader (his correspondent) to accept Judaism as a historical phenomenon. Its only monument being the Torah, he asks him to read the latter with no other object but to find out what Judaism is. "For we want to know Judaism; let us therefore ask: What do men become who recognise the contents of this book as the basis and rule of their lives, as revealed to them by God? Only when Judaism is known from itself, known as it exhibits itself, and then is found to be in itself untenable and objectionable—then only let him who likes reject it." It is impossible to follow in this article the line of reasoning, along which the author of the *Nineteen Letters* comes to the conclusions he draws, for this would mean to reproduce the whole book. I must content myself with quoting such passages as will give the reader an insight into the system which was finished and completed in Hirsch's mind at the very outset of his career. For the way by which he arrives at his inferences, and for the manner in which he finds them expressed in Judaism, I must refer the reader to the book itself.

Let us read, he says, the Torah, unmindful of the trouble which the reading of these writings caused us in our youth, unmindful of all prejudices which may have been instilled in us against them from many sides. Let us read them as if we never had read them. Let us put ourselves the questions: What is to me the world within me and without; what am I to that world; what am I as man and Israelite combined, as איש ישראל?

The inquiry proceeds step by step. A short description of nature in its beauty and usefulness is given. The Torah tells that God created all this. There is one Creator, everything else is created. This world is God's creation. Everything about us serves. Every force is a messenger of God; all matter is limitation put thereto by God, to act on it, within it, by means of it, according to God's omnipotent law. Everything serves God. What is man in this chorus of Creatures, of Servants of God? It is impossible that man alone, in a world in which everything serves, everything acts, should do nothing except either enjoy (receive), or suffer (want), and should not himself act.

Man, the image of God, *is for everything;* he is to till and to guard, his destination is to work in justice and love. It is not the earth which is for him, he is given to the earth. Everything else acts unconsciously and without will, man works

with consciousness and freedom. Our vocation, our destination is not that which comes to us but that which goes forth from us. Our actions accord with God's will if they are good, if not they are a failure. The greatness of these actions is only measured in proportion to the means vouchsafed us. Man is happy by bliss and perfection, only when these means are applied according to God's will. Man's destiny is attainable by everybody, in every condition of life. If the means given him are applied according to God's will he has attained the object of man. His whole life in its totality—his thinking, feeling, speaking, acting, also his acquiring and enjoying—was religion. This is above change, this is not affected by the vicissitudes of life.

Man's position in the creation is therefore neither that of a god nor of a slave. He is only a co-operator, but at the same time a first-born brother in respect to the nature and compass of his service. Not that is good or evil which either pleases or displeases God, but that which is either in accordance with or opposed to God's will. Man should freely submit to the law to which all other beings are unwillingly subjected. But he has the power not to submit. The demands of his body engender desires to enjoy, the power of his intellect engenders pride; either of these hinder his submission. When man suffers his animal inclinations to get the mastership to which, as a subservient slave, he subordinates the power of his intellect, he becomes the most dangerous of brutes. The author goes through the history of the first sin, of Cain, the Nephilim, Enos, Noah, by the light of these principles, which, in their turn, have been suggested by the narrative. He considers the flood and its necessity for the education of mankind; the necessity for selecting a people, and why the particular people that was selected, what it was, and what it was destined to become, so as to fulfil God's object. At the very commencement of the history of that people a man was selected to be its patriarch, who realised already in his own life the ideal of the future people. Loving God, and God alone, he relinquished country, native town, family, parents, and everything which is dear to man, to follow him who called him. He received the call to be the father of a nation which would become a blessing to all the nations of the earth, which would preserve the way of God to practise kindness and justice. He followed the call; he realised that love to the only God in his love to his children and his fellow-men. He combined love (אהבה) with (אמונה) firm trust in God and (יראה) fear of God. These qualities were inherited by Isaac and Jacob: in the former the fear of God was the

most prominent feature; the latter was above all the bearer of the trust in God. All three equally recognised God's absolute unity.

It is impossible for me to follow Hirsch throughout his investigation. All that can be done here is to quote some sentences, which by their sublimity and purity of tendency are indicative of the mind of their author, and of the nature of the aims he assigns to Judaism. And in quoting from the pamphlet I confine myself to such ideas as are of more general interest, instead of reproducing such as bear more distinctly on the subject in hand. For in doing the latter the statements must necessarily be taken out of their context; it would be impossible to give the arguments on which they are based. They would therefore appear as unsupported statements, as gratuitous, arbitrarily assumed conceptions, and would rather invite rejection than adoption. The following therefore must suffice:—

Now after all that has been said, what is it that we expect the Torah to be? It is a revelation of the means by which to execute God's will towards everything outside us by everything that is given us. In other words, it is the revelation of how to practise justice and love with everything towards everything. Add to this the idea represented by Israel, not only to realise all this in actual life, but also to preserve and to pronounce the idea which underlies all this for the education of self and others; and also everything which results from Israel's political life, which, of course, has no application outside the country and the state, and you have the contents of all the obligations the Torah lays upon you.—I. תורות. The historically revealed ideas about God, the world, humanity, and Israel, with all their consequences. And all this not as dogmas or creeds, but as principles of life to be recognised and adopted by mind and heart.—II. משפטים. Judgments. Justice towards equals from the principle of this very equality. Therefore justice to man. —III. חקים. Behests. Justice towards the lower orders of beings from the principle of their belonging to God, towards earth, plant, animal, and of all three after having become part of our self; consequently, justice towards our possessions, our body, our feeling, and our thinking.— IV. מצות. Injunctions of love towards all beings without any claim on their side, purely in obedience to God, and from the idea of our destination as man and Israelite combined.—V. עדות. Monuments of the truths underlying humanity and Judaism by symbolical representations in words and action for the individual, for Israel, and beyond Israel.—VI. עבודה. Exaltation and consecration of our life within, for the fulfilment of our vocation in the outer life by the purification of our judgment through symbolical action and word. The fundamental ideas are therefore: 1. Justice. To respect every being as God's creature, every property as thus ordained by God, every arrangement as God's law, and to satisfy all their claims.—2. Love. To adopt every being as a child of God, as a brother; to assist it in arriving at the end set it by God, without any claim of its own, purely in obedience to God.— 3. Education. To train self and others to such activity, by being pervaded by the truths as principles of life, by giving them expression for self and others, by recovering them when lost during life.

This sketch of what the Torah offers us, of what it demands of us, the author asks us to assume as a preliminary theory which awaits its verification in the further development of the subject; although the author assures us that every single opinion uttered here is the result of the study for several years of Bible, Talmud, and Midrash. The proof of his hypotheses he promised to give at a future time, and nobly he redeemed his pledge during the fifty-three years which succeeded this first attempt.

Do not expect, he says, to find in me an infallible master. I will honestly show you where I myself am still in doubt and darkness, and I will invite you to independent investigation. For the present do not expect any more than stray thoughts. Of course you cannot but find your Judaism antagonistic to your idea of the destination of man, of bliss and perfection, a destination not recognised by Judaism, against the lower potencies of which, namely eagerness for pleasure and worship of possession, it rather is diametrically opposed. The nature of these potencies is spiritualised by nobler men, but never altogether discarded. The idea itself is the result of considering the world without God as its motor; of considering God without a world that serves him. Israel knows something else, something more sublime. . . And that nation has borne no part in erecting the great edifice of Humanity? I will not ask, where then has one of all the other nations consciously supplied a stone towards it; whether every one of them has not sought merely self even when being building material in God's hand. Nor will I ask, whether everything they produced brought blessing with it. But I will ask, whether it is not true, that Israel has saved out of the shipwreck of the times, saved consciously and with sacrifice of self, that, through which alone, and as a means subordinate to it, science, culture, arts, and inventions will once become really building materials of bliss for the welfare of the world. Israel in its isolation works for the unison, the brotherhood of all humanity. Almost on every page of our prayer-book we pray for the realisation of that object. All nations work towards that end, nations which existed and disappeared, with their virtues and with their vices. All contribute to the one edifice of humanity. For this, all good men of all nations have lived; the Greek with his art, the Roman with his sword, Israel in its own way. . . . . The whole question of emancipation, in as far as it concerns only our external condition, is in Judaism only of secondary interest. The nations will soon or late decide the question between right and wrong, between humanity and inhumanity; and the first awakening of a nobler, a higher calling than "to have" and "to enjoy"; the first expression of a more lively recognition of God as the only Lord and Father, and of the Earth as a holy place assigned by him to all men for the development of their humane calling, will find its expression everywhere; in the emancipation of all oppressed, also in the emancipation of the Jews. We have a higher object to obtain—and this is entirely in our own hands—the ennobling of ourselves; the realisation of Judaism through Jews. This leads us to the question of "Reform." Certainly, we are far from what we should be. Only look at the picture of life, the execution of which the Torah sets us as our task! What strides we have to make, what distance to traverse, what height to ascend! And therefore, Reform by all means! Let us apply all our power, let us summon everything which is good and noble within us to ascend that height. Reform! But its object can be no

other except the realisation of Judaism by Jews in our time ; the realisation of that eternal ideal, under the circumstances in which the time has placed us. Education, elevation of the age to the Torah, but not levelling the Torah according to the time, or depressing the summit to the shallowness of our life. . . . . That great man to whom, and to whom alone, we owe the preservation of practical Judaism up to our own time, Maimonides, produced much good and much evil, because he reconciled and did not develop Judaism naturally out of itself. His mind was framed in the Arabic-Greek mould, so was his ideal of life. He penetrated Judaism from without, he introduced opinions which he had adopted from elsewhere, and with these he reconciled. . . . . What was the consequence? When these opinions produced their natural results ; when some deemed themselves to be above the guidance of the command ments which were represented to them as nothing but guides, and above the given explanations which had no meaning for them ; others, who had a deeper insight into Judaism, became averse to that philosophical spirit ; others, again, became enemies of all spirit. . . . . Only a few in the whole space of that time stood in their investigations purely within Judaism and built it up intellectually out of itself. Conspicuous above all are the author of *Cusri* and Nachmanides.

Theosophy and talmudical topics are considered next.

When the yoke commenced to be slackened, and the spirit again felt some freedom of movement, another brilliant and most estimable person arose to be a leader in the process of development. But neither did this man draw his freer intellectual progress out of Judaism. He was great in metaphysics and æsthetics, he studied the Bible for philological and æsthetical purposes. He did not construe Judaism as a science out of itself. He defended it only against political narrowness and pietistical demands from certain Christians. He was at the same time practically a religious Jew ; he showed his brethren and the world that one can be a strictly religious Jew, *and yet* shine forth and be celebrated as the Jewish Plato. This *and yet* decided. There was no help for it ; the direction was given and followed, and had to be gone through to its last consequences destructive of Judaism. . . . . And there it is that the disease lies. The idea of Judaism is wanting ; the idea in accordance with its history and its teachings ; and, in consequence of this, the love to these latter is wanting, which is the only counterpoise against allurements from without and from within. The spirit inherent in Judaism is the only goal that can save us. Compare with this the reforming tendencies of our time. Be angry with none, respect them all. All feel that there is something wrong ; all intend to promote that which is good, according to their lights ; all have in view the lasting welfare of their brethren. If they have not recognised that which is good ; if they have failed when desiring to grasp at the truth, in most cases it is not their fault ; they share the mistake with past generations. Is, then, this the reform which is wanted, to take up some standpoint or other from outside Judaism ; some foreign idea of human destination or emancipation, and now, accordingly, to curtail or enervate the fulness of Judaism? Is that reform, to stand within Judaism, but Judaism not understood, and merely trim to the requirements of a time which only feels the external appearance of a part of Judaism understood as little—the synagogue service? . . . . And now the schools, which contain all our hopes of the future! They are as the schools of the time. Youth is trained to make a living by handicraft, trade, art, science. The understanding is partly developed, but in this, also, the memory is being more exercised

than the reasoning faculties. But where is the heart formed, Judaism taught, the school penetrated by the Jewish spirit, so that it may at a later time pervade life? Where are men trained who recognise themselves to live in God's world, with faculties belonging to God, for the execution of his will—who rejoice in their vocation, who ardently and lovingly cleave to the name of "Jew," which summons them to be the bearers of such doctrine through time and fortune, through suffering and want, and, at the same time, to know the world and themselves, to learn history, to understand the present time, and to look upon themselves as building material for the future?

Two tendencies are opposed to one another. The followers of the one, having inherited Judaism, but not understanding it, obey its behests from habit without its spirit; carry it in their hands as a holy mummy, afraid to rouse the spirit. Those on the opposite path partly glow with noble fire for the promotion of the welfare of their brethren, but consider Judaism to be an appearance without spirit, and belonging to a time long gone to its grave. They search for the spirit but do not find it, and in their best endeavours to succour the Jews are in danger of severing the last heartstrings of Judaism from want of knowledge.

And now, when these opposite positions approach each other in thousands of varieties, and therewith demonstrate that both are in error, which remedy is left? Is it sufficient to found schools, to reform the service in the synagogue, on such rent and riven ground? The spirit, the inner principle of life is wanting, and you never succeed in calling it forth by polishing the outer frame.

There is only one remedy. The atonement must arise from the point where the sin was committed. The remedy is this: to forget the hereditary conceptions and mis-conceptions about Judaism; to take up the sources of Judaism; to read, to study, to comprehend them for practical use; to draw from them the conception Judaism has about God, the world, humanity, Israel. To know, to comprehend Judaism from itself, to raise it out of its contents, to a science of practical wisdom. . . And then, be unconcerned what others may think of your study, whether you will be unable to become conspicuous any longer among the heroes of subtle disputations, subtle indeed, but not doing homage to truth and life as their objects. Be unconcerned whether or not you will be able to become conspicuous in the various branches of knowledge which you study only as auxiliary sciences for your own sake. Be unconcerned whether you will become unfit to shine. You will learn to raise yourself to the light of truth, to the ardour and height of life.

Once there you will understand Israel's vicissitudes and teachings, you will understand life as the impress of such doctrine permeated and saturated with spirit. Spirit in everything, from the structure of the language to the edifice of life's actions, a spirit inflated by the Spirit of the only God.

That were indeed a work for the disciples of knowledge! But then the results of such science have to be transplanted into real life. Schools for the Jews! The saplings of your nation must be educated to be Jews, to be sons and daughters of Judaism, of such as you learned to know and understand, to respect and love as the life of your life. Let them master the language of the Bible as they master the language of the land in which they dwell. Let them learn to think in either, let their hearts be made to feel, their mind to think. Let the Bible become for them the book of the teaching for life, and let them be able to perceive its word throughout life! Let their eyes be opened to view the world around them as God's world and themselves as God's servants therein. Let

their ear be opened to history as the education of all men to such service. Then let them learn from the written and traditional law in its practical consequences to comprehend, to respect, and to love their life as such spiritual service of God, that they rejoice in the name of Jew and in a life issuing therefrom, in spite of sneers and wants. Let the way they are trained to find a living, as also the gaining of their livelihood in real life, be a means, not an end. Let them be taught to value life not according to position, to wealth, to fame; but according to the inner vocation which is full of real life, of worship of God. Do not let them subordinate the demands of their vocation to the demands of sensuality and comfort, but *vice versâ*. And in the meanwhile—until Israel's houses are built up by such sons and daughters of Israel—let us supplicate, let us beg in the houses of the parents that they do not disturb the work of the school, that they in icy coldness or bluntness of spirit, do not nip and kill the young buds in the minds of their children. Let the noble spark be blown into blaze also in the hearts of the parents, and where it is too late for understanding, at least respect be obtained—and would it not then become different in Israel?

It will become different in Israel. Our time leads unmistakeably towards it. The time suffers from the pains of labour. Better are these pains than the painless, but also joyless and hopeless house of the barren woman. It may be that this pain will outlive ourselves, our children, perhaps our grandchildren. But then the grandchild will rejoice in the offspring come to light and life, called "a Judaism which knows itself." The time gives one security for this result. It consists in the tendency to think about, to comprehend, to penetrate into that which is to be the subject of respect. As soon as the mind has recognised the fruitlessness of its endeavours which are devoid alike of foundation and of object; of the complying with the demands of the fleeting moment which are rated above their value; as soon as the mind is penetrated by the consciousness that life must be based only upon idea and truth obtained from within—it will wake up to the questions: "What am I as a Jew?" "What is Judaism?" And we shall no longer try to obtain the solution of that question from the chairs and writings of non-Jewish scholars, who often knew Judaism only from its reflection in a distorting mirror, and who believe themselves obliged partly to destroy the Torah and Judaism, in order to construct that which is their own. Nor will they go for solution to the writings of modern reformers who only consider external points; nor to the writings of such Jewish sages as choose the foundations for their system from outside Judaism. But they will turn to the Bible and the Talmud, the fundamental sources of Judaism; pre-supposing nothing except the endeavour only to comprehend the idea of life out of Judaism, and Judaism as an institution for real life. This will lead to the end, to produce that which is true and vital as truth and life, after the ancient but much forgotten rule—to learn, to teach, to observe, to act.

If Hirsch had done nothing but to indicate the true method according to which the essence of Judaism has to be recognised, it would by itself have been a remarkable effort. If he had left to others the task of tracing the truths which he pronounced to be symbolised by the precepts of the Torah; the task of trying, by the rules laid down by him, to induce his brethren to renounce the conventional theories which were destructive of the observance of the Jewish laws, he would

already have had great claims to the gratitude of his brethren. Others would perhaps have undertaken to educate Jewish men and women with this object in view. Others would perhaps have created schools for both sexes, which, besides giving sound and sincere religious instruction, would at the same time have been able to pass muster even among the efficient educational establishments as superintended by the authorities in Germany. It is possible that this would have been done. But it is certain that all this and much more was attempted and realised by Hirsch.

Immediately after the *Nineteen Letters* his *Horeb* appeared; which is a concise and lucid compendium of the traditional observances, explained as symbols after the principles laid down by him in his first work. But he was certainly not the first who attempted to explain one or the other of the Jewish laws as symbols; as expressions of certain thoughts which they were meant to represent. But with Hirsch such an idea took quite a unique shape. He subjected his own theories to the most severe criticism. He knew that "Symbolical explanations, when practised in the style of an amateur, could not but be injurious to the knowledge of Judaism; that it would be a mere play of wit, and degenerate into a mere display of ingenuity. In consequence of this it is easy for every shallow mind, for every mountebank, whenever it suits his purposes, to make such efforts ridiculous in the eye of ignorant people."[1] He knew the objections which could be raised, and actually were raised, against the proposition that the observances of Judaism were meant to be symbols; that they had for their object to keep some idea alive within us and constantly before our eyes.

He wrote his *Outlines of a Jewish Symbolic*,[2] in which he laid down the rules and guiding principles for the tracing of the ideas underlying the Jewish observances. In these articles he proves beyond doubt that a Jewish Symbolic really does exist, and the "preliminary remarks" in which he dwells on the theory of Symbols in general are a noteworthy sample of a philosophical disquisition. Is this the same eloquent preacher who so often kept his audience spellbound by the flow of his language, by the ardour with which he impresses his convictions upon his hearers; by the boldness of his metaphors which never descending to anything bordering upon platitude, always struck home by their aptness and their truth? The sixteen pages containing these "preliminary remarks"

---

[1] Jeshurun, 1857-1858.

[2] *Grundlinien einer jüdischen Symbolik*, Jeshurun, 1857, p. 615.

are decidedly hard reading. The concatenation of ideas is so close, the logic so severe, the special cases preferred for induction so exhaustive yet so sparingly used, the illustrations so striking, yet so soberly managed, that to give an extract would mean to reproduce the whole. To use a homely phrase, you cannot put a pin in. Here as elsewhere Hirsch displays the same judicial combination of induction and deduction, the same consciousness of the limits set to that class of reasoning which no human intellect is able to pass.

There is one ordeal to which every interpretation of a symbol has invariably to submit, and that is, the verification whether the thing or the action recognised to be a symbol proves in all its essential parts, and in its connection with the respective persons, with the conditions of locality and time, with the accompanying words, to be of such a nature that the detected idea can have been the one intended by the author of the symbol. The most ingenious interpretation will have to be dismissed, if opposed to one of these essential conditions. It is the same method and the same result, which ought to prevail in every sober interpretation of any document. A verse may be interpreted differently by ten different commentators, but only that one will be recognised as the correct one, according to which all idiomatical peculiarities and sentences, and the connection of all the relations in which they appear have been taken into account. Neither here nor there mathematical certainty can be obtained. That which is erroneous will however be dismissed with the most absolute certainty; and for a positive assumption we shall have to decide after the motive: that after careful consideration, everything which had to be taken into account is of such a nature that the assumption can be true."

Having indicated the method applied by Hirsch in evolving the ideas of which Judaism is the representative, I regret not being able to discuss in the present article the system in which it results. It seems paradoxical to say that his system was the fruit of a few years' thought only, and yet was not completed in a lifetime. In his first pamphlet Hirsch enunciated a system finished as to its fundamental principles, and thought out as to its details. His whole life was devoted to elucidate the the latter, to carry them back to their first principles, to gain for them recognition and adoption by his brethren. All his literary productions must be judged in this light. His Commentaries, the magazine *Jeshurun* edited by him, his critical articles, his polemical writings, his occasional pamphlets, are all of them so many materials necessary to the rearing up of his system. I must for the present satisfy myself with merely mentioning them; but to understand them a searching survey would be necessary.

One of Hirsch's objects, to gain for his views and principles the recognition and adoption of his brethren, was never for a moment lost sight of by him. And he possessed all the qualities necessary to ensure success in this direction. For there

was no human instinct of the nobler kind which was not strongly and vividly operating within him. If Hirsch had been no more than a man of profound thought, he would no doubt have made his mark in the world of letters. If in addition to this he had been also a man of genuine and ardent feeling, and of great eloquence, he would certainly have been also great as an orator. But all these qualities, and each of them of the highest order, were in Hirsch combined with all those qualifications which distinguish the man of action. Thought, feeling, and deed were always in harmony. Hirsch's every thought was an action, he never acted without realizing at the same time an idea.

One word about his success as a preacher. With a preacher like Hirsch it is as with a great singer. The effect of the performance must be felt but cannot be described and is lost to posterity. Whenever in his sermons some struggle, some hesitation was noticed, it was because he was applying to himself the reins, not the spur. He had to restrain the great copiousness in the outpour of ideas, in the exuberant flow of words which suggested themselves to him; and with the greatest skill he selected on the spur of the moment those that were most fitting. The effect his addresses had on his audience was always electric. Suffice it to say that the instances were by no means few, that men of culture and education entered the synagogue with opinions antagonistic to his, and left it again with serious doubts as to the correctness of their views, to end in becoming his most ardent followers.

But it was by his pedagogical achievements in the founding of and presiding over schools, and by his statesmanlike qualities in the organisation of communities, that he exhibited himself most as a man of action. That he knew his own mind and never acted at random, but always in accordance with settled principles, is evidenced by his many articles on communal affairs. Again I am unable to discuss them, and must therefore request my readers to inquire for themselves if they wish to know Hirsch in quite another character. That his theories were sound, that his activity proceeded in the right direction, cannot be shown better than by pointing to the congregation which he created in Frankfort-on-the-Main.

"Created," this is the proper expression. Rough material to work with he had hardly any. He commenced his career as Rabbi of the "Religionsgesellschaft" with scarcely a dozen congregants. The site on which he had to rear his structure was of the most unpromising nature. Peter the Great, when selecting a swamp to build his magnificent city on, had not

made a less judicious choice than Hirsch when he chose to made Frankfort-on-the-Main the citadel of observant Judaism.[1] Nowhere had the spirit of persecution of Jews by Jews been so prominent as in that city. Fidelity to Jewish observances, the study of Mishna and Talmud, even of the Bible in Hebrew, was being systematically stamped out. The council of that ancient Jewish congregation brought all the strength of the secular authorities to bear upon those of their brethren who still tenaciously clung to the execution of their religious duties. They pursued their fanatical intentions with a tenacity of purpose worthy of a better cause. By the machinations of that council it was, between the year 1818 and 1838, an indictable offence, checked and punished by the police, to teach the young the Bible in Hebrew and the Talmud. Teachers and scholars actually hid themselves in lofts and other hiding-places when studying these subjects in order to elude the tyrannical powers of the council. But the latter was on the alert; the hiding-places were discovered; the teachers were banished the city, and those men who had undertaken the care of providing the means for pursuing these studies were forbidden to do so under the penalty of fifty florins each. An educational establishment for the study of the Talmud together with general secular subjects, to which a generous member had bequeathed the sum of 50,000 florins, was suppressed, and the council boasts of this feat in an official document. Since times immemorial there had existed in Frankfort a society under the name of "Tsitsit Society." One of the objects was for its members to gather every Sabbath after the Synagogal Service in a private house to edify themselves by reading and interpreting certain sections of the Pentateuch and the Prophets. But in 1842 this also was declared to be an indictable offence. The council effected a prohibition of these gatherings and the society ceased to exist. It would lead me too far to relate how the Burial Society was tyrannised over by the council, and its members deprived of their most sacred, most humane, and noblest privileges. They hindered the restoration and adornment of the two chief synagogues; they neglected one of the most necessary Jewish institutions, and those of the neighbouring townships had to be used by the faithful. They abolished the ancient custom of providing prisoners and such patients as were in non-Jewish hospitals with kosher food. I cannot proceed with a full enumeration of the malpractices of the council. It seemed as if the council

[1] For the following particulars see Hirsch's pamphlet *Die Religion im Bunde mit dem Fortschritt von einem Schwarzen*, Frankfort o/M., 1854.

had extinguished the last spark of observant Judaism in Frankfort-on-the-Main.

But eleven men of that city turned themselves, in 1851, to Samson Raphael Hirsch. They asked him to come over to them and help them. Hirsch responded to the call. He resigned his position as Chief Rabbi of Moravia and Silesia which, besides being a place of honour and dignity, had also considerable emoluments attached to it; he gave up his seat in the Moravian Diet, and went to the assistance of the handful of workers in the cause of freedom of conscience and religion. As far as human efforts are concerned, it was he, and he alone, who must be called the author of that flourishing community called the "Israelitische Religionsgesellschaft," and of those first-class Jewish Educational establishments, which are, without exaggeration, the only ones of their kind in the whole world. It would require a separate article to do justice to the statesmanlike qualities in the noblest sense of the word, the unbending force of will, the untiring activity, the knowledge of the world, the powers of organisation and management, and at the same time the stern resistance to any sacrifice of principle, which put the stamp of greatness on this remarkable man.

How was it that Hirsch, who terminated his life at the age of eighty-one, during a long period of speech and writing, never contradicted himself, never was obliged to recede from positions formerly maintained by him? The reason is this; because Hirsch started with that which other great men are often unable to reach at the end of their careers. He did not start before he had carefully examined every detail of his system; before he had measured his own powers and made himself thoroughly acquainted with the nature of the material on which he intended to exert his faculties; before he had prepared himself to wield with master-hand the instruments; before he had traced out in his own mind the kind of opposition he would have to encounter; before he had estimated how much success could be reasonably expected, without dreaming of impossible and miraculous results. It was the rare privilege vouchsafed to this man that in his life was compressed in its widest and most profound sense that old rule of Judaism, which he recommends to his readers, "to learn, to teach, to observe, to execute."

S. A. Hirsch.

A JEWISH BOSWELL.

THERE is a remarkable saying in the Talmud "Nothing exists of which there is not some indication in the Torah." These words are often quoted, and some modern authors have pressed them so far as to find even the discoveries of Columbus and the inventions of Watt and Stephenson indicated in the Torah. This is certainly misapplied ingenuity. But it is hardly an exaggeration to maintain that there is no noble manifestation of real religion, no expression of real piety, reverence and devotion, to which Jewish literature would not offer a fair parallel.

Thus it will hardly be astonishing to hear that Jewish literature has its Boswell to show more than three centuries before the Scotch gentleman came to London to admire his Johnson, and more than four centuries before the Sage of Chelsea delivered his lectures on Hero Worship. And this Jewish Boswell was only guided by the motives suggested to him in the old Rabbinic literature. In this literature the reverence of the great man, and the absorption of one's whole self in him, went so far that one Rabbi declared that the whole world was only created to serve such a man as company (*Sabbath* 30*b*).

Again, the fact, that, in the language of the Rabbis, the term for studying the Law and discussing it is "to attend" or rather "to serve the disciples of the Wise" (שימוש ת"ח) may also have led people to the important truth that the great man is not a lecturing machine, but a sort of living Law himself. "When the man," said one Rabbi, "has wholly devoted himself to the Torah, and thoroughly identified himself with it, it becomes almost his own Torah." Thus people have not only to listen to his words but to observe his whole life, and to profit from all his actions and movements.

This was what the Jewish Boswell sought to do. His name was Rabbi Solomon, of St. Goar, a small town on the Rhine, whilst the name of the master whom he served was R. Jacob, the Levite, better known by his initials Maharil, who filled the office of Chief Rabbi in Mayence and Worms successively. The main activity of Maharil falls in the first three

decades of the fifteenth century. Those were troublous times for a Rabbi. For the preceding century with its persecution and sufferings—one has only to think of the Black Death and its terrible consequences for the Jews—led to the destruction of the Yeshiboth, the decay of the study of the Law, and to the dissolution of many congregations. Those which remained lost all touch with each other, so that almost every larger Jewish community had its own *Minhag* or ritual custom. (See Güdemann, III. i.)

It was Maharil who brought some order into this chaos, and in the course of time his influence asserted itself so strongly that the rules observed by him in the performing of religious ceremonies, were accepted by the great majority of the Jewish communities. Thus the personality of Maharil himself became a standing Minhag, suppressing all the other Minhagim.

But there must have been something very strong and very great about the personality of the man who could succeed in such an arduous task. For we must not forget that the Minhag or custom in its decay degenerates into a kind of religious fashion, the worst disease to which religion is liable, and the most difficult to cure. It is therefore an irreparable loss both for Jewish literature and Jewish history, that the greatest part of Maharil's posthumous writings are no longer extant, so that our knowledge about him is very small. But the little we know of him we owe chiefly to the communicativeness of his servant, the Solomon of St. Goar whom I mentioned above.

Solomon not only gave us the Minhagim of his master, but also observed him closely in all his movements, and conscientiously wrote down all that he saw and heard, under the name of לקוטים, *Collectanea.* It seems that the bulk of these *Collectanea* was also lost. But in the fragments that we still possess we are informed, among other things, how Maharil addressed his wife, how he treated his pupils, how careful he was in the use of his books, and even how clean his linen was. Is this not out-Boswelling Boswell?

The most striking point of agreement between the Boswell of the fifteenth and him of the eighteenth century, is that they both use the same passage from the Talmud to excuse the interest in trifles which their labours of love betrayed. Thus Solomon prefaces his *Collectanea* with the following words: "It is written, His leaf shall not wither. These words were explained by our teachers to mean that even the idle talk of the disciples of the wise deserves a study. Upon this interpretation I have relied. In my love to R. Jacob the

Levite, I collected every thing about him. I did not refuse even small things, though many derided me. Everything I wrote down, for such was the desire of my heart."

Thus far Solomon. Now, if we turn to the introduction to Boswell's Life of Johnson, we read the following sentence: "For this almost superstitious reverence, I have found very old and venerable authority quoted by our great modern prelate, Secker, in whose tenth sermon there is the following passage: "Rabbi Kimchi, a noted Jewish commentator who lived about five hundred years ago, explains that passage in the first Psalm, 'His leaf also shall not wither' from Rabbins yet older than himself, that even the idle talk, so he expressed it, of a good man ought to be regarded."

Croker's note to this passage sounds rather strange. This editor says: "Kimchi was a Spanish rabbi, who died in 1240. One wonders that Secker's good sense should have condescended to quote this far-fetched and futile interpretation of the simple and beautiful metaphor, by which the Psalmist illustrates the prosperity of the righteous man." Now Kimchi died at least five years earlier than Croker states, but dates, we know from Macaulay's essay on the subject, were not Croker's strongest point. But this lack of sympathy one can hardly forgive to the editor of Boswell. Had he known what strong affinity there was between his most Christian author and the humble Jew Solomon, he would have less resented this condescension of Archbishop Secker.

As to the Jewish Boswell himself, we know very little about him. The only place in which he speaks about his own person is that in which he derives his pedigree from R. Eleazar ben Samuel ha-Levi (died 1357), and says that he was generally called "Der gute Rabbi Salman." He well deserved this appellation. In his Will we find the following injunction to his children: "Be honest, and conscientious in your dealing with men, with Jews as well as Gentiles, be kind and obliging to them; do not speak what is superfluous." And wisdom is surely rare enough to render inappropriate a charge of superfluousness against the work of those who in bygone times spent their energies in gathering the crumbs that fell from the tables of the wise.

S. SCHECHTER.

MANY MOODS IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES.

To both Jewish and Christian orthodoxy of a hundred years ago all the writers of the Old Testament spoke a single mind. All were supposed to hold the same opinions, to teach and to cling to the same ideals. The conception of God which seemed true to Moses was the same conception which satisfied Isaiah, and one view of man's relation to the divine expressed the sentiments both of Jeremiah and of Ezra. It is criticism which has restored to the Bible its original variety of life and colour. Just as in the human structure the inter-connection of mind and matter is so much more complex than was supposed erewhile, so, too, in the Bible, the human and divine elements are far more subtly transfused than the pious simplicity of an earlier age believed. It is through the very variety of its human aspect that what we call the inspiration of the Bible is now recognised and revered.

Yet there are two ways in which this variety is limited. One is that because it is a collection of the religious and historical writings of a single race, the Bible (by which term I here mean the Old Testament only) takes for granted throughout one or two fundamental religious convictions, from which it never deflects. That Yahveh is the God of Israel, and that Yahveh is a God of righteousness,—these are assertions which, however differently they might be expressed, and whatever difference in implication they might contain for different ages and minds, would never have been flatly contradicted by any Israelite from David to Judas the Maccabee. This limitation is obvious and familiar; the other, though undoubtedly very important, is as yet of unascertained range. We may call it the editorial limitation, and it shows itself in different ways. Certain functions of the Old Testament editors have only quite recently been more narrowly inquired into; and till the criticism of Stade and his school has been systematically examined, there must remain considerable doubt in many important details relating to this work of the Biblical editors.[1] Its method, how-

[1] I refer especially to their work in Stade's excellent *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Into the field of this criticism it should be noted that Geiger led the way. Compare the *Ueberarbeitung* chapter in his *Urschrift*, pp. 72-101.

ever, is already clear. Much of it is comprised in that useful German word, for which unfortunately we have no English equivalent, *Ueberarbeitung*. The historical books provide the best field for these critical investigations. Their results we see most satisfactorily in those chapters of Samuel in which a clearly primitive train of thought is rounded off or interlarded with far later reflections and ideas. How much the editors may have omitted from their originals we cannot tell; it is very probable that many a passage, into which even they could not read their own religious convictions, was left out or greatly modified. Even in the prophetical writings we have, though with reserve, to be on the watch for the editor's hands. Not merely, as almost everybody now-a-days is aware, are whole chapters appended to one prophet's utterances which belong to a different age (*e.g.*, Isaiah xl.-lxvi., Zechariah ix.-xiv.), but even within single chapters a careful, though sometimes too subtle, criticism has shown with more or less convincing exactitude the presence of editorial accretions. If then an attempt is made to prove an identity of thought between, let us say, Jeremiah and Ezra, by the help of a few verses from the former which are used to counterbalance a number of other passages which ordinarily would suggest a considerable difference between these two writers, we must first be sure that the argument of the harmonist is not resting upon the precarious foundation of an editorial comment or gloss. On the other hand, the existence of isolated passages such as Isaiah lvi. 1-8, or writings with a partly polemical purpose, such as Jonah and Ruth, suggest a doubt whether many noble utterances may not have been curtailed or suppressed by over-zealous editors with whose religious position they were not in harmony.

The actual variety of thought in the Biblical writings in their present form may be roughly classified as follows. First, a variety that indicates and illustrates a development in time of moral and religious thought from lower to higher. But within this category we cannot include all species of difference. Nehemiah is later than the "second Isaiah," but he is spiritually his inferior. Secondly, a variety that is partially explained by the fact that the authors of Scripture fall into three or four different classes. The prophets, the wise men, the priests and the psalmists had all, to some extent, their own special points of view, and there are writings in the Bible, such as Deuteronomy or Ezekiel or Psalm cxix., which represent a more or less perfect fusion between two of these different classes. Lastly, there remains all the variety that may be due to the individual idiosyncrasy and character of each particular writer.

I.

I propose to illustrate the many moods of the Scriptures by a few salient examples; sufficiently familiar as they are to the scholar, they still need interpretation to the "general reader."

The variety, which is mainly due to upward development, is well shown in the progressive conceptions of God.

Monotheism in Israel did not spring full fledged into existence. It was only gradually that the patron deity of the nation was transformed into the sole and only God in heaven and upon earth. M. Renan, indeed, would have us believe that among the old patriarchal ancestors of the Hebrews there was already prevalent a kind of primitive monotheism. The nameless Elohim (gods) they worshipped were easily combinable into a single Elohim (God), "whose breath is the life of the universe."[1] The introduction of the worship of Yahveh as the national God was a downward religious step. Centuries were needed before Yahveh, the cruel, jealous and partial Deity, could be disrobed of his own peculiar attributes, and endowed with the higher qualities of the patriarchal Elohim. But M. Renan's theory is still unproved. And seeing that it is inconsistent with the safest conclusions of comparative religious study, we may abide in the belief that the pre-Mosaic conception of deity, of which Stade, with perhaps too sweeping a negative, declares that we know nothing, was not higher than the Mosaic, but lower,[2] and that the recognition of Yahveh as the sole God of Israel marks a gigantic religious advance. Moreover, the exclusive worship of Yahveh, when once acknowledged as the religious duty of Israel, became the stepping-stone to monotheism. It was the monolatry offered to Yahveh which turned the plurality of the word Elohim from a living reality into a mere grammatical archaism.

It seems strange and even sad that the two terms which the Jews, the monotheists *par excellence*, use to designate God should carry upon the face of them the evidence of a polytheistic origin.[3] The very substitution of the true pronunciation

---

[1] Renan *Histoire d'Israel*, Vol. I., Chapters ii.-iv., which repeat his old theory of the primitive monotheism of the Semites in the famous *mémoire* in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1859.

[2] Compare Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I., pp. 130, 140, 515. Kuenen, *Drie wegen, één Doel. Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1888. p. 473*ff.*

[3] Besides the use of Elohim for alien and heathen deities, compare the curious passage in Judges, "Should I (*i.e.* the olive) leave my fatness, which gods and men in me do glorify, to go to wave over the trees?" (Judges ix. 9). Q. P. B. = *Queen's Printers' Bible*, a work which every general reader of the Bible, as well as every scholar, should possess. A new and revised edition has just appeared.

Yahveh in the place of the old rendering *Jehovah* gives a peculiar shock to our religious sentiment. Jehovah, by the lapse of ages and the influence of faith, has almost become synonymous with God. But when for that familiar, and therefore unsuggestive word, we read Yahveh, we are painfully sensible of the inevitable implication. Yahveh though perhaps etymologically, and certainly historically, at a comparatively early date, a worthy and lofty designation for God, is nevertheless only a proper name, of the same class as the proper names of other gods of other nations. A name is far remote from our conception of the Deity. Naming implies particularisation: he who is the sole representative of his class stands in no need of having his identity secured by the help of a particular appellation. Yet however much Yahveh in the eyes of a David or a Solomon was superior to other gods, he was not regarded as the only Divine Power. Yahveh had to pass from being the god of a tribe, before being recognized as the Universal Deity of all mankind. It is natural that these lower conceptions as they peep out from the oldest historical records, which even in their present form are in this respect still imperfectly edited, should frequently present many unattractive features. Upon these it is unnecessary to dwell in detail; a few examples will serve our purpose sufficiently.

The localisation of Yahveh strikes us especially. There are signs that he was first thought to reside habitually upon Mount Sinai,[1] while later, Palestine becomes his permanent dwelling-place. On this point it suffices merely to refer to such repeatedly quoted passages as 2 Samuel xiv. 16, Exodus xv. 17, Hosea ix. 3, etc.[2]

At other times the ark is superstitiously identified with God, as in 1 Samuel vi. (cp. Numbers x. 33-36), the ideas in which chapter may be contrasted both with Jeremiah's view of the ark (iii. 16) and with God's residence by grace in the sanctuary at Jerusalem, according to Ezekiel, the *Priester-codex*, and the temple Psalms. "Heaven," in which a modern child's faith localises God, became his dwelling-place for the Hebrews also, but at what date is uncertain.[3] For a later age heaven itself becomes unable to contain God, and the Divine

---

[1] Compare Exodus xix. 4, Deut. xxxiii. 2, and Dillmann's Commentary, *ad loc*; Judges v. 4, etc.; Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 447; Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, p. 344, E.T.

[2] Compare now for the whole of this subject Robertson Smith's Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First Series, Lecture III.

[3] Compare Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 446.

Universality is nowhere more magnificently proclaimed than in Solomon's Prayer (1 Kings viii. 27), and Psalm cxxxix.[1]

Jephtah's Yahveh in an illustrative, but over emphasised passage Judges xi. 24 (Q. P. B.), is not conspicuously different in capacity and range of interest from the god of the Moabite stone. Yet this is the Yahveh whose house shall be called an house of prayer for all peoples. How great the change! The spirit of the one Yahveh drives its possessor to slay a thousand of the Philistines (Judges xv. 15); the spirit of the other impels to preach good tidings to the meek, and to bind up the broken-hearted (Isaiah lxi. 1).

Still, as these very extracts from the book of Isaiah prove, it is Yahveh, not Elohim, of whom these things are said, and Yahveh is not a mere synonym for God. Yahveh is the God revealed in history; or rather he is the God revealed in Israel's history. Israel's God is the God of Prophecy, not the more abstract, if more philosophical, God of humanity at large.

But it is clear that the conception of God in the books of the "Wise" indicates a different kind of religious progress to that achieved by the Prophets. It does not affect the truth of this proposition that in Proverbs God is usually called Yahveh. Though addressed under this name, the God of Proverbs is not so much the God of Israel as the God of the individual or the world. Unfortunately the dates of both Job and Proverbs still remain uncertain. The possible influence of the "Wise Men" upon the work of the Prophets must therefore also remain for the present a very doubtful quantity.[2] A certain lack of religious ardour seems traceable in the writings of the Wise. In spite of the glorification of wisdom, we seem to miss the intimacy of religious sentiment as expressed in many of the Psalms. The Prophets were naturally more conscious of a close relationship to God. Sentences like "I dwell with him that is of a humble and contrite spirit" or "the Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him," seem more in place in Isaiah or the Psalms than they would be in Proverbs, Job, or Ecclesiastes. It is probable that the lack of warmth and *Innigkeit* in the Preacher's references to God is explainable from the temperament of the man and the sad circumstances of his age, whereas in Job and Proverbs these deficiencies, if they are more real than apparent, are to be ascribed to the nature and limits of the class of literature to which they

---

[1] It is, therefore, not true, as Stade (*Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 467) would imply, that Acts xvii. 24 taught something till then unknown to any Jew.

[2] Cheyne (Job and Solomon, p. 123) rates their influence high even in the pre-exilic period. A very late date is given to Proverbs by Holtzmann, Stade's continuer and disciple, in *Geschichte* II., p. 292, and by Stade himself, p. 216.

belong. When, however, a very late date is assigned to Proverbs and Job, as well as to the Preacher, the lateness of whose age is certain, the supposed lack of warmth in their conceptions of God becomes additionally important, for it is then brought into connection with a general theory that has become a commonplace among most critical theologians. The theory is that in proportion as the conception of Yahveh became purified from the earlier anthropomorphisms, or, speaking from a modern point of view, as the change proceeded from Yahveh to Elohim, God became more distant and transcendent, and his relation to man colder and less intimate. It is supposed that the change is first noticeable in Ezekiel, and that this "false transcendentalism" became more and more the customary and ordinary manner of conceiving God among the "Scribes" and "Pharisees." The necessary corrective was then supplied, so it is assumed, by the life and teaching of Jesus, and theologically at a later age by the theory of the three ὑποστάσεις or *Personæ* in the single Godhead. Now, I should be the last to deny that the idea of God, formed by an ethical and religious genius of the first order such as Jesus, was indefinitely higher and more intimate than could be formed by a far smaller personality, such as the author of Ecclesiastes or of the book of Tobit. Nor do I deny that the theory of the Trinity (at a great sacrifice of the purity of the divine idea for nine-tenths of those who have accepted it) has kept in view and put prominently forward certain relations of the Deity to man and to the world, without which the whole conception of God loses half its value and half its truth. But it is I hope not merely an hereditary and therefore unconscious Jewish prepossession which makes me protest against the too frequent habit of misusing and misinterpreting certain portions of the Old Testament and of the later Jewish literature as a contrast and foil to Christianity. What a gratuitous unfairness it surely is when Professor Schultz, after conceding that the conception of God in the apocryphal books is usually agreeably free from the crudities and sensuous forms which mar the purity of the older ideas, goes on to say that this greater purity is in the last resort not the expression of a higher religious development, but the result of spiritual exhaustion (Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 4th edition, p. 507). This is a mere statement of opinion unsupported by evidence; whereas that the intimate relation of God to Israel, and even to every individual Israelite, is a characteristic of the whole Talmudic period might be convincingly proved. The "false transcendentalism" (except perhaps in such writers as

Koheleth, or in regular philosophers like Philo) is a figment of the theologians' brains. It is perfectly true that God is conceived as far removed from every human weakness or limitation; and it is also true that he is distinguished from the world which he has created and rules; but as to the first point, it is surely not an error but a truth, and as to the second, it is the necessary characteristic of every simple faith, whether Jewish or Christian. No pantheistic God has ever received, or will ever receive, the prayer and worship of ordinary humanity. Christian theologians usually write in comparative unfamiliarity with the literature they specially decry; they cannot work themselves into sympathy with its frequent strangeness of speech, while they are still more unfamiliar with living specimens of piety, bred and nurtured upon exclusively Rabbinic lines. Otherwise they would see for themselves that whatever may be the faults of the individual religion of people such as these, lack of warmth and intimacy in their conception of and communion with God is certainly not among the number.

In another respect also the Talmudic idea of God is more akin to that of the Prophets than to that of Ecclesiastes. By the author of Ecclesiastes, so far as we can judge, God was not habitually regarded as standing in a special relation to Israel; he is Elohim, not Yahveh. To the Talmudists he is Yahveh still, though they do not pronounce his name.[1] For us to-day the idea of God is not so easy. We have to make his Elohim aspect the basis of our conception; then only can we transfuse it with all those essential qualities, without their limitations (does not this roughly equal the substitution of mankind for Israel?), that made the word Yahveh precious and significant to the Psalmists and the Seers.

II.

The many moods of Scripture can also be illustrated by the varying conceptions of God's relation to Israel and to other nations. The ordinary pre-prophetic idea is aptly expressed by the passages in Judges and Samuel already alluded to. It is the tolerant attitude of conventional paganism. Each nation has its own special God and is thus religiously in-

[1] The pronouncing Adonai for Yahveh is usually put down to a "Pharisaic" superstition. If it be so, we can be grateful to the superstition, since a name for God had to be given up. Yet since the basis of the alleged superstition is that Yahveh is not a mere name, but expresses in a mysterious way the essence or true nature of God, the "superstition" is surely religiously higher than the frank utterance of Yahveh as an ordinary appellation.

dependent of every other nation. This view was even in later times shaken off with difficulty, but its character was modified. It then became a conscious dislike or neglect of the lofty Prophetic visions—a religious selfishness: the other nations may worship their false gods, if they please, we will enjoy our privilege of adoring Yahveh, the true God. This is, I fancy, the thought expressed in a verse of Micah, appended, perchance, as a side note or reflection by a narrow-minded scribe to a solemn universalistic prophecy, and then by a strange, though not unusual, fate incorporated into the text: "for all the peoples shall walk every one in the name of his God, but we will walk in the name of Yahveh, our God, for ever and ever" (Micah iv. 5).

How are we to account on any non-theistic hypothesis for the extraordinary change from the conception of Jephtah to that of the Babylonian Isaiah? Did ever a God become so exclusively identified with a people, did ever a people become so exclusively identified with a God, as Yahveh with Israel and Israel with Yahveh? Israel is Yahveh's particular people, and Yahveh is their sole and particular God. He is Israel's pride and glory, and in another sense, his glory and pride are centred in Israel. And yet out of this very particularism springs the universalism of the later Prophets. How did this change come about? Excluding the influence of external events, the relations to Assyria and the other great monarchies of Asia, its great internal cause lay in the peculiar character of the nation's God, as the best spirits of the people, so far back as the eye of history can range, conceived him. Yahveh is a God of power and of jealousy; he is greater than the other gods; he cannot tolerate them beside him, and so at last he comes to be the only God, and all other divine powers in the universe are at most his ministers and attendants. And secondly, Yahveh is a God of righteousness, and therefore whatever his relations to other peoples beyond Israel in present, past, or future, they must be relations which are founded and shaped by the ruling law of righteousness.

That one God among many should become the patron deity of a single people presents no difficulty where a plurality of gods is assumed. It is no hard matter that each deity looks after the interests of his own clients. But a covenant or peculiar relation of grace between the only God on one side, and a particular nation on the other, is almost bound to produce its religious antinomies. That the only God should single out one particular nation as his special property, though leaving, perchance, the others to the care of his own angelic

servitors,[1] obviously demands some very peculiar and unusual explanation, if it is to be adequately reconciled with divine impartiality. Such an explanation could not be given to it so long as Israel was still a nation among the nations. The idea of the covenant could only be stripped of its danger, and yet maintain its value, when the religious community took the place of the nation, when Israelites became complete citizens of other lands than Palestine, and when the altruistic view of Israel's relation to God became finally predominant. In other words, the idea of the covenant could not be realised in all its purity until modern times.

That God and Israel are specially related to each other, and that Israel, if it observes the conditions of the agreement, is to reap enormous benefit, both temporal and spiritual, from this relationship, is a fundamental assumption of the Old Testament writers. Why God chose Israel and for what end, were naturally questions that did not very often suggest themselves to the national consciousness. The covenant must be obeyed, that its advantages might be enjoyed; there was no need to question or explain. If the nation had properly fulfilled its own part of the agreement, the prophetical writers would scarcely have even thrown out the fragmentary ideas upon the subject that we can now discover. Thus, for instance, the benefits which God showered down upon an ungrateful people are sometimes ascribed to the excellence of the Patriarchs, and to the necessity which God was under of fulfilling his word of promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Deuteronomy declares that it was not as a reward for righteousness that God had brought the Israelites in to possess Canaan, but partly because of the wickedness of the Canaanite nations, and partly as a confirmation of the oath to the fathers (Deut. ix. 4; compare Genesis xv. 16). In another passage, the author asserts that God's choice of Israel was made because he loved him. In a far later teacher the choice comes dangerously near to caprice. "Was not Esau Jacob's brother; yet I loved Jacob and hated Esau" (Malachi i. 2).[2] Far nobler is the explanation of Exodus xix. 6: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." These words seem almost to imply that the election of Israel is for the good of others as well as for his own. Equally

[1] Compare Deut. xxxii. 8, in the LXX. reading. Dillmann, however (Nu. Dt. Jo., p. 398), denies the originality of this reading, and thinks the whole idea much later. Compare also Stade, Vol. II., p. 239, and Cheyne on Isaiah xxiv. 21.

[2] Contrast with Malachi's hatred of Edom the kindlier feeling of the Deuteronomist, ii. 5, 8, 29, xxiii. 7, and compare Schulz, p. 748, fourth edition.

noble are the words of Genesis xviii. 19, where a moral purpose is clearly assigned to Israel's prerogative[1]: "I have taken notice of him (Abraham) that he may command his children and his household after him so that they keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." In the Babylonian Isaiah there are three reasons given for Israel's primacy. The first is the reason of all things, the glory of God, who by the witnessing of Israel and his apostolic services is exalted among mankind. Secondly, comes Israel itself and its own future grandeur. The Covenant is a gift of grace, bringing a rich guerdon with it. And lastly, the election of Israel, or rather of the servant in whom all that is best in Israel is personified, is for the world's sake. Israel is to be a light to the nations, and God's salvation unto the end of the earth.

I admit that this method of explaining Israel's special relation to God is elsewhere unparalleled; but none the less, isolated as the explanation is, it has triumphed over all lower ideas, and unquestionably represents to-day the ripened doctrine of the synagogue.

The older prophets do not generally concern themselves with other nations, except in so far as these are related to Israel. Here it is that the religious danger comes in. When, for example, one nation is at war with the other, each always thinks itself in the right, and even in modern times demands the special protection of God. In old Israel this natural feeling implied much more. In the last resort it implied that, as Yahveh must be on the side of Israel, in doing injury to Israel the offending nation had also sinned against Yahveh. It is unnecessary to quote examples of so familiar a theme. Even Babylon, the minister of God's wrath upon Judah, was supposed to have sinned against Yahveh, because she not unnaturally imagined that her own strength had wrought the victory. During and after the exile the enmity to the nations deepens. Before that time the prophets mainly, if not exclusively,[2] directed their denunciations against certain definite countries; but afterwards, Ezekiel being here, as in so many other things, the pioneer of later developments, the "nations," as a collective plural, became identified with the enemies of Israel. The Israelites in the later (mainly Maccabean?) psalms are the righteous, the

---

[1] The date of Genesis xviii. 19 and xv. 16 is disputed. See Dillmann, *Genesis*, fifth edition, upon the former passage.

[2] Stade notoriously regards an allusion to "many nations" as an almost certain mark of a later authorship. Compare his essays in his *Zeitschrift* upon Zech. ix.-xiv., Micah iv.-vii., etc., and Ryssel's Micah.

"nations" are the wicked. The Lord's day is to be ushered in by an awful judgment upon the nations, the enemies of God and of his chosen people.

This punishment of the nations which, according to the principle of righteous retribution, must be caused by their sinfulness, is partly accounted for by their hostility to Israel. This, however, is not the only cause which is mentioned. Their very ignorance of the true God is made a reproach against them. Idolatry is not only a sin in Israel, but also in the nations at large. So in a (probably unauthentic) passage in Jeremiah the fury of Yahveh is invoked upon "the nations that know him not, and upon the families that call not on his name." The view that idolatry is conscious apostasy is cleverly elaborated in the Wisdom of Solomon (xiii. and xiv.).

On the other hand Amos, the oldest of the literary prophets, bases the ruin of Moab upon an act of barbarism committed not upon Israel, but upon Edom. To him apparently the nations' ignorance of Yahveh is no offence, though all peoples are under God's immediate providence. "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord. Have I not brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (ix. 7).[1]

How powerful must have been the force of religious inspiration for a prophet in the midst of the strife with Assyria to imagine and predict a time when Assyria, now Israel's foe, and therefore God's, should be called the work of the Lord's hands (Isaiah xix. 25). The tender care for the stranger manifested in all three great strata of Pentateuchal legislation (in spite of Stade's sneer, Vol. I., p. 510, n. 3), together with the varying pictures of the conversion of the nations to the knowledge of God, must always remain sufficient evidence of the largeness of heart and view to which the old Israelite religion could rise. Side by side too with the particularist efforts of Ezra and his school ran another feeling, which found expression partly, perhaps, in directly polemical utterances such as Jonah, Isaiah lvi. 1-8, and Ruth, but also in several of the Psalms, the writers of which were at the same time very probably the faithful followers of the Law. (Compare Psalm lxxxvii., xxii. 28, etc.)

---

[1] The philosophic interpretation of Malachi i. 11 seems to me too strangely unusual to be safely cited as one of the "many moods" of the prophets upon this subject. Would that this doubt did not exist! It should, however, be stated that Kuenen, Stade, and many other scholars accept it, while Cheyne in his article, "The Invisible Church in Hebrew Prophecy" (*Monthly Interpreter*, 1885, p. 77), regards it as "the only tenable" explanation.

It must also be remembered that the universalist side of Judaism is not forgotten even in the Rabbinic literature. The ascription of the cause of the dispersion to the making of proselytes, and the beautiful, if childlike, image of God weeping over the drowned Egyptians, and chiding his angels for their song of triumph, are certainly far overbalanced by other opposite passages; but comparatively few as these universalist sayings may be, they yet kept the light from being quenched, and thus helped forward the coming of the time when the universalism of the prophets, purified from its dross and separated from its merely local and temporary elements, should become an unquestioned constituent of Judaism.

III.

In most books of the Old Testament God and Israel are the two poles of the religious idea; with us they are God and man. This difference is commonly made much of in books on Old Testament theology, but here again we must beware of exaggeration. It is quite true that the relation of God to each human soul, which to us seems the very kernel of religion, is far less accentuated in the older books of the Scriptures than in modern times, or even than in the New Testament. The individual recedes behind the community; it is Israel as an abiding whole which is of first importance, not the single units who appear upon the stage only to vanish from off it. Israel's religious value consists in its continuity and self-identity from age to age. There is something sublime in that complete assimilation of personal interests with those of the community which, as it would now seem, has enabled so many of the Psalmists' personifications to escape detection from the majority of critics up till the present day.[1] Yet, though the command to love God is addressed to Israel as a whole, each single member of the nation is personally bound by the mandate, and though all the Psalms be "national," no Psalmist speaks of sorrows, joys, or desires which he has not himself personally experienced.

At the same time it must be conceded that the personification of a community in antiquity is a very different thing from a mere poetical figure. The solidarity is so real that it

[1] Compare Smend, *Ueber das Ich der Psalmen. Z. A. W.*, 1888, p. 49*ff.* The personification theory is, however, a return to the old homiletic interpretation of the Synagogue. Smend probably rides his hobby too hard. Compare Nowack's judicious remarks in the *Einleitung* to his new edition of Hupfeld's Psalms, p. x., and Schuurman-Stekhoven in *Z. A. W.*, 1889, p. 131.

carries with it most important consequences, and when reflection begins, suggests many a moral problem.

Upon the assumed solidarity of a city or nation the Deity is frequently supposed to act in the earlier periods. This solidarity extends from the dead to the living, and exercises its influence in the direction of mercy as well as in that of punishment. I need not multiply examples. Ten good men would be sufficient to procure forgiveness for all Sodom. For the sins of Manasseh the captivity is predicted upon his descendants. David sins, and his child dies. He is tempted to number Israel, and a plague kills many thousands of the people.[1] Ahaz is penitent, and his punishment is postponed for his son. Another plague is due to Saul's cruelty against the Gibeonites, and the execution of Saul's sons becomes its expiation. Sin accumulates generation by generation. The ages that had to elapse till the Canaanites' measure of guilt was full, and till the fated season of their punishment had arrived, needed the lengthy sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt.[2] Such is the Divine Law. For God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the third and fourth generations of those that hate him. But love extends its influence yet further, for God "shows mercy to the thousandth generation of those that love him."[3] In after years, when the nation was becoming weary and saddened under oppression and trouble, the weight of the fathers' sins seemed a burden too hard to bear. Individualism was awakening, even in its denial. "Our fathers have eaten sour grapes," men said, "and the children's teeth are set on edge." Then came the Deuteronomist, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and they declared that individualism was the proper law of punishment both for God and man.[4] "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear in (Q. P. B.) the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear in the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

---

[1] David is, however, made to suggest that the solidarity ought not to extend beyond his own house: "These sheep what have they done?" (2 Samuel xxiv. 17.)

[2] Compare also 2 Samuel iii. 29; xii. 10; 1 Kings ii. 33; xi. 12; 2 Kings v. 27; viii. 19; x. 30, xiii. 23; 2 Chron. xxi. 14; Isaiah xiv. 21; Jer. xxxii. 18; Lev. xx. 5; Job v. 4; xxi. 19; Psalm lxxix. 8; cix. 14; Neh. i. 6; Daniel ix. 16.

[3] The Deuteronomist is bound to quote the second commandment as he found it, but his own view is not only given in xxiv. 16, but also in vii. 9, 10. God's mercy extends to a thousand generations, but those that hate him he repays to their face.

[4] Yet it must be noted that Jeremiah strictly only asserts that the proverb shall have no force or truth in the Messianic age.

It cannot be said, however, that individualism ever became a significant feature of the old Hebrew religion. Where, as in the Psalms, there is the intensest religious feeling, it is, nevertheless, if critics such as Smend see rightly, experienced in close connection with the whole community. Take Psalm li. for instance. It is quite certain that the Psalmist tells the lessons of his own life; but at the same time verse 6 (Heb.) makes it clear that a national reference is also intended. The wisdom literature is far more individual, and yet its degree of religious intensity is lower. The priestly legislation recognises the solidarity of the community in a marked manner by the institution of the national sin offering. The idea conveyed in the old story of Achan, by which the sin of a single man spreads its fatal influence more and more widely till it taints with the pollution of its guilt the entire people, was only very gradually overcome.

There is indeed no deeper problem in the philosophy of religion than the nature of sin. It is thus no wonder if the usually simple utterances of the Old Testament writers illustrate several different sides of this complex question. Here again there are many moods; whether all the elements of truth can be brought together under a single conception that shall be universally true, and explain equally for each human soul the nature of his sin, may however be doubted. Theories of sin, such as the theory of St. Paul, are not, even if true for many, necessarily true for all.

Apart from the allegory in Genesis ii., there is no theory of the origin of sin to be found in the Old Testament, and that chapter seems to have had no influence whatever upon later teaching. Man who is flesh and not spirit is liable to error and wrong doing. "There is no man that sinneth not." Such is the general view. Jeremiah, indeed, thought that there was an inherent deceitfulness about the heart, a sore sickness which God alone could cure (Jer. xvii. 9, 14; x. 23). The direful consequences of sin led to the mistaken[1] view that there was something almost supernatural about it, as if sin were a kind of eternal power which God may use as a snare to bring about a greater punishment. The tendency towards solidarity comes in once more. The sins of one generation seemed a force that created sinfulness in the next, one link of sin bringing with it another. Traces

[1] Theologians seem sometimes to speak of sin as Realist philosophers used to speak of kinds—as something real over and above the particular sins of individuals. Unless we believe in a devil, this idea is surely a fiction. Yet Holtzmann (Stade II., p. 304), commenting on Sirach xvii. 20 seems to accept it.

of these views, together with remonstrances against them, are to be found. Thus to an early writer in the books of Samuel the sin of David in numbering the people seemed due to the direct temptation of God (2 Samuel xxiv. 1). The Chronicler long afterwards was willing to believe that the sin was caused by supernatural influence; the agent however is no longer God, but Satan (1 Chronicles xxi. 1). The hardening of Pharaoh's heart and of Sihon's (Deut. ii. 30) is scarcely in point, because it was done for the benefit of Israel (compare Joshua xi. 20). But an interesting verse in Isaiah lxiii. is very significant, as showing the perplexity into which long-lasting affliction, half deserved and half wanton, had thrown many a troubled spirit in the exile period. "O Lord, why dost thou make us to err from thy ways, and harden our hearts from thy fear." The text of Isaiah lxiv. 5 is unfortunately corrupt, but seems to imply the idea that, by its long continuance from age to age, sin had become a kind of chain in which the wrath of God had fettered the community, and from the bonds of which they could not shake themselves free. More simple is the expression in Lamentations v. 7. "Our fathers have sinned and are not, and we have borne their iniquities." And even the prediction in Lev. xxvi. (an exilic chapter with marked affinities to Ezekiel) accepts this sombre belief: "They that are left of you shall pine away for their iniquity in your enemies' lands; *and also for the iniquities of their fathers with them* (*i.e.*, as well as of themselves, Q.P.B.) shall they pine away." Ezekiel, on the other hand, whose strong accentuation of man's free capacity to turn from good to bad and from bad to good brings other difficulties in its train, rebukes with a noble scorn the dark superstition that the curse of God is the origin of sin.[1]

His contemporaries had used the same argument as we find in Isaiah lxiii., "If our transgressions and our sins are upon us and we pine away in them, how then should we live" (xxxiii. 10). Ezekiel replies that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked: a man has only to turn from his evil ways that he may live. The prophet is clearly of opinion, first, that there is no divine or satanic power which impels a man to sin, and secondly that in the moral sphere each man can act independently of his community, and even of his parents. There is no constraining force which induces sin and punishment apart from a man's own will. Whereas the popular view, represented also in the quotation from Leviticus,

[1] But compare Ezekiel xxiv. 23.

regards the sin of a community as a sort of spiritual snowball; sin begets sin, and the amount is accumulated generation after generation, till at last it seems impossible for the bearers of this heaped up store of iniquity to rid themselves of the burden. Ezekiel repudiates this doctrine; according to his teaching in the 18th and 33rd chapters of his book each man starts his life with a blank judgment sheet; his fathers' sins are not laid to his account, and they do not lessen his capacity for a righteous life.

Into the nature of sin the Hebrew writers and preachers enquired as little curiously as they did into its origin. Sin to them is simply a transgression of God's will or commandments. To the prophets God's injunctions are twofold: they forbid idolatry, they enjoin morality. The Law extended the range of sin much more widely: to eat fat is as much a sin as to commit adultery. Hence the introduction of the Law developed the idea of "secret" or "unconscious sins," errors into which a man might fall without his knowledge, a conception entirely foreign to the earlier prophets. But with this increase in the range of sin, and under the current conception that misfortune was equivalent to punishment, it became all the more usual in times of trouble to bewail the iniquities the commission of which must have caused the distress.[1] A different mood, on the other hand, is discernible in some of the Maccabean psalms; there the "Saints," the חסידים, in whose mouth is a hymn to God, in whose hand a two-edged sword (cxlix.), are not conscious of any defiling guilt. They complain, "All this is come upon us, yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant." Not for their sins, but yet "for God's sake," are they "killed all the day long" (xliv. 22).

How is a sinful man or a sinful community to become free from sin? Here, again, there are divers moods to be recorded. The primary view is that man must and can turn from the wickedness of his ways and rid himself of his sin. "Wash you, make you clean," cries Isaiah, "Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well." The Prophet does not imagine that there is anything to prevent his hearers from "ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well," if they please. And exhortations of this kind are not foreign to any period of the prophetical ministry. Every preacher will naturally urge his audience to struggle for their own amendment, and none would deny that such struggles may be crowned with success. At the same time

[1] Compare Daniel ix. 5; Neh. i. 6; Psalm cvi. 6.

the idea that it is in man's unaided power to pass from sin to virtue was to some extent checked in certain minds and at certain periods by two important considerations. The first of these we have noticed already. It is that each unit is one of a community and shares in that community's sin, and perhaps also in the sin of its forefathers. The weight of sin which the individual feels attached to himself is thereby greatly increased, and the difficulty to be rid of it is also correspondingly augmented. Secondly, the conception of sin was deepened, and passed into that of sinfulness, that is to say, it seemed to some minds as if the sinful nature which had been produced by sin could not be cleansed by the human will alone. When the set of the soul was directed towards wrongdoing, it could not, by its own effort, unhelped by an outside and diviner power, be turned in the contrary direction. Hence, perhaps, it may be explained that we find traces of a feeling that the thorough eradication of sin must be God's work and not man's. This view is chiefly prominent in passages dating from the exile, and dealing with the messianic age, as if the writers felt that the spiritual regeneration of Israel, as well as the material regeneration of nature, must need the special intervention of God. The illustrative passages come from Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and are all very much of the same kind. They are often placed in curious juxtaposition with other passages in which the same spiritual changes in the heart, which in the first series are ascribed to God, are there demanded from the unaided effort of man. Jeremiah (xxiv. 7) predicts that God will give Israel one heart to know him; he will cleanse them from their iniquity (xxxiii. 8), and put his teaching in their inward parts and write it on their hearts (xxxi. 33). Ezekiel also foretells the granting of one heart and a new spirit, a time when the stony heart shall be removed and a heart of flesh given in its place. Then shall the people be able to walk in the ordinances of their God (xi. 19, 20). The new spirit is God's spirit, the spirit of true life (xxxvi. 26; xxxvii. 14). Yet, at the end of his eighteenth chapter, he urges the people to get this new heart for themselves: "Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Are we to assume that the Prophet passed from one to another of these utterances without being aware of any contrariety between them, and that at one time the one, and at a second time the other of two apparently, but no really, conflicting sides of a complex truth was more vividly present to his

mind? With these passages in Ezekiel and Jeremiah may be compared the messianic prediction of Zephaniah, which takes a wider range than Israel. "Then will I turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent." In a verse of Deuteronomy, the aid of God seems promised to crown the human effort with a more glorious issue. "If," so runs the prediction in xxx. 4 (a chapter clearly considerably later than the main bulk of the Deuteronomy of Josiah) "thou shalt return" (*i.e.*, in the land of captivity) "unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice with all thine heart and with all thy soul," "then (verse 6) the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy seed to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

All these passages are messianic. But there are a few others, mainly in the Psalms, which show that even for the present and every day life of the community, the divine help was thought by some (in the post-exilic period chiefly?) to be needful for the living of a good life and for the conquest over sin. "Shew me thy way," "teach me to do thy will," are not unfrequent prayers in the Psalter (compare xxv. 5, xxvii. 11, cxliii. 10, cxxxix. 24, etc. 1 Ch. xxix. 18, 19, is also of value). More significant still is the bidding, "let me not wander from thy command," or "hold thou me up, and I shall be safe" (cxix. 10, 117). The double aspect of the human relation with God is mystically expressed in Psalm lxiii. 9: "My soul followeth hard after thee: thy right hand upholdeth me." Noticeable are the prayers in Jeremiah and Lamentations: "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved" (Jeremiah xvii. 14). "Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we will return" (Lamentations v. 21; compare Jeremiah xxxi. 19; Psalm lxxx. and lxxxv. 5).[1]

It is a development of the doctrine implied in the prayer of Lamentations if we find it stated in Jeremiah, "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not for man that walketh to direct his steps" (x. 23); or again in

[1] Upon Psalm lxxxv. 5 the Midrash, in a passage quoted and improved upon by Dr. Frankl in one of his sermons, moralises thus: "The sons of Korah said, 'How long wilt thou say (to Israel), Turn, O backsliding children (Jeremiah iii. 14); and shall Israel say to thee, Turn thou first, as it is said, Return, O Lord, how long (Psalm xc. 13), and wilt thou say to Israel, Nay, turn ye first, [as it is said, O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God (Hosea xiv. 1)?]; thou wilt not turn by thyself, and we will not turn by ourselves, but let us both turn together and at once, as it is said, Turn thou with us, O God of our salvation.'" Frankl, *Fest- und Gelegenheits-Predigten*, 1888, p. 31. The Midrash (Tillim, *ad loc.*) translates שׁוּבֵנוּ "Turn thou with us."

Proverbs, "Man's goings are of the Lord; how can a man then understand his own way?" (xx. 24). Here the cry for help that meets us in Lamentations seems turning into a kind of restrictive fatalism. What is true without exaggeration in living experience seems onesided and doubtful when twisted into a theory. This could even happen in the case of the noble Psalm li., with its almost unique prayer for the help of God's holy spirit in the struggle with sin. The view that sin is not to be overcome without that divine aid has never been expressed more purely or with intenser conviction. "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a firm spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy holy spirit from me."

The labels "good" and "sinful" are applied in different ages to different deeds. The pre-prophetic period (*i.e.* the period before Amos), though we may, I think rightly, refuse to believe that Stade's too depreciatory estimate of it is correct,[1] possessed, even in the minds of zealous Yahveh worshippers such as Elijah, a lower ideal than that of an Isaiah or a Micah. Thus the cruelties of Jehu, which God is made to sanction and approve in 2 Kings x. 30, are become such an abomination to Hosea, that for their sake the whole kingdom of Israel is to be visited with ruin. In a tradition respecting Samuel, the utter destruction of the Amalekites is the divine command, deflection from which is a grievous sin; in Jonah, the very cattle, the saving of which Samuel censures in God's name, are a reason for God to spare the Ninevites from destruction.[2]

A variety of mood of extreme importance is roughly characterised by the opposition between the prophets and the Law in regard to "external" and "internal" religion, or more accurately in their respective attitudes towards ceremonial observances. To estimate this difference truly, and yet without exaggeration, it is necessary to remember the date at which the Law became an important factor in the religious life of Israel.

Up to the time when Deuteronomy was accepted by Josiah

---

[1] *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 573.

[2] Compare too the different views of the monarchy in 1 Samuel. To the "theocratic" chronicler the kingdom was a desertion from God and a grievous sin; to the older narrator it was a meritorious unification of the tribes. Though usually the kingdom of the Ten Tribes is regarded as the illegitimate result of a rebellion against the divinely appointed house of David, one passage at least from the pen of an Ephraimite still records for us the other side of the question. "Hear, Yahveh, the voice of Judah, and bring him back unto his people" (Deut. xxxiii. 17, with Dillmann's commentary).

as the binding law for the individual and the state, the teachers of Israel under the monarchy may have shown some respect towards the holy customs of antiquity, but were unaware of the existence of any authoritative code claiming a divine sanction. It does not appear as if the small Book of the Covenant (Exodus xxi.-xxiii.), or the laws contained in Exodus xxxiv. were ever publicly recognised as binding till they were absorbed and modified by Deuteronomy. Thus, up till the date of that book's composition and publication, the prophets, that is such men as Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, sought no other or higher guide for their teaching than their own inspiration. Jeremiah, a contemporary of the Deuteronomist, seems to take up a varying attitude towards his book. At first he may have hoped that great things would follow from its adoption. The Covenant mentioned in his eleventh chapter, disobedience against which is threatened with a curse, seems to refer to Deuteronomy.[1] But very shortly the prophet, in his zeal for the unattainable ideal, must have perceived that the compromise of Deuteronomy produced no better fruits than the unalloyed moral teaching of his prophetic predecessors. No prophet has spoken out more vehemently against the value and even the validity of sacrifices than Jeremiah. "The ark of the covenant" is to be forgotten, and never made again; the temple of the Lord is no safeguard against the coming ruin. Contrast this with Isaiah's secure trust in the indestructibility of Jerusalem and of the temple upon Zion. There is not so much about sacrifices in Deuteronomy as in the later priestly legislation, but yet the perfect Israelite of Deuteronomy could certainly not neglect these outward exhibitions of piety. However we may try to soften the meaning of Jeremiah's words, they sound strangely in contrast with many a verse of Josiah's code. (Deuteronomy, be it remembered, represents its legislation as Mosaic.) "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." How utterly impossible such a sentence would be in any writer after Nehemiah. Ezekiel, here as elsewhere, represents an intermediate stage between the earlier prophets and the later Law. He does not refer to an authoritative Mosaic code, but he lays stress upon matters of ritual and purity, and devotes many chapters of his book to new laws for future use respecting the priests, the temple

[1] See Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. 56, 167; Marti, *Der Prophet Jeremia von Anatot*, p. 17.

and the sacrifices.[1] After the return, while we find Haggai urging the rebuilding of the sanctuary, Zechariah, high as is the place he assigns to Joshua, the high priest, gives the true prophet's answer to the enquiry as to the fasts and their continuance. Some twenty years after Zechariah comes the work of Ezra and his school, the introduction of the Law and its perfervid adoption as the final and authoritative code of God. How the Law or Pentateuch, for all the parts of the so-called five books of Moses were now at last welded together into a single whole, was able so admirably to win the devoted affection of the people at large; how it became gradually identified with the entire religion of Israel, and unquestionably accepted as Mosaic from end to end, this is not the place to enquire. But the final exhortation of Malachi represents the accomplishment of this process, and with its entirely new appeal to the written Mosaic Law, unnamed before by the whole series of Malachi's predecessors it sounds the death knell of prophecy. The written Law of God rendered the spoken message from him unnecessary.

The Pentateuch, as we now possess it, is a kind of compromise between the natural desire of man for an external embodiment of religion, and the prophet's too difficult identification of it with the doing of justice, the love of "mercy," and the walking humbly before God. The dangers to which the Law led cannot here be pointed out, nor, on the other hand, can I attempt a defence of the legal school from the unfair attacks to which they are too commonly subjected by Christian theologians. Levitical or Rabbinical religion is a theory of religion, and is, therefore, not without its moral risks. Pauline religion is also a theory of religion, and has equally its moral dangers. The religion of the prophets and the religion of Jesus are not theories; they are natural, immediate and inspired. But by the masses of the people theories of religion are most easily followed. Hence the success of Rabbinism and Paulinism alike. But just as it is unfair to judge Paulinism from the excesses of Antinomians, so is it equally unfair to judge Rabbinism from the bad Pharisees who were attacked by Jesus.[2]

A few examples of spiritual moods that have their roots in the Law are not without their interest. Professor Smend

---

[1] Notice how the tests of a good life include at least one matter of *Sitte* elevated into a mark of outward religious purity. Ezekiel xviii. 6; compare Lev. xviii. 19; xx. 18.

[2] Whether they were as bad as Jesus in his zeal imagined may however be doubted; similarly in the case of the "false prophets" and Jeremiah. Compare also Wellhausen's *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, p. 127, one of this author's innumerable brilliant and telling passages.

has recently pointed out the important place occupied by the temple in a large portion of the Psalter.[1] It is curious to note how some of the noblest spiritual passages in the Psalms are connected with the love of the temple upon the hill of Zion. All such psalms are doubtless post-exilic. (Sometimes Professor Smend has, I think, narrowed the House of God too exclusively to the material temple, where a higher meaning is intended, but even these passages start from the temple made by hands, though they rise to the larger sanctuary that is not.[2]) Psalms lxv., lxxxiv., lxiii., and xlii., for example, should be studied in this connection. Psalm cxix. and the second portion of Psalm xix. are interesting specimens of the high spiritual influence which the Law could exercise upon many a pious believer. How entirely these Psalms demolish the theory of the bondage of the Law. And the Talmud, if the Rabbins had only been more poetical, would assuredly have been full of similar hymns. The true disciple of the Rabbins has always managed to transfigure the most external and uninteresting prescripts of the Law with a spiritual light, which no one, at all infected with the spirit of criticism, can ever hope to see or even adequately to understand.[3]

V.

A simple piety even at the end of the nineteenth century can find all the religious ideas which are precious to it within the Old Testament literature. Those who are unable to achieve a similar amount of *Hineinlesen* must content themselves with the view that no book can contain complete religious perfection, because religion, like all other partly human creations, is subject to the law of development. They will not, on the other hand, foolishly attempt to run counter to the highest wisdom of mankind in spiritual things by seeking to minimise the value of conceptions which in their fulness are foreign to the Old Testament thinkers, or which perchance have been largely accentuated in one form or another by an alien or younger creed. On the contrary any germs of these ideas, now precious to ourselves as well as to

---

[1] Smend, *Ueber die Bedeutung des Jerusalemischen Tempels*, etc., *Studien und Kritiken*, 1884, p. 704.

[2] Compare "Mystic Passages in the Psalms," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. I., p. 143.

[3] Another curious instance of a mood that lies between "legalism" and "prophetism" is a passage in the post-exilic Joel. "Turn ye to me with all your hearts, *and with fasting and with weeping, and with smiting of the breast.*" But the next verse begins, "Rend your heart, and not your garments."

civilisation at large, that we may discover in the Old Testament scriptures, we shall hail with satisfaction.

It is a false charge brought against the Old Testament religion that it is eudæmonistic or utilitarian. All theistic religions must be to some extent eudæmonistic, because they must all believe that God in the last resort proportions reward to desert, according to some law of justice. It makes no difference whether the reward is expected in this world or in another. The eudæmonism is just the same. Jesus would not have said "Rejoice and be exceeding glad when men revile you and persecute you," if he could not have added in the same breath, "for great is your reward in heaven." On the other hand the virtue and duty of self-sacrifice are not so plainly taught in the Old Testament scriptures as we should teach them in any hand-book of practical ethics which we might compile to-day.

The comparative absence of this teaching is connected with the general view that suffering and misfortune are always evils, and this view again is doubtless partly dependent upon the want of any belief in a happy or compensatory future life. Yet even here there are indications of another "mood." That suffering may discipline is indicated more than once. "Happy," says Eliphaz, "is the man whom God correcteth" (Job v. 17). "My son," so runs the exhortation of the wise man, "despise not the chastening of the Lord; neither be weary of his correction, for whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (Proverbs iii. 11, 12; compare Deut. viii. 5). "Happy is the man whom thou chastenest," exclaims one Psalmist, and another, trained, as we must remember, under the Law, is glad for his sorrow, because "before I was afflicted I went astray, but now I have kept thy word" (Psalm cxix. 67, 71; compare Lam. iii. 27). Sacrifice for religion's sake was illustriously shown in the days of Antiochus and the revolt of the Maccabees; when, as the Psalmist complains, God seemed to have cast off and put to shame, and yet for his sake his faithful servants were "killed all the day long" (Psalm xliv. 22). And, finally, the conception of labour, suffering and death for the sake of others is luminously set forth in the picture of the suffering servant who takes upon himself the sins of others. No passage in any literature has had, I should imagine, an influence at all comparable to that of the fifteen verses in Isaiah which describe the servant's office and suffering, his death and his triumph. It always seems to me an unfortunate thing that the ideas contained in that chapter and in the few cognate verses elsewhere (xlii. 1-7; xlix. 1-7;

l. 4-6) should have been so strangely neglected by all later stages of Judaism, and that it should have been reserved for the founder and teachers of Christianity to raise them to their proper level of importance among the spiritual possessions of mankind.

The growth of the doctrine, both of the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul, must be sought in the large blank page between the Old Testament and the New. It is only the beginnings of these beliefs which we can find in the older Scriptures. These beginnings, such as the outlook upon an indefinitely prolonged life in communion with God, as we find it in Psalms xlix., lxxii., and xvi., the doubtful allusions in Ecclesiastes, the fuller teaching of a resurrection in Daniel, and the prophecy of death's annihilation and the quickening of the dead in those four mysterious and very late chapters of Isaiah (xxiv.-xxvii.),[1] need not be quoted here in detail. When hopes and glimpses such as these met and mingled with the Platonic teaching of immortality, it was not unlikely, strange though the union was, that spiritual fruit of costly price would be its issue. And such fruit we find in that curious product of Jewish-Alexandrian culture, the Wisdom of Solomon. There, as Professor Cheyne has pointed out, the very knowledge which to the Psalmist is a reason for humbly remembering the shortness and frailty of life, is to the Alexandrian sage *ρίζα ἀθανασίας*, a root of immortality. That heroic self-abandonment[2] of the Old Testament trust in God receives in his book its final justification. *Δίκαιων δὲ ψυχαὶ ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ, . . . ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης.* "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, . . . their hope is full of immortality."

C. G. Montefiore.

---

[1] Compare Smend, *Anmerkungen zu Jesaiah*, 24-27. *Z. A. W.*, 1884, p. 161*ff*. Vatke, *Biblische Theologie*, page 550, note 2.

[2] Compare Delitzsch on Psalm xxxix. 8.

ARE THE JEWS A NATION TO-DAY?

UNDER the title of "the National Idea in Judaism" in a previous issue of the *Quarterly*, Lady Magnus essays to prove "that those who would dissociate the national from the religious, or the religious from the national element in Judaism, attempt the impossible." It will be the arrogant purpose of this article to "attempt the impossible." Lady Magnus' mode of treatment is the historical. Someone has said that you can prove anything from history, and in support of that opinion, I, too, will look at the question historically, to show what different impressions the same pictures make on different minds.

I.

We find the early growth of the Jewish religion and nation so completely interwoven that it is difficult to separate the purely national from the purely religious. The Mosaic Code indiscriminately enjoins duties touching political economy, civil justice, domestic industries, local hygiene, and the Ten Commandments. Church and State were one, and it is difficult and sometimes impossible to point out just where religion left off and politics began. The earliest Jewish government was a theocracy. National conquests were treated as religious conquests—a species of Holy War, the "extermination of the heathen" being principal and the acquisition of territory subordinate. Joshua, the soldier, who made Israel a nation, was the logical successor of Moses the law-giver, who gave Israel its religion.

Eli, the judge (a sort of chieftain), was also the priest; and Samuel, the *prophet*, anointed the first *king*. King Saul was deposed on religious grounds for not putting to death Amalek, the national and hence the religious enemy. To King David is ascribed part of the early liturgy, and King Solomon builds the first Temple.

The prophets strangely intermingled ethics and politics. Their sterling appeals for righteousness constantly branched off into local government matters.

Even the Messianic idea which later became so prominent a religious doctrine in Judaism, and more especially in Christianity, was at first simply the hope for an ideal ruler—a second King David.

After the Restoration the High Priest held the temporal power. The fall of the nation seemed for the moment as though it necessarily must involve the fall of the religion; and the ninth of Ab has been observed for 1800 years as a day of *religious* humiliation.

Those who survived and did not entirely lose hope based that hope simply on the regaining of Judæa, and regarded part of their religious duties in a condition of temporary suspension. The Bar-Cochba insurrection was more than a struggle for a lost kingdom, and Rabbi Akiba's participation was consistent with the religious undercurrent of the memorable tragedy.

When that last desperate effort failed, and Hadrian made the iron enter their souls; when "Jewish disabilities" began, and it was considered a misfortune to be a Jew, then the hope of regaining Judæa became the intensest yearning of their intense natures. But as time wore on, the possibility of attaining that hope by natural means, or the course of war, became more and more visionary. Only by some supernatural intervention at some distant period could they picture the hope for restoration—only by some mighty upheaval of the universe. Only the "hand of the Lord can accomplish this thing." Thus the old hope deepened into a conviction and became a doctrine of Judaism.

When driven from city to city, and from land to land, with the mob shouting their Hep! hep! after them, their deepest consolation was that all this condition was temporary. Sooner or later the Lord would claim his peculiar people and "speedily rebuild Jerusalem." No service now entered the Ritual without the expression of this hope. "This year we are slaves, but next year we shall be free." To-day it pervades the entire orthodox liturgy, and although their complete toleration in many countries enables them to await this restoration with a good deal of equanimity, still the belief prevails that the Jews are a nation yet, still in this condition of temporary suspension, still vaguely expecting to return to Jerusalem.

II.

This brief survey might seem to favour Lady Magnus' theory that "it is impossible to dissociate the national from the religious in Judaism," and may strengthen the inference that we are yet a nation. Unfortunately for any such opinions, that complete interweaving of religion and nation is not peculiar to Jews and Judaism; it is common to all antiquity. The evidence proves too much. We might state as a general rule that national boundaries and religious boundaries were identical, and hence that there were about

as many religions as nations, and that the death of a nation generally meant the death of its religion.

Gods played as large a part in the Trojan war as men. War and peace were decided by religious oracles, and national policies were generally in the hands of the priests. Not merely Israel, but many early nationalities were theocracies. Socrates was put to death by the *civil* authorities for denying the gods of Greece. Treason was heresy, while patriotism and piety were synonymous terms. A subject's obeisance partook of religious significance, and eventually a Roman emperor became, by virtue of his position, a Roman god. When Persia overthrew Babylon, the Babylonian gods fell as a logical consequence. That the Israelites continued to observe a religion other than that of their conquerors and governors shows that the work of differentiation had commenced. For prior to this time religion as a distinct and separate institution was not only not known, it would not even have been understood.

This strong union of religion and nation is true even later than antiquity. For Christianity was accepted in Europe by nations, not by individuals, and when Protestantism was introduced, the particular creed of the princes was to decide the creed of the principality, and each of the European nations created for itself that form of Protestantism best suited to its *national* peculiarities. And prior to this time the Empire of Rome came to be identified with the realm of the Church. The theory survives to-day in the paradoxical phrase, Roman Catholic.

The history of Judaism is not more closely interwoven with that of Judæa than is the history of England with that of the English Church. Ever since the time of Henry VIII. the sovereign has been head of the Church. From that time till the reign of Queen Anne the great national question was the religious question, and then the creed of the nation was declared by Act of Parliament. Opposition to the dethronement of James II. came from the belief in the "divine right of kings." The foundation of the Irish Question has always been and always will remain a religious problem.

Thus we see that the fact that Judaism was early associated with a nationality is no reason why it need always be associated with a nationality as an integral part of itself, since that union was part of a larger truth. That our religion and nation are to-day separated is the best reply to the question whether Judaism could exist independently. We do not find it necessary to carry about with us in maturity all the appurtenances of our childhood. When manhood comes they may be hindrances instead of helps. The embodiment

of a nation may have been necessary for the growth of the religious idea. But once developed, it was able to throw aside the chrysalis coat of nationality and soar forth free.

III.

To the question then, Are we a nation to-day? I answer emphatically, No! What remnant of Jewish government and political power remained during the existence of the Second Temple was completely overthrown in the year 70. The country that Jews once owned belongs to others, and has been out of Jewish hands ever since Rome became an Empire. What has not intervened since then? Empires and nations have risen and changed hands and fallen time and again since the plough was passed over the ruins of Herod's Temple. Jews to-day are found in all countries, and are citizens in many, and in some instances they know no other, and care to know no other nation than the land of their birth. A nation forsooth, without a land, without an acknowledged government (for even the ecclesiastical chiefs are only local), without a geographical or even a linguistic unity, since Hebrew is a living tongue only to a few! Is not this harder to conceive than the farce of the Holy Roman Empire? Could the Poles to-day in Austria, Russia and Germany, call themselves a nation? And yet the partition of their land is an event comparatively of yesterday.

All people might find themselves belonging to different nationalities if they only go back to sufficiently distant ancestors. Americans are anything but Americans. The English are British as far as they are Britons, Germans to the extent that they are Saxons, and French in as far as they are Normans. It may be an interesting question to ask to what extent the past grants possession to the present. What title has a poor man to money that once was his? What title have we to Judæa by virtue of the fact that our distant ancestors in antiquity once owned that land? Are we a nation because our distant ancestors were a nation? What objection to some ghostly Roman Empire arising, and on the strength of our ancient tributary condition imposing modern procurators?

IV.

That Israel is at present a nation *de jure*, and will in the future again be a nation *de facto*, is an idea that has partly been kept alive among Israelites by Gentiles. It is, in a measure, a result of Gentile interpretation of the prophets. It is not fair either to the prophets or to the truth to attempt

to translate poetic vision into prosaic fact. The ideal pictures of a future national restoration should be treated as ideal pictures, and nothing more. But even when literally interpreted we can find later conditions in Jewish history as fulfilment of these visions. Not that we approve this method of explaining the prophets. The Jewish prophets were not oracles, or wizards, or fortune-tellers. So to read their words is to degrade them, and to deprive them of their spirituality. The Jewish prophets were zealous workers for God and righteousness; gifted with that burning eloquence that can stir whole masses. Let us hope we have long passed the time for using the Bible as a fetish-book in which to read the future. The attempt to stretch the Scriptures, in order to verify favourite dogmas, is one of the distinctions between Judaism and Christianity. "And he went down into Egypt, in order that the word might be fulfilled, And I brought my son out of Egypt," etc., etc. So we must needs think ourselves a nation, and proceed to purchase Palestine to make ourselves a nation, "in order to fulfil," etc. These puerile attempts to help out Providence would be ludicrous if they were not preposterous. Their logical consequence is mysticism. Lawrence Oliphant, the most sanguine advocate of the national theory, was, among other things, a mystic. I say that this theory has been in a measure encouraged among us by Gentiles. Emma Lazarus was fired with it by George Eliot. But George Eliot was a Positivist, and therefore did not advocate the Restoration on Biblical grounds, or by virtue of religious conviction. She saw the belief smouldering among the Jews, and thought its realisation would be a magnificent goal for a race she so much admired. Would it? This shall be our last consideration.

V.

In summing up the final consequences of this doctrine, we find that one of the results of calling the Jews a national, as well as a religious community, has been to confuse the duties and the relations of both. Some call themselves Jews because they are born Jews while repudiating all religious obligations; others remain within the fold simply by virtue of belonging to the Jewish race. Thus our fold is filled with a large number who have practically renounced our faith, who may be agnostic, perhaps even atheistic, but who claim to belong to us on the strength of the old national delusion. Thus the religious obligations of the unreflecting masses become confused and clouded, and the demoralising effect of the non-observers is felt throughout our entire ranks.

The national theory is further disadvantageous in that it keeps alive a retrogressive principle, *i.e.*, the union of Church and State. This remnant of the past is slowly dying out in most civilised countries, and those who can read the times have no doubt of the tendency. It is part of the history of the growth of religious liberty; and the complete toleration that is being gradually realised in nations having a State religion indicates the beginning of the end. As long as a particular creed is associated indissolubly with many offices of distinction and honour, just so long is religious sincerity impeded and the ideal religious condition delayed. Why, then, should we strive to keep alive a decaying principle whose merits are bound up with primitive civilisation, and in whose death lies the key to religious advancement? It is only with reference to that idea that a Goldwin Smith can find an excuse for asking the rhetorical question, "Can Jews be Patriots"?

It has another injurious influence. The confusion of the two ideas, the religious and the national, has resulted in grafting many national observances on to Judaism itself. Thus local customs have been elevated to the sanctity of religious duties, and by that very fact have degraded the really religious. Many observances, obsolete in their application and secular at best, have crept into our faith by virtue of the national doctrine, and have discredited, and in some cases concealed, the really spiritual. This is, perhaps, one of the gravest evils under which we labour to-day; and in consequence of the discouraging aspect given to our faith by this mass of ceremonial many are drifting from the fold.

Finally, it throws us open to the accusation of tribalism. As long as we shut up our religion within national boundaries, the Gentiles have a right to reproach us with striving for ourselves alone. Of all religions ours is most worthy to become universal. Its rational doctrines appeal to the most enlightened; it exceeds in breadth, liberality, and withal in simplicity, all the recognised faiths; its ethics are all-comprehensive, embracing "the whole duty of man," and its place in history entitles it to be called, not merely *a* religion, but—religion. This is, in fact, our traditional position—long ago acknowledged by all the nations—to be the teachers of religion. This, if anything, is our mission, of which we talk so much but do so little. The time has surely arrived to cut our faith loose from all political and territorial shackles, to stand forward as a religion of humanity, as such to go down to posterity, as such to decide our destiny.

MAURICE H. HARRIS.

"MARRIAGES ARE MADE IN HEAVEN."

"The Omnipresent," said a Rabbi, "is occupied in making marriages." The levity of the saying lies in the ear of him who hears it; for by marriages, the speaker meant all the wondrous combinations of the universe, whose issue makes our good and evil.

GEORGE ELIOT.

THE proverb that I have set at the head of these lines is popular in every language of Europe. Need I add that a variant may be found in Chinese? The Old Man of the Moon unites male and female with a silken, invisible thread, and they cannot afterwards be separated, but are destined to become man and wife. The remark of a Rabbi, quoted in *Daniel Deronda*, carries the proverb back apparently to a Jewish origin; and it is indeed more than probable that the Rabbinical literature is the earliest source to which this piece of folk-philosophy can be traced.

George Eliot's Rabbi was José bar Chalafta, and his remark was made to a lady, possibly a Roman matron of high quality, in Sepphoris. Rabbi José was evidently an adept in meeting the puzzling questions of women, for as many as sixteen interviews between him and "matrons" are recorded in Agadic literature. Whether because prophetic of its subsequent popularity, or for some other reason, this particular dialogue in which Rabbi José bore so conspicuous a part is repeated in the Midrash Rabbah alone not less than four times, besides appearing in other Midrashim. It will be as well then to reproduce the passage in a summarised form, for it may be fairly described as the *locus classicus* on the subject.

"How long," she asked, "did it take God to create the world?" and Rabbi José informed her that the time occupied was six days. "What has God been doing since that time?" continued the matron. "The Holy One," answered the Rabbi, "has been sitting in heaven arranging marriages." "Indeed!" she replied, "I also could do as much myself. I have thousands of slaves, and could marry them off in couples in a single hour. It is easy enough." "I hope that you will find it so," said Rabbi José; "in heaven it is thought as difficult as the dividing of the Red Sea." He then took his departure, while

she assembled one thousand men-servants and as many maid-servants, and, marking them off in pairs, ordered them all to marry. On the day following this wholesale wedding, the poor victims came to their mistress in a woeful plight. One had a broken leg, another a black eye, a third a swollen nose; all were suffering from different ailments, but with one voice they joined in the cry, "Lady, unmarry us again!" Then the matron sent for Rabbi José, admitted that she had underrated the delicacy and difficulty of match-making, and wisely resolved to leave heaven for the future to do its own work in its own way.

The moral conveyed by this story may seem, however, to have been idealised by George Eliot almost out of recognition. This is hardly the case. Genius penetrates into the heart, even from a casual glance at the face of things. Though it is unlikely that she had ever seen the full passages in the Midrash to which she was alluding, yet her insight was not at fault. For the saying that God is occupied in making marriages, is, in fact, associated in some passages of the Midrash with the far wider problems of man's destiny, with the universal effort to explain the inequalities of fortune and the changes with which the future is heavy.

Rabbi José's proverbial explanation of connubial happiness was not merely a *bon mot* invented on the spur of the moment to silence an awkward questioner. It was a firm conviction, which finds expression in more than one quaint utterance, but also in more than one matter-of-fact assertion. To take the latter first, "Rabbi Phineas in the name of R. Abbahu said, We find in the Torah, in the Prophets, and in the Holy Writings, evidence that a man's wife is chosen for him by the Holy One, blessed be he. Whence do we deduce it in the Torah? From Genesis xxiv. 50: *Then Laban and Bethuel answered and said* (in reference to Rebecca's betrothal to Isaac): *The thing proceedeth from the Lord.* In the Prophets it is found in Judges xiv. 4 (where it is related how Samson wished to mate himself with a woman in Timnath, of the daughters of the Philistines): *But his father and mother knew not that it was of the Lord.* In the Holy Writings the same may be seen, for it is written (Proverbs xix. 14): *House and riches are the inheritance of fathers, but a prudent wife is from the Lord.*" Many years ago, a discussion was carried on in the columns of *Notes and Queries* concerning the origin of the saying round which my present desultory jottings are centred. One correspondent, with unconscious plagiarism, suggested that the maxim was derived from Proverbs xix. 14.

Here we may, for a moment, pause to consider whether any

parallels exist in other ancient literatures to the belief in heaven-made marriages. It appears in English as early as Shakespeare—

> God, the best maker of all marriages,
> Combine your hearts in one. HENRY V., v. 2.

This, however, is too late to throw any light on its origin. With a little ingenuity one might, perhaps, torture some such notion out of certain fantastic sentences of Plato. In the *Symposium*, however (§ 192), God is rather represented as putting obstacles in the way of the union of fitting lovers, in consequence of the wickedness of mankind. When men become, by their conduct, reconciled with God, they may find their true loves. Astrological divinations on the subject are certainly common enough in Eastern stories; a remarkable instance will be given a little later on. At the present day, Lane tells us, the numerical values of the letters composing the names of the two parties to the marriage-contract are added separately, and one of the totals is subtracted from the other. If the remainder is uneven, the inference drawn is favourable; but if even, the reverse. The pursuit of *Gematria* is apparently not limited to Jews. Such methods, however, hardly illustrate my present point, for the identity of the couple is not discovered by the process. Whether the diviner's object is to make this discovery, or the future lot of the married pair is all that he seeks to reveal, in both cases, though he charm never so wisely, it does not fall within the scope of this inquiry. Without stretching one's imagination too much, some passages in the *Panchatantra* seem to imply a belief that marriage-making is under the direct control of Providence. Take, for instance, the story of the beautiful princess, who was betrothed to a serpent, Deva Serma's son. Despite the vigorous attempts made to induce her to break off so hideous a match, she steadfastly declines to go back from her word, and bases her refusal on the ground that the marriage is inevitable and destined by the gods.

As quaint illustrations may be instanced the following: "Raba heard a certain man praying that he might marry a certain damsel; Raba rebuked him with the words: 'If she be destined for thee, nothing will part thee from her; if thou art not destined for her, thou art denying Providence in praying for her.' Afterwards Raba heard him saying: 'If I am not destined to marry her, I hope that either I or she may die,'" meaning that he could not bear to witness her union with another. Despite Raba's protest, other instances are on record of prayers similar to the one of which he disapproved.

Or again, the Midrash offers a curious illustration of Psalm lxii. 10: "Surely men of low degree are a breath, and men of high degree a lie." The first clause of the verse alludes to those who say in the usual way of the world, that a certain man is about to wed a certain maiden, and the second clause to those who say that a certain maiden is about to wed a certain man. In both cases people are in error in thinking that the various parties are acting entirely of their own free-will, while as a matter of fact the whole affair is predestined. I am not quite certain whether the same idea is intended by the *Yalkut Reubeni*, in which the following occurs:—"Know that all religious and pious men in this, our generation are hen-pecked by their wives, the reason being connected with the mystery of the Golden Calf. The men on that occasion did not protest against the action of the mixed multitude (at whose door the charge of making the calf is laid), while the women were unwilling to surrender their golden ornaments for idolatrous purposes. Therefore they rule over their husbands." One might also quote the bearing of the mystical theory of transmigration on the predestination of bridal pairs. In the Talmud, on the other hand, the virtues of a man's wife are sometimes said to be in proportion to the husband's own; or in other words, his own righteousness is the cause of his acquiring a good wife. The obvious objection, raised by the Talmud itself, is that a man's merits can hardly be displayed before his birth—and yet his bride is destined for him at that early period.

Yet more quaint (I should perhaps rather term it consistent, were not consistency rare enough to be indistinguishable from quaintness) was the confident belief of a maiden of whom mention is made in the *Sefer ha-Chassidim* (§ 384). She refused persistently to deck her person with ornaments. People said to her: "If you go about thus unadorned, no one will notice you nor court you." She replied with firm simplicity: "It is the Holy One, blessed be he, that settles marriages; I need have no concern on the point myself." Virtue was duly rewarded, for she married a learned and pious husband. This mention of the "Book of the Pious" reminds me of the circumstance under which the originator of the latter-day Chassidism, Israel Baalshem, is said to have married. When he was offered the daughter of a rich and learned man of Brody named Abraham, he readily accepted the alliance, because he knew that "Abraham's daughter" was his bride destined by heaven. For like Moses Mendelssohn, in some other respects the antagonist of the Chassidim, Baalshem accepted the declaration of Rabbi Judah in the

name of Rav: "Forty days before the creation of the child, a proclamation (בת-קול) is made in heaven, saying: The daughter of such a one shall marry such and such a one."

I will close with an Agadic story, in which the force of this predestination is shown to be too strong even for royal opposition. It does not follow that the pre-arrangement of marriages implies that the pair cannot fall in love of their own accord. On the contrary, just the right two eventually come together; for once, free-will and destiny need present no incompatibility. The combination, here shadowed, of a predestined and yet true-love marriage, is effectively illustrated in what follows:

"Solomon the King was blessed with a very beautiful daughter, who was the fairest maiden in the whole land of Israel. Her father observed the stars so as to discover by astrology who was destined to be her mate in life and to wed her: when lo! he saw that his future son-in-law would be the poorest man in the nation. Now, what did Solomon do? He built a high tower by the sea and surrounded it on all sides with inaccessible walls; he then took his daughter and placed her in the tower under the charge of seventy aged guardians. He supplied the Castle with provisions, but he had no door made in it, so that none could enter the fortress without the knowledge of the guard. Then the king said: I will watch in what way God will work the matter.

"In course of time a poor and weary traveller was walking on his way by night, his garments were ragged and torn, he was bare-footed and ready to faint with hunger, cold, and fatigue. He knew not where to sleep, but on casting his eyes around him he beheld the skeleton of an ox lying on a field hard by. The youth crept inside the skeleton to shelter himself from the wind, and while he slept there, down swooped a great bird, which lifted up the carcass and the unconscious youth in it. The bird flew with its burden to the top of Solomon's tower, and set it down on the roof before the very door of the imprisoned princess. She went forth on the morrow to walk on the roof according to her daily wont, and she descried the youth. She said to him, 'Who art thou? and who brought thee hither?' He answered, 'I am a Jew of Acco, and a bird bore me to thee.' The kind-hearted maiden clothed him in new garments; they bathed and anointed him, and she saw that he was the handsomest youth in Israel. They loved one another, and his soul was bound up in hers. He was ingenious and witty; and one day she said, 'Wilt thou marry me?' He replied, 'Would it might be so!' They resolved to marry. But there was no ink

with which to write the *Kethubah*, or marriage certificate. Love laughs at obstacles. So, using some drops of his own blood as ink, the marriage was secretly solemnised, and he said, 'God is my witness to-day, and Michael and Gabriel likewise.' When the matter leaked out, the dismayed custodians of the princess hastily summoned Solomon. The king at once obeyed their call, and asked for the presumptuous youth. He looked at his son-in-law, enquired of him as to his father and mother, family and dwelling-place, and from his replies the king recognised him for the self-same man whom he had seen in the stars as the destined husband of his daughter. Then Solomon rejoiced with exceeding joy and exclaimed: Blessed is the Omnipresent who giveth a wife to man and establisheth him in his house." The moral of which seems to be that though marriages are made in heaven, love must be made on earth.

I. ABRAHAMS.

NOTE.

The chief passages to which the reader is referred are: *Midrash Rabbah*, Genesis § 68, Leviticus § 29, Numbers §§ 3 and 22; *Midrash Tanchuma* to the portions כי תשא, מטות and וישלח; *Midrash Samuel*, Ch. v.; Talmud, *Moed Katon*, 18*b*, and *Sotah*, 2*a*.—Dr. Bacher's latest work *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, II. (1890), contains on pages 168-170 important notes on some of these passages.—I have freely translated the story of Solomon's Daughter from Buber's edition of the *Tanchuma*, Introduction, page 136. It is clearly compounded from several stories too familiar to call for the quotation of parallels. With one of the incidents may be compared the device of Sindbad in his second voyage. He binds himself to one of the feet of the rukh (*i.e.* the condor or the bearded vulture); and in another adventure, he attaches himself to the carcass of a slaughtered animal, and is borne aloft by a vulture. A similar incident may be noted in the *Pseudo Ben Sira* (ed. Steinschneider, page 5). Compare Gubernatis, *Zool. Myth.*, II. 94. The fabulous *anka*, too, was banished by God as punishment for carrying off a bride.

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

THE RELIGION OF THE SEMITES.

Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First Series. The Fundamental Institutions.

By Professor ROBERTSON SMITH, 1889.

This is a most interesting and valuable book. When Professor Robertson Smith's series of lectures are concluded, they will form the standard work upon their subject, except in so far as Babylonian and Assyrian religions, purposely excluded from the book, are concerned. There is, indeed, no other book, so far as I am aware, in which even the fundamental institutions of the Semitic religions are treated so fully and completely as in the volume before us. If the other portions of the series come up to the level of this first part, the new Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge will have undoubtedly conferred upon all students of religion a very considerable boon. It is not within my power to criticise this book. I should like, however, to point out its great importance and suggestiveness for readers of the Old Testament. From the Bible, and especially from the Pentateuch, a large number of illustrations are taken, but these receive a new light from the parallel passages, dealing mainly with the religious customs of Arabia, with which they are co-ordinated, and the general theories which they are used to substantiate.

The titles of the lectures sufficiently explain their subjects. It is the fundamental institutions of the Semitic religions with which Professor Robertson Smith deals. To that most fundamental of them all, to the institution of sacrifice, six out of eleven lectures are devoted. Nearly related and leading up to sacrifice, is the investigation into sanctuaries, altars and holy places. The relation of the gods to man and to outward objects, as well as their own nature so far as they affect the character of the institutions, are also dealt with in the second and third lectures. The whole plan of the book is better understood after it has been read a second time. As in a good novel one cannot appreciate the working out of the plot till one has reached the *dénoûment*, so in Professor R. Smith's book, one does not adequately see what the choice of material and the manner of presentation in the earlier lectures are leading up to, till one reads these lectures again after one has first finished the whole.

The "fundamental institutions" examined in this book, and especially the rite of sacrifice, are, it will be found, to a considerable extent reviewed and explained by the help of two theories. But these theories are themselves facts, so that perhaps it would be more correct to say that the phenomena of the institutions are largely grouped under or developed out of two "fundamental" facts, the origin of which precedes in time the earliest religious traditions which have come down to us. These two facts are Totemism and Taboo. It will be found that a

variety of Biblical customs, and a number of laws, representing the final written precipitate of immemorial usage in the Levitical Code, must be brought back for their complete explanation to Totemism and Taboo.

Totemism is now-a-days sufficiently known to need no definition. "In the Totem stage of society, each kinship or stock of savages believes itself to be physically akin to some natural kind of animate or inanimate things, most generally to some kind of animal" (p. 117). This belief does not imply that other animals (and other objects, such as trees or fountains) may not also be thought to be either themselves divine, or the seat of spirits and demons, but merely that the Totem, that is the animal kin, is the sacred and divine ancestor of that particular stock. The Totem, moreover, is friendly to his kin, and so the tribal god, in whom the Totem culminates, or out of whom he grows, is essentially the friendly protector of the tribe, just as he comes to be regarded as its father and king. For Professor R. Smith is keen to deny the truth of Statius's well-known adage, *Primus in orbi deos fecit timor*. The attempt to appease "invincible or mysterious enemies of more than human power" is not the origin of religion. "From the earliest times religion, as distinct from magic or sorcery, addresses itself to kindred and friendly beings, who may indeed be angry with their people for a time, but are always placable except to the enemies of their worshippers and to renegade members of the community"[1] (p. 55). In the light of Totemism, we can now explain a portion of certain facts in old Israelitish life. Some animals are not eaten at all; some are eaten in the ordinary way in which we eat animal food to-day (*e.g.* game, "the roebuck and the hart" of Deuteronomy); some are only eaten on solemn occasions, after or as a sacrifice. These last are the domestic animals, the ox, the sheep, and the goat. Why are oxen sacrificed and not gazelles? Professor R. Smith marshals a variety of evidence to show that in the earliest pastoral ages the domestic animals were sacred beings, regarded "on the one hand as friends and kinsmen of men, and on the other hand as of a nature akin to the gods" (p. 278). (Totemism can survive together with the higher belief in deities that are independent of, though akin to, their animal representations.) That is the ultimate reason why "the idolatrous Israelites worshipped Jehovah under the form of a steer" (p. 291). But if to the ancestors of the Hebrews the domestic animals were originally sacred and kin, why did they in their sacrifices slaughter their own kinsfolk? Professor R. Smith's theory of sacrifice is an answer to this question. But first of all, the very fact that the gazelle is eaten casually by any individual, whereas the domestic animals are only eaten socially, and after sacrificial rites, shows that they must have been regarded as essentially more sacred than game. (This social, communal element of sacrifice and antique religion generally is admirably brought out, explained and commented upon by our author (pp. 236-250). A number of Biblical passages illustrate the thesis, and are in their turn freshly illumined by it. Compare especially 1 Sam. i. 3, 21; ix. 12; xx. 6, 29). Now sacrifice itself is not originally a tribute or gift to the god. These ideas are secondary (p. 328), and come up only when the old ideas have become partly unintelligible. Sacrifice is essentially a communion between the kindred god and his worshippers. Both parties were supposed to meet "together from time to time to seal and strengthen their fellowship, and to nourish their common life by a

[1] That is why Amos iii. 2 is such a *bouleversement* of the whole theory of ancient religion.

common meal, to which those outside the clan were not invited" (p. 257). It was natural that if any temporary estrangement was imagined to have occurred between the god and his human kin, the common meal was all the more useful. Thus the original sacrifices could branch off into the sacrifice of mere festivity on the one hand, and the atonement sacrifices on the other. The animal used in sacrifice is even more akin to the god than are the worshippers themselves, and for that very reason he is more fitted than a man to be the means of re-establishing or confirming the bond between the god and the clan (p. 342), and thus Professor R. Smith holds for this and other reasons that "human sacrifice is not more ancient than the sacrifice of sacred animals, and that the prevalent belief of ancient heathenism that animal victims are an imperfect substitute for a human life arose by a false inference from traditional forms of ritual that had ceased to be understood" (p. 346, and for the false inference itself compare Genesis xxii., and pp. 291, 343, and 446). But the destruction of kin life, whether in animal or man, was a very solemn thing, and only permissible as an act of the community and not of the individual, and that is why executions (outside the range of blood revenge, "which applies to manslaughter, *i.e.*, to the killing of a stranger") "constantly assume sacrificial forms, for the tribesman's life is sacred even if he be a criminal, and he must not be killed in a common way" (pp. 351, 398, and 399. This elucidates Numbers xxv. 4, and other Biblical passages quoted in these pages). Professor R. Smith explains in detail the character of the most ancient sacrificial meals, and points out survivals of these antique usages in many Biblical customs. The oldest sacrifice involves no burning, and indeed no altar-hearth. Thus in 1 Sam. xiv. 32-35, the altar which Saul is said to have built in verse 35 is really identical with the stone which he caused to be rolled unto him in verse 33, and "the simple shedding of the blood by the stone or altar consecrated the slaughter, and made it a legitimate sacrifice" (p. 185).[1] The blood, as the seat of the life, is the most sacred part of the animal, and thus it came to be generally regarded as too sacred to be drunk, and was wholly made over to the god. But an outward reception of the blood was still occasionally retained upon solemn occasions, and this explains why in Exodus xxiv. 8, Moses sprinkles the blood of the covenant sacrifice half upon the altar, and half upon the people, why the priests are consecrated with blood (Lev. viii. 23), why the leper is purified with blood (Lev. xiv. 7), and why the altar upon the Day of Atonement is cleansed by blood (pp. 301, 325, 326, and 389). Scarcely less sacred than the blood as a seat of life are "the viscera, especially the kidneys and the liver, which in the Semitic dialects are continually named as the seats of emotion, or more broadly, the fat of the omentum, and the organs that lie in and near it" (p. 360). This is why the fat is forbidden in the Levitical legislation as an article of food, and in sacrifices is burned upon the altar (Lev. iii. 15-17; vii. 23-25). The further idea that "the thigh is a seat of life, and especially of procreative power" sufficiently explains the old Israelitish superstition mentioned in Genesis xxxii. 32, which, though not elevated into a law by the authors of the Pentateuchal codes, was, nevertheless, unfortunately not neglected by post-Biblical legislators (p. 360, note 2).

The student must read in the lectures themselves how the original

[1] The sacred stone is the symbol of the deity "set up in a place already consecrated by tokens of the divine presence," p. 189, (in Saul's case by his victory over the Philistines, p. 108), and at an earlier stage the symbol of the god may be also his abode (Genesis xxviii. 22, p. 181).

type of sacrifice changes its character, and develops, on the one hand, into the "honorific" or tributary, on the other, into the "piacular" and exceptional form of it, with either of which the reader of the Bible is quite familiar. How, too, in the priestly legislation, old and new ideas are linked together unconsciously, he will there find frequently shown.

The idea of Taboo, which, as I have already said, is largely used by the professor to explain many a Semitic "institution," is partly connected with that awful and mysterious aspect of life, out of which, as we saw, religion, as distinct from magic and sorcery, was not evolved. Taboo is defined as "a system of restrictions on man's arbitrary use of natural things, enforced by the dread of supernatural penalties." When these natural things are connected with the friendly deities of the clan, they become rules of holiness, but if they are connected with the innumerable mysterious agencies and evil spirits that lie, as it were, outside the communal religion, the Taboos become, in the Semitic religions, rules of uncleanness. The two kinds of Taboo are, however, often confused together (p. 142).

A remarkable number of laws in the Pentateuch are traceable to Taboo, of which, as our author points out, the second type, which underlies rules of uncleanness, is far lower than the first type, which constitutes the basis of holiness (p. 143). Thus it becomes clear that the principle of forbidden foods is at bottom nothing but Taboo. So are the laws connected with the purification of women after childbirth, with their uncleanness during menstruation, with leprosy, and the especially minute regulations concerning the uncleanness caused by the carcases of "creeping things," or vermin (Lev. xi. 32). The last illustration is further substantiated by the evidence the Bible affords of idolatrous worship of and sacrifice to vermin (Isaiah lxvi. 17; Ezekiel viii. 10). For when in exceptional cases, and as a powerful piaculum, an unclean animal is sacrificed, it is also a sacred animal, which is ordinarily invested with a rigid Taboo (pp. 275, 276, and 388. Compare the author's earlier work, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, pp. 304-310, a book which has frequently to be referred to in reading the lectures).

Of Taboos that belong to the higher type, there are also several Biblical examples. Taboo, for instance, explains why, according to the oldest laws, the firstlings of domestic cattle, which cannot be sacrificed, must, if not redeemed, be killed, and why the first three years' produce of fruit trees was forbidden for use (pp. 431 and 149). Again, holiness is contagious, and thus creates new Taboos. That is why shoes must be put off before holy ground is trodden, otherwise they could not be worn again, or why consecrated or "banned" things affect with their Taboo whatever they come near (pp. 434 and 435). It is a deduction from this principle that caused the use of holy objects as materials for ordeals. Even of this curious superstition the Levitical legislation contains a most interesting example. It is the use of the "holy water" in the trial of a woman suspected of adultery, a form of ordeal to which, as is shown in the work before us, there is many an ancient parallel (p. 164).

I trust I have said enough of Professor R. Smith's book to show how useful and valuable it is for all Biblical students. I have by no means exhausted the variety of Biblical topics with which it deals, nor have I even alluded to the wealth of material, mainly drawn from Arabic sources, outside the Bible which it brings together. Jewish students will, it is to be hoped, not neglect these lectures, though it is, I admit, only those students whose Judaism has nothing to fear from such

enquiries upon the field of comparative religion, who will read the book without a shade of discomfort or regret. For no one can read it without being convinced that there are incorporated in the Pentateuchal legislation (mainly in its latest priestly code), a variety of ordinances, which are merely traditional survivals from a past heathenism, put forward, when their origin was wholly forgotten, as the fresh and perfect word of God. (Orthodox Christianity has to encounter similar or still more fundamental difficulties, to which Professor R. Smith appears occasionally to allude.) Is not our author, *e.g.*, in the right when he says, "The irrationality of laws of uncleanness, from the standpoint of spiritual religion, or even of the higher heathenism, is so manifest that they must necessarily be looked on as having survived from an earlier form of faith and society"? (p. 430). The writer of Psalm l., as Professor R. Smith points out (p. 373), scornfully rebukes a popular theory of sacrifice current in his day, which is still indicated to us by a phrase in Leviticus (iii. 11). Is it "orthodox" or "reformed" Judaism which is working upon the Psalmist's lines?

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

THE FABLES OF ÆSOP.

The Fables of Æsop, as first printed by Caxton in 1484. By JOSEPH JACOBS. (D. Nutt, 1889.)

A NEW edition or a re-issue of Æsop's fables may truly be said to concern all sorts and conditions of men; for of all books—the Bible itself not excepted—it is probably that with which the great majority of readers have from childhood been most familiar. And the edition before us will suit many tastes. The curious, who love to track and to explore the by-paths of literary history, will find much that is novel and suggestive—if not altogether convincing—in the elaborate preface of Mr. Jacobs, while its light and fluent style will attract the general reader: and indeed to the select of this class the book as a whole is recommended by the inevitable copy of verses from the industrious pen-of-all-work of Mr. Andrew Lang.

In the first place, then, we have a reprint of the fables of Æsop with those of Avian, Alfonso and Poggio as first printed by Caxton in 1484. Though the original Gothic type, which indeed would have been unreadable, has not been imitated, yet to such an extent have the scruples of amateurs in these matters been respected, that the very misprints of Caxton have been religiously preserved. But it is with the prefatory sketch of the history of the Æsopic fable that scholars, and in particular the readers of this review, will chiefly concern themselves; and to this we now turn.

"Our Æsop is Phædrus with trimmings." This abrupt announcement, with which the preface opens, leads us at once to an important point from which to survey the wide and complicated question before us. For if our Æsop is really Phædrus, whence came Phædrus? And moreover whence came Avian, whose fables in the middle ages rivalled in popularity those of Phædrus? That Latin writers had Greek models of some sort in view it is only natural to assume, though, in passing, and in consideration of the original genius of "the last great writer of heathen Rome," we must protest against Mr. Jacobs' sweeping assertion that

"Latin literature is but one vast plagiarism from the Greek." However at this point in our search for Æsop we enter Greek territory, only to discover that the spuriousness of the various collections of Greek fables published under Æsop's name has been evident since Bentley's day, and to find ourselves compelled to wander further afield in search of one Babrius. This Babrius, however, though he composed in Greek, turns out to have been—in the judgment of the most recent Germans—a Roman, and probably the same as the Babrius whom in the year 235 A.D., we find acting as tutor to the son of Alexander Severus. But leaving Babrius on one side, and turning to Greek literature for such evidence as it may have to offer concerning Æsop himself, we find two references and two only. On one hand there is the story of Herodotus about Æsop the slave at Samos and the compensation claimed for his murder, while, on the other hand, Æsop is shown to us by Aristotle pleading as an advocate before the men of Samos on behalf of a demagogue—rather an unusual thing for a slave to do under the circumstances of ancient society. Assuming Æsop to have been Greek, the asserted fact of his being a slave in a Greek community of itself presents a difficulty, though Mr. Rutherford finds a way out of it. Assuming him to have been a barbarian in the interest of our belief that he was a slave—and the veracity of Herodotus is as we know as unimpeachable as that of the Bible, and can be vindicated in much the same way—we are confronted by the equally obvious difficulty of his appearance as an advocate at Samos. In short the accounts as they stand are inconsistent and incredible; and in answer to the question Who was Æsop? the utmost that can be said is summed up in Mr. Jacobs' words: "to the later Greeks Æsop was a kind of Joe Miller." To the further question—How came Æsop of all men to deserve and to attain this distinction?—Mr. Jacobs' hypothesis, that he was the first to make political use of the fable, is no answer, if it appears, as we think it does, that the only recorded case of such political interference is antecedently incredible. With regard, therefore, to the fabulist himself—*stat nominis umbra;* but before passing from the Greek to the Oriental side of the question we are led to the important conclusion that "the Fables of Æsop as literary products are the fables of Demetrius Phalereus." For it is to *The Assemblies of Æsopian Fables* compiled by the latter about the year 300 B.C. that both Phædrus and Babrius can be traced.

After reviewing the various theories put forward by Max Müller, Tylor and Benfey, to account for the appearance of the same or similar fables among peoples widely separate in space and time, Mr. Jacobs decides for the borrowing theory which Benfey favoured. He then presents and analyses the few Jātaka tales to which parallels are to be found either in our Æsop or in Bidpai—a process which naturally leads up to the question "whether the Greeks derived their fables all or some from India." And at this point we are glad to see Mr. Jacobs vigorously combating the views of those scholars, who, under some sudden æsthetic impulse, desert the methods of science, and confound a question of evidence with a question of "taste." Professor Weber discovers something so clear-cut, something so artistic about the Greek fables, as to exclude the very possibility of their being derived from a people who have presumably produced nothing but what is coarsely cut and inartistic. But this at least may be said for Professor Weber that he does not estimate the difference between two things without knowing both of them. Such an Indianist may be allowed to dogmatise about India. But Mr. Rutherford—as becomes a person who knows only one side of the ques-

tion—is even louder in the same elevated strain. Holding himself severely free from any such prejudices as might flow from acquaintance with India and its literary products, is it possible, he asks, that a nation so original as the Greeks should be indebted for their fables to the childish Orientals. And so a possibility which was seriously entertained by a Benfey is banished from the face of the earth with the magnificent decision of a Podsnap. Mr. Jacobs maintains that where close parallels exist between our Æsopic collections and the Jātakas, the latter are prior and original—a conclusion which in his judgment would probably have been that of Benfey, had the latter been in possession of the fuller evidence which now establishes an earlier date than he suspected for the Jātakas.

But we must now proceed to consider the Talmudic fables, as to which we learn that "the industry of Jewish scholars has only been able to unearth about thirty fables from the vast expanse of Talmudic and Midrashic literature. Yet, few in number as they are, they are of crucial importance critically." Of these thirty "all but six, or perhaps only four, can be traced either to India or Greece, or both. It is the obvious inference that the Beast-fable in Judæa is a borrowed product, and the only question is from which of the two sources it has been derived. All our evidence turns in favour of India. For where the Greek and Indian forms of the fables common to the three differ, the Jewish form agrees with the Indian, not the Grecian." In the course of his endeavour to ascertain through what channel the beast-fable passed from India to Judæa, Mr. Jacobs has been able for the first time, as it appears, to throw light upon a difficult passage in the Talmud which has long tried the ingenuity of the commentators. We are told of R. Jochanan ben Zaccai that "he did not leave out of the circle of his studies even the *Mishle Shu'alim* (*Fox-fables*) and the *Mishle Kubsim*." The puzzle lies in the last two words, for which the commentators offer the remarkable rendering "Fables of the Washermen."

"Now there is an uniform Greek tradition that a special class of fables called the Libyan were collected by a Libyan named Kybisas, Kybisios, or Kibysses. Babrius himself in his second prologue couples him with Æsop:—

> πρῶτος δὲ, φασίν, εἶπε παισὶν Ἑλλήνων
> Αἴσωπος ὁ σοφός, εἶπε καὶ Λιβυστίνοις
> λόγους Κιβύσσης.

"Now the slightest rounding of a corner of a letter, transforming *mem* (ם) into *samech* (ס) would change the inexplicable *Mishle Kobsim*, 'fables of washermen,' into *Mishle Kubsis*, 'fables of Kybises,' and with the Greek tradition before us there can be little doubt that the change is justified."

Mr. Jacobs further concludes that the word Libyan, which appears to have been indiscriminately applied to all dark-skinned races, implies nothing more than the consciousness that the fables so styled were a foreign importation; and he goes so far as to identify them—if not wholly at least—mainly with the Jātakas (p. 130). Be this as it may, we think that few will be disposed to challenge the restoration of Kybises to the Talmud, and if Mr. Jacobs' preface contained nought else that was novel, it would on that ground alone be a noteworthy contribution to the history of the fable.

But as to the suggestion that Proverbs xxx. 4 and 15-23 are also derived from India, we can see nothing in the first of the parallels adduced but what might easily have occurred independently to two thinkers

in face of the question which has been stated in a thousand forms, but has never yet been answered. And in the last two cases the identity, being only partial, is in our judgment insufficient to support a definite conclusion. But with regard to the four things never sated the closeness of the agreement is such that there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that there has been borrowing on one side or the other; and we hold that on the strength of his parallel from the Mahâbhârata (iv. 2227), Mr. Jacobs is entitled to reverse the judgment of Prof. Graetz, who, with the Hitopadésa alone in view, had decided for Jewish priority.

We have left no space to deal with Mr. Jacobs' presentation of the mediæval history of the fable, particularly in England; but we would specially refer our readers to what is said about the Jewish fabulist Berachyah Nakdan, who seems now at last to have been rescued from the semi-obscurity which has so long hung over his name and fame.[1]

In the course of his extended and minute investigation Mr. Jacobs has been led to traverse fields wider than can fall within the ken of any single scholar; but with the help of a never-failing tact he manages to walk circumspectly even when most remote from the limits of his special studies. The errors we have noticed—sins whether of omission or of commission—are few and unimportant. The strange form *itiahâsa*, which confronts us at the top of the genealogical tree, we should have taken for a misprint, had it not been repeated (p. 147), and coupled with an interpretation which will come as a surprise to students of Sanskrit or Pali. On p. 130 one of the claimants for the child in the supposed Buddhist original of "the judgment of Solomon" appears as a *Yakshinī* or female demon, and so far so good; but on p. 136 the same personage is alluded to as a *rishi*, whereas *rishis* were ascetics of distinguished piety and, so far as our information goes, of the male sex exclusively. We think, moreover, that in appealing to Buddhism for wherewithal to account for the undoubted "degradation in the status of women due to early Christianity," Mr. Jacobs goes out of his way to obtain what lay in abundance ready to his hand nearer home. We believe that the fact in question was the natural and necessary result in practice of such ascetic teaching as that of Paul, not to speak of the concurrent influence of the legend—taken over by the Christians as part of their general inheritance from Judaism—in which woman appears as the channel through which sin entered the world, unless we are to suppose that this πρῶτον ψεῦδος, with its long train of consequences in the shape of cruelty and vice, was also derived from the Jātakas. Among the imitators of Æsop we think that mention might have been made of Leonardo da Vinci and Northcote. The former consummate and immortal—*quem honoris causa nominatum volo;* the latter a curious spectacle in this century as with the help of Hazlitt he toils at the composition of fables dull and heavy as his own pictures, and that with the serious aim—not of amusing children but of instructing men.

But enough has been said to show the value and interest of the work before us. To the specialist it will need no recommendation; while the general reader—decoyed it may be to its perusal by the falsetto of Mr. Lang—will be surprised to find how varied and copious are the treasures of ancient wit and wisdom which lie hidden beneath the trite surface of Æsop's Fables.

S. Arthur Strong.

---

[1] This portion of Mr. Jacobs' work will receive fuller treatment in a subsequent number of the Review.

A Commentary on the Book of Daniel. By JEPHET IBN ALI the Karaite. Edited and Translated by D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.[1]

WE are indebted to the Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, for this excellent contribution to the Literature of the Karaites. Jephet ben Ali Hallevi flourished in the latter half of the tenth century, and was the author of commentaries on several books of the Bible, and the editor of a ספר המצוות of the Karaites. His ability as a writer has been variously estimated. Graetz speaks of his "Wortschwall und Weitschweifigkeit." Neubauer is inclined to esteem highly his knowledge of Hebrew, and his power as an exegetist. The commentary on Daniel which Professor Margoliouth has edited, gives us the best example we can have of Jephet's critical and exegetical powers. The text has been most carefully edited by the collation of no fewer than ten MSS., and the translation, though not attempting literalness is very exact and very readable.

The present commentary on Daniel is interesting on account of its historical allusions, of its polemics against "the man of Fayyum," as Saadiah was called by his opponents, and its polemics against Christianity and Islam. The general reader who is acquainted with Gibbon's 52nd chapter, will find references in the commentary to Karmath, to the revolt in Arabia, through which the land which had given birth to an empire, separated herself from the empire she herself had formed. It is interesting to find from one of Margoliouth's notes, how the name Karmath is brought into connection with the Hebrew קשר and the Arabic Qarmata.

The polemic against Saadiah is a polemic against Rabbinical Judaism. We know how bitterly the controversy was carried on between the upholders of tradition, and the followers of the strict letter of Scripture. אחיכם שונאיכם "Your brothers and your haters," in Isaiah lxvi. 5, was applied by a Karaite commentator to his brethren in race and faith. The same want of self-restraint existed on the side of the Rabbanites. Karaism was a retrogression and not a reform; but irrespectively of the merits of the controversy we must deplore the harsh words, the hatred to which the schism of Anan ben David gave birth. In one passage in the commentary on Daniel, we find, after the name of the man of Fayyum, the word הם. Margoliouth is undoubtedly right in translating this word by "also" in his valuable glossary of curious words, but we should have liked to hope that they were a clerical error for ע״ם, equivalent to the Hebrew ע״ה (Peace be upon him), which Jephet applied to the names of his Karaite predecessors. We find in this commentary that just as the Rabbanites called the Karaites Sadducees, so the latter called their opponents Pharisees.

The publication of Jephet ben Ali's commentary is, as I have said, an interesting contribution to the Jewish polemical literature against the two younger religions. Neubauer was of opinion that the older Karaites were more bitter against Islam than against Christianity, but Steinschneider thinks that the evidence does not quite support this view. We know how very fierce the opposition was to Islam. It was Jephet who scornfully called the Koran קלון (shame,) who spoke of Mohammed the Rasūl

[1] *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Clarendon Press.

(apostle) of God as Pasul. We forget sometimes that it was the companionship in sorrow after the Spanish persecutions, which made Jews and Moslems more friendly ; but we need only turn to the comment of Jephet on Daniel, cap. xi. verse 27, or remember how the "son of the handmaid" was despised, or recall Jehudah Hallevi's *double entendre* in his well-known Zion dirge איך אראה בפי עורבים נשריך "How can I see thy eagles in the mouth of the Ravens (Arabs)," to understand how little, in spite of the identity of belief in the Unity of God, the religion of "Resignation" was respected by the children of the mistress, how the yoke of the child of the handmaid weighed heavily on their necks. Christianity was not more beloved. Margoliouth quotes a passage from Jephet's Arabic commentary on Obadiah 3, where the "pride of the heart" of Edom is made to refer to the presumption of Christianity in giving God a son, in inventing the Trinity, in abolishing the law. Neither daughter religion was respected. Were not the worshippers of wood and stone those who bowed before the Cross, or kissed the black stone at Mecca? But the fierceness was not onesided. The followers of Mohammed accused the "Ahl al-Kitab," the "People of the Book," of forgery, of wilful obstinacy, of blindness to the mission of God's beloved servant.

Surely, in one respect at least, the exegesis of our days is to be commended. It is judicial, it is impartial. In the days of orthodox interpretation, the commentator was like an advocate holding a brief for his religious party. "Shiloh," Jews have held to mean the Messiah; Christians have referred it to Jesus; Moslems to the "Apostle of God." So again the difficult verses in Psalm ii. are referred to the future deliverer of Israel, the founder of Christianity, or Mohammed according to the religion of the commentator. Modern exegesis at least endeavours to discover what the writer of the inspired record really meant. It is not perpetually working up evidence to gain a case and defeat an opponent.

Jephet ben Ali is well known to the students of Ibn Ezra. Ibn Ezra quotes him at least seven times in his commentary on Daniel, and with respect to Jephet's comment on vii. 4, "he was made to stand like a man," Ibn Ezra adds יפה פירש, "he has explained beautifully." Ibn Ezra seems to quote Jephet here from memory. The quotation agrees with the original in sense only, but the quotation on viii. 2, as given by Ibn Ezra, agrees exactly with the original, even Jephet's reference to Jeremiah xvii. 8 is given. Possibly Professor Margoliouth overlooked this reference in Ibn Ezra, when he says that the quotations do not correspond with the Arabic originals. They do not as a rule, but this is a notable exception.

For an instance of a most bizarre interpretation it is interesting to turn to Jephet's comment on ix. 25, where ביצוק העתים is translated "the dough of the times." Margoliouth notices too how he takes חברתו, in Isaiah liii. 5, as connected with חבר an associate, and ענות, in Psalm xxii. 25, as being derived from ענה to answer; but he quotes with approval Jephet's grammatical explanation in his commentary on Exodus for the pointing of such a word as יבלת "thou art able." I may add that Ibn Ezra quotes with disapproval many opinions of Jephet, *e.g.*, that on the last verse of Psalm xi. But we must remember Pinsker's suggestion (*Likkuté Kadmoniyot*, p. 184), that there is more than one Jephet referred to by Ibn Ezra.

In the comment on chap. xi. 1, Jephet gives us an illustration of his philosophical opinions. He removes the anthropomorphism in such sentences as "God descended," by supposing the ellipsis of a word, *e.g.*,

the "Angel of God," "the glory of God," "the Apostle of God." He removes the difficulty in sentences like "God repented," "God was angry," by explaining the predicates. Speaking of a similar method of interpretation to the former in the case of the Karaite Benjamin Nahavendi, who flourished in the early part of the ninth century, Graetz says, "Nach acht Jahrhunderten feierte Philo's Logos in Nahawendi's Engel seine Auferstehung."

In conclusion, let us again congratulate Prof. Margoliouth upon his contribution to Semitic and Karaitic literature. The present number of the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* is a worthy sequel to Dr. Neubauer's Mediæval Chronicles."

LAWRENCE M. SIMMONS.

Rabbi Meir and "Cleopatra."—(See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I., 336, note 1). How to explain the anachronism of Rabbi Meir, who lived in the second century, holding a conversation with the Queen Cleopatra on the subject of the Resurrection (*Sanhedrin*, 90*b*), I have already suggested in the *Revue des Études Juives*, V., 185 (compare *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, Vol. II., page 68). The words קלפטרא מלכתא are a corruption of פטריקא דכותאי, Patriarch of the Cuthæans, *i.e.*, of the Samaritans. In *Genesis Rabbah* (ch. 4, 70, 94), polemical dialogues between R. Meir and Samaritans are recorded; in *Koheleth Rabbah*, 5, 10, a conversation occurs between R. Meir and a Samaritan on the very subject of the resurrection of the dead. In one of these conversations the "Patriarch of the Samaritans" is mentioned; the Samaritan, to whom Meir had demonstrated that he was not a descendant of Joseph, goes to complain on the subject, לגבי אפטוריקי דידהון, that is to say, to their Patriarch.

W. BACHER.

Translation of the Talmud in England in 1568?—The library of the late Dr. Lœwe contains so many invaluable treasures of Oriental literature, that a full description of them would fill a small volume. As is well known, Dr. Lœwe himself was an Oriental student of a very high rank, but the fact that he was the friend and confidant of Sir Moses Montefiore, whom he accompanied through his travels in the East, gave him also the opportunity of collecting many rare books and manuscripts, which any great library would be proud to possess. I shall here only draw the attention of the reader to a work seemingly insignificant, but, nevertheless, of great interest both to the bibliographer and the historian. The title of this work is לחם הפנים, containing a translation of certain parts of the *Shulchan Aruch* into the Spanish-Jewish dialect (Ladino) by one Meir. It was published in the printing offices of Joseph Jabez, at Salonica, in the year 1568, and republished in Italy during the seventeenth century. (See Steinschneider's Catalogue, col. 1687). Hitherto the Salonica edition was known only through one copy in the possession of the British Museum, and it is

marked in Zedner's Catalogue (p. 335) with the words "No other copy known." We have thus at present two copies of this rare work. There occurs also a curious statement in the Hebrew preface, which is worth pointing out here, though it was already referred to by Steinschneider. Apologising for his rendering special Jewish matters into a profane language, the author says that "already, many years before, somebody has translated many Ritual Laws from the *Turim* into a secular language (לע"ז), of which copies were sent to the Marannos, in Flanders (פלאנדיש) . . . . And as I have also heard that in England (or Angleteria באינגל טירה) *the Gentiles are now printing the Talmud in Latin*, and we also know that most (Hebrew) books which are now printed in Italy are carried away to Padua, Paris, and Salamanca, and other Gentile places, both books on the Law and commentaries, not to speak of Cabbalistic books."

I am unable to tell on what facts this rumour about the translation of the Talmud in England as early as 1568 could have been founded; all the great Hebraists we know of, as Selden, Pocock, etc., belonged to the seventeenth century. But I hope this note may be read by some specialist, who will set us on the right clue.

S. SCHECHTER.

"**Bestemm.**"—The Jewish-German jargon is a museum of curiosities and antiquities gathered from all lands and seas. As a conqueror leaves behind him in the ground coins which mark his devastating track, so the various civilisations have left their impress on the Jewish intellectual life and its popular language. And thus the history which a word has to tell us is, frequently, a more faithful and persistent memorial than stones and documents. Such a record of a sorrowful portion of Jewish history I discovered in a Jewish-German term, whose original home, though one would hardly credit it, was Venice. Any one desirous of cursing heartily in the jargon employs a single word to express all kinds of suffering and trouble—Bestemm. This term is used as a noun, and occurs in the phrase "to give one Bestemm," which expresses the intensest exasperation.

It is the old word for Blasphemia and Blasphemiare, which appear in the disguised form Bestemmia and Bestemmiare. The form "blastemare" was the intermediate stage through which the word passed before it reached its present form. On an ancient Christian window in the Netherlands we find under a representation of Job Blaspheming, the words IOB BLASTEMA.[1] From this to *Bestemmia* is but a single step. Our business here, however, is not to trace the well-known etymology of the word, but rather to show the way through which it passed into the Jewish popular dialect. That way leads us to Venice, where a judicial Court existed, with the special function of trying cases of Bestemmia. It did not always confine itself to the examination of real charges of blasphemy.[2] Every one is aware of the alarming proportions which the system of denunciation attained at Venice. Nothing was easier than to be summoned before this tribunal, whose cruel methods of examination

[1] See Fr. H. Kraus, *Roma Sotteranea*, 289, 5.
[2] See *Hebraische Bibliographie* VI., page 65, note 4.

and terrible punishments had become so familiar to the people that it gave the Jews a term to express torment and torture.

If the word Ghetto, which has passed into all languages, is a memorial of the Cannon foundry of Venice, the Jewish-German *Bestemm* perpetuates the memory of a Venetian magistracy long since defunct. A slight and yet sufficient proof of the enduring character of that race which has reared monuments to its oppressors, and revives memories of institutions which the waves of time have long swept away into oblivion.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

Algazi's Chronicle and the names of Patriarchs' Wives.—תולדות אדם is the title of a small and rather rare volume, by R. Samuel Algazi, containing, among other things, a chronological sketch from the Creation to the year 1583, in which the author wrote his work. As the whole space given to this sketch does not exceed the space of ten pages (in small octavo), no one will expect its author to bring forward many fresh and new points; and Dr. Steinschneider is quite right in pronouncing it as a mere extract from an older chronicle, and of no importance. (See his Catalogue, p. 2,403.) One point, however, in "Algazi's Chronicle" seems to be new and worthy of notice. It is the enumeration of the names of the wives of Biblical personages, of which Algazi's predecessors, as far as we possess their works, know little or nothing. These names, given in pp. 1 and 2, run as follows :—

The wife of Seth, עזורה; of Enosh, נועם; of Kenan, מהוללאות; of Mahalalel, דינה; of Jared, ברכיה בת רצויה; of Enoch, עדנה בת דניאל; of Methuselah, עדנה בת עזריה; of Lamech, ברונוש בת ברכאל; of Noah, אמורע בת ברכיאל; of Shem, מחלה בת בנו; of Arpachshad, רצויה בת ששון; of Shelah, מלכה בת מדי; of Eber, עזורה בת נמרוד; of Peleg, לבנה בת שוער; of Reu, אורה בת חור; of Serug, מלכה בת נהר; of Nahor, ישגב בת ישחוב; of Terah, עדנה בת אברנהו.

This list, which agrees more or less with the Book of Jubilees, chapters iv.-viii., is the most complete in Hebrew literature. Perles, in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien* (p. 90), gives another list of these names from the margin of a certain MS. in Munich. But it is much more corrupt and shorter than Algazi's. Algazi must, therefore, either have made use of some Hebrew work, since then lost, or, less probably, of some non-Jewish source.

S. SCHECHTER.

POST-BIBLICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1888-9.

THE bibliography of post-biblical literature, which we are going to give, is a first attempt, which cannot pretend to be complete. In the first instance, we were obliged to make omissions, since it is difficult to get hold of all publications printed in the various countries where Jewish learning is cultivated. The East, Russia, and Poland have no regular book market, and moreover, the publishers do not advertise their books. Secondly, we have purposely omitted modern commentaries on the Bible, the Talmud, and the Halakhah, as well as modern poetry and philosophy. Finally, the periodical literature is so vast, that we could only take notice of those magazines which are purely devoted to literature, and even here many notices had to be overlooked, some being insignificant, and others too short. Reviews of books, which have often some original suggestions, we have excluded for want of space and time.

TARGUM AND RABBINICAL COMMENTARIES.

The learned R. Simon Baruch Schefftel of Posen, who was not a professional writer, after having retired from business, devoted his leisure time to the study of the Targum of Onkelos. And in order to be able to consult MSS., he went to Munich, where the Rabbi, Dr. J. Perles, his son-in-law, introduced him to the library authorities. The famous Sabionetta edition of this Targum, reproduced some years ago by Dr. Berliner, was his constant companion. His notes, which form nearly a concordance of this Targum, and which contain grammatical and lexicographical remarks, based upon readings of MSS., were carried through the press by his well-known son-in-law, and published with the title of *Biure Onkelos, Scholien zum Targum Onkelos* (München, 1888).

Mr. Harry S. Lewis, B.A., late Miss Amy Fry and Tyrwhitt scholar at Cambridge, has made a laudable attempt towards supplying a commentary on the Targum of the Prophets, which is much needed, by giving that on Isaiah i. to v. (Trübner, 1889). The Targum is not provided with vowel points, which is a drawback for a beginner; moreover, his commentary is written in Rabbinical Hebrew, which makes the use of it difficult, except for those who are acquainted with this idiom. Why Mr. Lewis did not write his commentary in English, and why he did not utilise the excellent MSS. which are to be found in the three great English libraries for fixing the text, and for putting the vowel points, we cannot understand. Perhaps experience will teach him to continue in a more practical way. The Targum, with vowel-points, and with the addition of an English translation, and a short commentary (for the greater part of the Targum is quite clear, being only a translation of the Hebrew), is wanted. Such a book will do great service to students, advanced as well as beginners. For Mr. Lewis's Hebrew, good as it is,

contains many plays upon words, which a trained Rabbinical scholar will understand, but not those who know only Biblical Hebrew. The young and talented author does not shrink from stating that he does not know the derivation and explanation of many a word in the Targum. We were, therefore, astonished not to find the same statement for ציבחר in V. 18. He rightly explains the word by "a small quantity," or "a minimum," but without giving its etymology, and without saying that he does not know it. Professor Nöldeke has long ago explained the word in question in his grammar of the neo-Syriac language (Leipzig, 1868, p. 270, note 2), as ציבחד. This is the right spelling, found in the *Evangelium Hierosolomitanum*, in Syriac characters, as well as in the Targum (in MSS.), and in the Talmud composed in Palestine, for it is a true Aramaico-Palestinian word. Professor Nöldeke's explanation was quoted by the late Professor Fleischer in the *Additamenta* (p. 574) to Dr. J. Levy's dictionary on the Targum, which appeared soon after Professor Nöldeke's grammar. In the body of the dictionary, Dr. Levy writes צבחר, but in his dictionary to the Talmud (Leipzig, 1882), he definitely adopts the right spelling of ציבחר, a word composed of ציב, "a fibre," "a thread" (so explained in the Talmud by חוט), and "one fibre or thread is equivalent to our "one straw," to be compared with the Latin *floccus*. The lately proposed solution of ציבחר as צב + חד ("any quantity you *like*, however small," *one*), where Nöldeke and Levy are ignored, is, in our opinion, inadmissible, for "like one" is not an equivalent for "a little"; and, besides, the right spelling is not צב (for צבי?), but ציב. Anyhow, Mr. Lewis ought to have consulted here Dr. Levy's dictionary, as he did in many other instances. If we have devoted this space to Mr. Lewis's work, it is chiefly because it is the only production on post-biblical researches worth noticing by an Englishman, who, we hope, will continue to cultivate Rabbinical studies, for which he is so well prepared. For a future work, we may advise him to employ a printing office where corrections are attended to; in the present publication typographical mistakes are unfortunately so abundant as to disfigure the book.

Saadiah (more correctly Seadyah) Gaon, who is called the head of the exegetists, is best represented for the current year. The octogenarian member of the French Institute, M. J. Derenbourg, is giving us a new edition, according to lately discovered MSS. of Saadiah's Arabic translation of Isaiah, with copious notes (*Zeitschrift für alt-testamentliche Studien*, edited by Professor Stade, 1889). Dr. Jonas Bondi gives in his doctor-dissertation (Halle, 1888), extracts from Saadiah's commentary on Proverbs, from the unique Bodleian MS. Dr. John Cohn, of Altona, has just brought out Saadiah's Arabic translation and commentary (Altona, 1889) on Job. The edition is made in an arbitrary way, according to the unique Bodleian MS., which has, besides the translation and the commentary of Saadiah, also those of Moses Jiqatilia, and of an anonymous author. To distinguish one from the other is often difficult, and the right method would have been to reproduce the MS. as it is, and not pick out Saadiah only. Has Dr. Cohn always been sure which passages are by Saadiah? We doubt it. But the edition as it is will be of use until the entire MS. is published.—M. J. Derenbourg has taken up another commentary on Isaiah, viz., that of the sober and bold Judah Ben Balam (who lived about 1020), whose Arabic interpretation of this prophetical book is in course of publication, with a French translation, and notes in the *Revue des Études Juives* (1888-9).—R. Tanhum, of Jerusalem (who lived in the thirteenth century), is the next best commentator to Judah Ben Balam. The late Dr. Cureton

thought it important enough to edit his commentary on the Lamentations. Dr. Simon Eppenstein has chosen Tanhum's commentary on Ecclesiastes i.-vi. as the subject of his doctor-dissertation at the University of Leipzig. —We have to record one Karaitic publication, viz., the Arabic translation and commentary on Daniel by Jephet ben Eli (who lived towards the end of the tenth century), very ably edited from MSS. in the Bodleian and the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, and correctly translated into English by Professor D. S. Margoliouth, of Oxford (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Semitic Series, Vol. I., part III., 1889). This commentary is important for the history of Karaitic exegesis, as well as for the opinions concerning the time of the arrival of the Messiah. The Judaico-Arabic vocabulary will be enriched by the glossary, which Professor Margoliouth has done well to give at the end of his translation. The preface contains a concise sketch of Jephet according to the latest authorities.—The commentary in Hebrew on the Pentateuch by Jacob of Vienna, edited by R. Menasse Grossberg, from a unique MS. at the Royal Library of Munich (Mainz, 1888), offers not much that is new, but the author represents the exegesis of a school not much known.— The Biblical commentaries by the famous mathematician, astronomer, philosopher, and exegetist, Levi ben Gersom (or Leo Hebræus in the Latin translation of his astronomical work), were all printed except those on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. They are now edited by the chief Rabbi of Mantua, Cavaliere Marco Mortara, in the second volume of the annuary, and published by Herr E. Graeber. We shall mention later on (p. 201) Levi's biography by Dr. Steinschneider.

Talmud, Halakhah and Commentaries.

The premature death of Rabbi R. N. Rabbinowitz will retard the continuation of his *Variæ lectiones* (דקדוקי סופרים), of which fifteen parts have already appeared. Some attention has been paid lately to the minor tractates of the Talmud.—Dr. M. Goldberg has edited, as a doctor's dissertation, a critical edition of the first four chapters of the ethical tractate called דרך ארץ רבה, with a literary introduction, in which he discusses the authorship of it.—*Kritik der sämmtlichen Bücher "Aboth" in der althebräischen Literatur* (*s. l.*, 1888), is the title of Dr. Moritz Jung's doctor-dissertation, which forms the introduction to some future greater work of his. The author gives detailed accounts of the Mishnah Aboth, as well as of many small treatises, chiefly post-talmudical. It is only natural that the Aboth de R. Nathan should here find its place. Dr. Jung seems not to know Mr. Schechter's edition of this tractate, and in general, we regret to say, Dr. Jung is not well acquainted with modern writings or the vast field of literature he tries to embrace. We have been told lately that in this country someone possesses a "sacred deposit" concerning the Aboth de R. Nathan, which was handed over to him by one of his teachers as far back as 1836. It is strange that it should have been kept back more than half a century. The deposit will show, according to the happy possessor of it, that the modern editors of the Aboth de R. Nathan, viz., the late S. Taussig as well as Mr. Schechter, "have not found out the riddle" of this book. However, it is certain that in 1836 the rabbi in question had no MSS. at his disposal, and had no idea of the existence of a second text of this tractate, and we do not think that the "sacred deposit" will harm Mr. Schechter's edition. But we shall see when it will be published. At present we can only say that, in any case, Mr. Schechter's edition is and will remain the standard edition of

this tractate.—We record the first part of an edition of the Tosefta, with two Hebrew commentaries, the one containing explanations of words and sentences, and the other that of the Halakhic matter ; they are entitled חשק שלמה, composed by the rabbi [S.] Lev Friedlænder, of Mulhouse, (Alsace). Why the author transliterates חשק as *Hosak* S., and not *Hesek* (1 Kings ix. 1), we do not know. On the French title page he puts the following : "Tirée d'un grand nombre d'œuvres et manuscrits, corrigée, nouvellement classée, complètement simplifiée et expliquée avec l'aide des sources Talmudiques et littéraires." We shall not cavil at his strange French, but we should like to know which are the MSS. the rabbi of Mulhouse has discovered, which were not at the disposal of Dr. Zuckermandl for his critical edition. We notice many valuable observations on the text of the Tosefta by Herr Hayyim Oppenheim in the periodical *Beth Talmud*, 1888-9.—Two important and interesting essays have appeared on the *Mekhilta* attributed to R. Simeon ben Yohai, which is only known by extensive quotations. These monographs form the programme of the two rabbinical schools, viz., at Breslau, by Dr. J. Lewy, and the orthodox one at Berlin, by Dr. Hoffmann. The chief result is that the greater Midrash (מדרש הגדול), imported during the last ten years from Yemen, contains very large parts of this lost book. The publication of this Midrash being in preparation by Mr. Schechter, we shall say more about it when the work lies before us in its entirety. Mr. Schechter, with his profound knowledge of the Talmudic literature, his critical method and his patient investigations, which he has shown in his edition of the Aboth de R. Nathan, will, we are sure, point out most of the passages in this Midrash which were extracted from the lost Mekhilta.—We are glad to find that students of rabbinical schools have been making the subject of their doctor-dissertations grammatical points in the Mishnah and the Talmud. Dr. Salomon Stein wrote on the verb in the language of the Mishnah (Berlin, 1888). Dr. Isaac Rosenberg had last year an essay on the verb in the Babylonian Talmud, and Herr Moses Schlesinger contributed to Dr. Berliner's *Magazin* (1889) an article on the verb in the Palestinian Talmud. The last is of importance, for if we have attempts on grammars for the Mishnah and the Babylonian Talmud, nothing of the kind for the Palestinian Talmud, which is written in the Galileo-Aramaic dialect, exists as yet.—Herr Chaim M. Horowitz, who is already favourably known as the editor of various Midrashic and Halakhic treatises, has given us an introduction in Hebrew to the literature of the Amoraim up to 500, which forms the first fasciculus of a book entitled *Uralte Toseftas*. This book will be a valuable addition to that branch of literature, if the author is enabled to edit all he promises. We regret that his learned and instructive introduction is somewhat confused ; perhaps a detailed index to the entire publication will help the reader to find his way in it.—M. Loeb made the subject of one of his lectures in the *École des Hautes Études* (Paris, 1888) the history of tradition as found in the first chapter of the Saying of the Fathers (מסכת אבות). The lecture has appeared in the "Bibliothèque" of this institution.—Professor Bacher, whom we shall find very well represented in the enumeration of the grammatical literature, deserves a prominent place here by his second volume of the *Agada der Tanaiten* (Strassburg, 1890), which begins with the death of R. Aqiba, and finishes with the completion of the Mishnah. The two volumes of this work are indispensable for those who cultivate Talmudic literature in a critical way. The Agadic sayings of the various doctors are given in a complete translation, and with variations from cognate books, for instance, the Tosefta and the Midrashim, accompanied by ample reference to modern

writers. The translation is clear, and, we do not need to say, accurate. With his previous publication, entitled "Die Agada der Babylonischen Amoräern" (Strassburg, 1878), the subject is nearly exhausted. These volumes will be also of great use to the students of folklore.—We may recommend, also, Dr. Adolf Blumenthal's German essay on R. Meir, entitled *Leben und Wirken eines jüdischen Weisen aus dem zweiten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert, nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Frankfurt-a.-M., 1888).—The Hebrew compilation of Talmudic and Midrashic sayings relating to the social life of a Jew in all practical moments, made by Isaac S. Suvalski (Warsaw, 1889), is very useful, inasmuch as all sources are indicated in foot-notes. The monograph has the title of ספר חיי היהודי על פי התלמוד.—Of post-Talmudical literature we have to record, in the first instance, the completion of the edition of the Talmudic encyclopædia, by Isaac Lampronti, entitled פחד יצחק. It is published by the Hebrew Literary Society מקיצי נרדמים, under whose auspices also the new edition of the *Halakhoth Gedoloth*, by Simeon קיירא (Kayyar?), according to the Vatican MS., is appearing. The edition was undertaken by the eminent Talmudist, Dr. E. Hildesheimer, director of the orthodox rabbinical school at Berlin. The first part has reached us. It is provided with copious critical notes. We shall have more to say about it when the preface, in which the differences between the printed text and the new edition, as well as the relation of it to the Halakhoth, attributed to R. Yehudai Gaon, will be discussed. —Among the most instructive literature for lexicography, as well as for history of Jewish learning, are the *Responsa*. Indeed, our knowledge of the Gaonim (the successors of the doctors of the Gemara) is mostly derived from their Responsa, of which we possess now a valuable collection, edited ably by Dr. Harkavy from MSS. in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, and published by the same society. Dr. Joel Müller, Professor of the Rabbinical *Hochschule* at Berlin, is the greatest living authority on the Responsa-literature, which he has sufficiently shown by his various publications on the subject; for instance, that with the title of תשובות גאוני מזרח ומערב, Berlin, 1888 (collected from the scattered articles in the *Beth Talmud*). In the seventh programme of the *Hochschule* he treats of the Responsa of Spanish Rabbis in the tenth century, the epoch when Jewish learning began to pass from the East and the Maghreb to Spain. It was, indeed, no easy task to collect from numerous casuistical works the fragments of these Responsa.—The Book of Precepts (ספר המצות), composed by the famous Moses ben Maimon in Arabic, is well-known from its Hebrew translation by Moses ibn Tabbon (Tibbon). It cannot be doubted that the skilled translator did his task satisfactorily, and that the inaccuracies found in the editions of it arise from copyists and printers. A translation can, however, scarcely take the place of the original, which is now well edited in Hebrew characters from many MSS. by M. Moïse Bloch, Rabbi at Versailles. In the learned preface, M. Bloch discusses the three translations of this treatise, of which that of Salomon ibn Ayoob is completely preserved in MSS. We hope that M. Bloch will find material help for its publication.— We shall at present only mention that another part of Maimonides' commentary in Arabic on the Mishnah, part Tohoroth, with a corrected Hebrew translation, edited by M. J. Derenbourg, has appeared in the publication of the *Meqitze Nirdamim*.—The parts Taanith and Meghillah of the Halakhic work (ס' ההשלמה) of Meshullam, of Béziers, is now edited by Rabbi M. Grossberg, at the end of the commentary of Jacob of Vienna (above, p. 193).—Of late commentaries on the Talmud, we mention the edition from a MS. of that of R. Nissim, of Gerona (ר"ן) on

Abodah Zarah, made by Rabbi S. A. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1888).—Of a miscellaneous character, we mention Dr. Salomon Spira's essay on the Eschatology of the Jews according to the Talmud and Midrashim (Halle, 1889). In spite of the able articles of Herr Schorr in his periodical *he-Halutz*, IV., Dr. Spira has hit upon points not mentioned by the former acute critic.—We may be allowed to make a bare mention of the unpalatable book in tasteless Hebrew against H. Schorr by Herr Meir Kohn Bistritz (1889). The title, ביעור טיט היון, already indicates the character of the book. The author spoils his criticism, which in many paragraphs is good and plausible, by his invectives. Criticising and abusing are two different things; but we are a little accustomed to it by similar outbursts in this country, with the difference that the author of the latter is everywhere wrong.—Very useful for the history of early exegesis is the German essay of Dr. Samuel Landau "On the opinions of the Talmud and the Geonim concerning the value of the exegesis found in the Midrashic literature."—Dr. E. Landau's Zürich dissertation "On the synonym names for God" in the post-biblical literature, derived from words connected with space, *e.g.*, the words מקום and שכינה, is well put together, and will prove interesting also for students of the New Testament literature.

Grammar and Lexicography.

Professor Bacher, of Budapest, has for some time chosen the subject of mediæval Jewish grammarians, which he handles in a masterly way. He has ably edited Joseph Qamhi's (Kimhi) grammar (ס' הזכרון)[1] for the Jewish Literary Society (מקיצי נרדמים) according to several MSS., and he found out (*Revue des Études Juives*, XII., p. 371), that this book was provided with glosses by the author of the book of Punctuation (ס' הנקוד), usually attributed to Moses ben Isaac, of London. (See however, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, I., p. 182.) But his delight seems to be the father of the grammarians, R. Jonah (Abul-Walid ibn Jannah) of Saragossa. After several able articles on R. Jonah's Arabic dictionary (in which he suggested many good emendations to the Oxford edition), he brought out, together with M. J. Derenbourg, the Arabic text of R. Jonah's grammar, with emendations to the somewhat incorrect edition of its Hebrew translation, which he supplies in the notes. Let us mention here that M. Metzger, Rabbi of Belfort, has published lately (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, t. 81), a French translation of it, which seems to be well done on the whole. It is rather strange to find the translator saying he had made it according to MSS., and ignores completely the above mentioned edition. With the edition and French translation of R. Jonah's *Opuscula*, by MM. H. and J. Derenbourg (Paris, 1886) we have now all the writings of the Saragossa grammarian except his outburst against the Prince (Naghid) Samuel, his contemporary at Cordova, of which only a few fragments exist at present. It is indeed satisfactory that, in spite of the great apathy of the rich Jews towards Hebrew literature, such editions are published, and much more in the original Arabic. Not satisfied with his essays on R. Jonah's

[1] We remind our readers that Mr. H. J. Mathews, Exeter College, Oxford, had edited a year before, for the same society, Joseph Qamhi's Grammatical Polemics against R. Jacob Tam (of Ramerupt), entitled ס' הגלוי.

writings, Professor Bacher furnished lately an important essay on Abul Walid's exegesis, as found in his grammatical and lexicographical writings (*Aus der Schrifterklärung des R. Jona*, Programme of the Rabbinical School of Budapest, 1888-9, Budapest, 1889). Will Professor Bacher now be satisfied with having squeezed out, if we may employ this expression, the Saragossa grammarian? One would believe that is so, but we know it is not the case. For Professor Bacher is going to make an edition of the Hebrew translation of R. Jonah's Arabico-Hebrew dictionary, according to the existing MSS., which will appear in the publication of the above-mentioned Hebrew Literary Society, which just manages to exist. This is not the only grammarian who attracted Professor Bacher's attention. We shall mention (p. 201) his biography of the famous Elijah Levita, the greatest Massoret after Jacob ben Hayyim. Unfortunately, an encyclopædia, even the great German publication, cannot give space to do complete justice to authors. Professor Bacher has, therefore, given an essay on Elijah's learned productions *Elijah Levita's Wissenschaftliche Leistungen* (in the *Zeitschrift der deutsch-morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Bd. 43), where he is allowed to handle the matter according to his own heart. The grammar forms the chief part in it, and Dr. Bacher's essay completes Dr. J. Levi's able doctor-thesis, entitled *Elia Levita und seine Leistungen als Grammatiker* (Breslau, 1888).—Dr. S. Kohut, now one of the Rabbis of New York, and formerly Rabbi in Hungary, was obliged to interrupt for a time, owing to his change of countries, his learned and critical edition of the Talmudical lexicon (ערוך), of Nathan ben Yehiel, of Rome. We are glad to mention that the continuation (Vol. V.) has appeared, and if material means do not fail, he will follow the continuation in a regular way.—Rabbi Dr. J. Levy has finished his task on the same subject. His Talmud dictionary, which is made in accordance with modern criticism, is now complete, and the author, who, we are sorry to say, is in failing health, will be able now to take his well-deserved rest after his labours on the dictionaries on the Targum and the Talmud.—Is there room for another work of the kind, such as Dr. M. Jastrow, Rabbi at Philadelphia, has undertaken with great originality? We may answer in the affirmative. In the first instance, Dr. Jastrow writes in English, which will be a boon for scholars in England and America. On the other hand, he is more complete than Dr. Levy in quotations from the Jerusalem Talmud and the Midrashim, many of which have appeared since Dr. Levy began his excellent work. Dr. Jastrow has often better selections for Greek words in the Talmudic literature. It is true that his philology is somewhat peculiar, the author following the biliteral system, but on the whole, it does harm only by taking up too much space.—Dr. Julius Fürst gives in the *Magazin* (1888-9) specimens of his forthcoming *Glossarium Græco-Hebræum*, *i.e.*, Greek words occurring in the Midrashim, with full explanation. We hope that he will be able to publish his work soon, which will be of importance also for post-classical Greek.

History.

The father of Jewish History according to modern researches, Professor H. Graetz, has had the great satisfaction to see a fourth edition of the third volume of his well-known History of the Jews (from the death of Judah the Maccabean till the loss of the Jewish State) (1888-9). The author is so ingenious that we are not astonished to find much new material in this volume, for instance, the excursus on the

connection of the conversion of St. Paul with that of the Queen Helene of Adiabene, that on the date of the composition of the Gospels, and more especially on the Jewish coins, of which a part has appeared in English. We do not mean to say that all his items and data will be accepted without discussion, but at all events, Professor Graetz will have the merit of having introduced new views in all these parts. We cannot enter here in details; besides, such an important work would well deserve a separate review in this QUARTERLY.—The dissertation on the Maccabean wars against the Syrians, according to Greek and Agadic sources in their relation to history, by Dr. Cæsar Josephson (Breslau, 1889), is worth reading.—The History of the Jews in England before the expulsion, has been much advanced by the publications of the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, and more especially by the editing of the *Shetars*, by Mr. M. Davis, although done somewhat unmethodically. A similar publication has come out in Germany, by Dr. R. Hœniger and Herr M. Stern, with the title of *Das Judenschreinbuch der Laurenzpfarre zu Köln* (Berlin, 1888), which accords with the critical method of the modern historical schools. The latter contributes some useful notes to the history of the Jews in Germany in the *Magazin*, etc., edited by Dr. Berliner (1888-9).—Professor D. Kaufmann of Budapest has lately taken up parts of Jewish history of a comparatively modern time. After having given an exhaustive sketch of the Vienna philanthropist, Samson Wertheimer (Wien, 1886), he communicated in this QUARTERLY (I., pp. 89 to 94), the epitaphs of Carvajal (which he unearthed in a Leipzig MS.) and Jeshurun Alvares, and continued with an important contribution on the history of the expulsion of the Jews from Vienna and Lower-Austria, viz., the details of the period from 1625 to 1670, which appeared as a programme of the Rabbinical School of Budapest for 1887-8. This sketch is written in a beautiful style, of which he is a master, and the data are taken not only from printed books of all kinds, but he has also made ample use of archives and unpublished epitaphs from personal inspection, as well as from communication of many friends. We find in Professor Kaufmann's monograph of not less than 228 pages, not only the historical facts which preceded the Vienna catastrophe, but all biographies and notices of the Rabbis, official, as well as private, of the time. The material is so ample and so exhaustive, from printed sources as well as MSS., that it will be rather difficult for a historian to make full use of it without an index, which is unfortunately not given by the author, even though it was on his instigation that an index was made of Zunz's book on the hymns used in the Synagogues (see p. 201). We cannot go into the details of the excellent work, and we must be satisfied with the mention of the Table of Contents, which is as follows: 1. Ferdinandus II. and the Jewry of Vienna; 2. His reign; 3. Leopoldus I. and the expulsion; 4. The return of the exiles and their new homes, viz., in Moravia, Bohemia, Hungary, Bavaria, Brandenburg, Poland, and France (Alsace-Lorraine).—Dr. M. Grünwald gives to his meagre periodical the pompous title of *Das Jüdische Centralblatt;* it appears very irregularly. He gives in it documents concerning the Jews in Bohemia and Moravia, but fills half of his issue with some of his lectures and translations from the Italian. Is it worth while having a special organ for such second-rate documents? We think not; it is high time that Jewish literature should have a central and international organ, for as it goes on now, it is impossible to follow the current of Jewish literature, even for rich scholars.—The *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, which has reached the third year, remains faithful to its programme; it gives documents on the history of

the Jews in Germany. We point out specially the history of the Jews at Rothenburg by Professor H. Bresslau. The miscellaneous notes contain much new matter. We do not approve of the attacks made on Dr. Güdemann's excellent work (see below).—The *Revue des Études Juives*, 1888-9, has several historical articles, by M. Loeb on the chronicle of Joseph Cohen of Avignon, and by other *savants* on the state of the Jews in the Papal States in the eighteenth century, the history of the Jews in the Catalonian provinces, in Nantes, and in Marseilles.—M. Joseph Halévy has an interesting essay on the persecution of the Christians of Nejrân in Yemen, by the Jewish King Dhoo Nowas, towards the end of the fifth century of the common era; he comes to the conclusion that this story is based on legends, for there was no Himyaritic king who professed Judaism. The indefatigable explorer of the Yemen countries, Herr Eduard Glaser expresses, however, a contrary opinion in an article in its last issue, entitled *Skizzen zur Geschichte Arabiens, etc., Heft I.* (Munich, 1889). Dr. Brüll (*Jahrbücher* ix., pp. 102, *sqq.*) gives many good suggestions for readings in the Mediæval Chronicles, published in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*. Magister Jonas Gurland, Rabbi at Odessa, has written on persecutions in Poland and edited monographs concerning them (*Ozar Hassifruth II.*, 1888).—The history of teaching and of the social state of the Jews in Germany during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, by Dr. Güdemann of Vienna (*Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland während des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts*, Wien, 1888) is as excellent as his three previous volumes on Spain, France, and Italy. The literature of this epoch in Germany is a poor one, consisting chiefly of the too many treatises on the ritual (*Minhagim*) and casuistic *Responsa*, in which, now and then, some crumbs for Jewish history may be gathered. But the chapters which treat of the relation of the Jews to the Christians will be read with great interest, inasmuch as Dr. Güdemann has the art of being interesting, even with dry material. The last chapter on the German Jews in Upper Italy and the comparison between German and Italian culture is worth reading attentively.

Philosophy.

Dr. J. Guttmann thinks that the philosophical system of the famous Solomon Ibn Gabirol (Avicebron, who lived in the eleventh century), as laid down in his "Fons Vitæ," is not yet entirely known by the works of the late S. Munk (who had only a Hebrew compendium of Gabirol's work, of which the Arabic original is lost, and only a Latin translation of the whole exists), nor by that of Dr. Seyrlein, who worked on the Latin translation. It seems that there are many discrepancies between these two *savants*. He therefore undertook to give a new and complete exposition of Gabirol's philosophy, indicating when possible the means which were at his disposal. In general, Gabirol follows the neo-platonic ideas, and when he mentions Plato, he means Plotinus, and inclines towards pantheism, just like Philo and Spinoza, so that we could say that three Jews at various epochs, in antiquity, in middle ages, and in modern times, are the representatives of pantheism. Dr. Guttmann holds with Munk that Gabirol did not die at the age of twenty-nine as reported by early authors, but that he must have reached a mature age of about fifty. No reason is given why the date assigned by those who live only a century after Gabirol should be doubted. The objection that Gabirol expounds a new philosophical system at so young

an age, is not very strong ; we think we could find examples for that, even in modern times. One who writes poems of such gravity and depth as Gabirol did at the age of fourteen to eighteen, may have also written a philosophical book before he was thirty years of age. Anyhow we can only give full praise to Dr. Guttmann's clear exposition of Gabirol's philosophy, which are accompanied by references to the sources.—Joseph Ibn Tsaddik of Cordova is the author of a philosophical treatise in Arabic on the Microcosm. We know only the Hebrew translation of it, edited in 1854 by Dr. A. Jellinek. Dr. Leopold Weinsberg (Breslau, 1888) gives an analysis of it, and more especially of Joseph's relation to the Arabic Aristotelians, and to the philosophy of the *Calam*.—Dr. David Mannheimer gives in his doctor-dissertation (Halle, 1888) a clear exposition of the Cosmogony according to Jewish philosophers from Saadiah Gaon to Maimonides.—We think that we may be allowed to range here an essay on the Law (*Recht*) and its position towards the Ethics according to the knowledge of Ethics and Law in the Talmud (Berlin, 1889), by Dr. Sch. Schaffer. The Talmud gives no system for any of the branches treated in it, not even for casuistry, but from the scattered sentences we can draw conclusions of what the various authors of them meant in Ethics and Law, but we must guard ourselves against attributing them to the Talmud as an integral book ; the sayings are of individual Rabbis, but not by the Rabbinical school.

Kabbalah.

It is to be regretted that M. Adolphe Franck has issued a second edition of his work *la Kabale*, which appeared in 1843 without any alteration. The first edition was not built on solid ground, but since then documents bearing on this branch of literature were brought to light, for instance, on the book *Bahir*, which was declared a fabrication by the Synod of Narbonne, about 1240, of which the author ought to have taken notice.—The issue of new cabbalistical texts is fortunately scanty. We record a different text of the היכלות רבתי from that to be found in Dr. Jellinek's Beth ham-Midrash, edited from a MS. by R. S. A. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1887-8) ; some chapters attributed to the prophet Elijah, and some anonymous ones, edited from MSS. by Herr Chaim M. Horowitz, with the title of כבוד חופה. Unfortunately the latter publication is autographed with very small characters and difficult to read.

Poetry and Liturgy.

In the poetical department we have to mention M. Samuel Philipp's edition of the poems of Rabbi Hai (Haya) Gaon, re-edited according to MSS., with critical notes by the editor, and by Herren Reifmann and Halberstamm. Herr Philipp entitled the work בית חבחירה, forming a second collection ; the first consists of liturgical pieces by the famous Judah Halevi. We may unhesitatingly say that Herr Philipp has a kind of intuition for Hebrew poetry, and it would not be a bad idea to entrust him a complete edition of all Judah Halevi's poems, religious as well as profane, the MSS. of which are at Oxford, if we could discover a Mecænas in our rich communities who would be willing to erect a monument to the favourite poet of Heine by defraying the cost of such an edition.—Some *Selihoth* are published in the *Sammelband* iv., by R. Isaac Baruch Levi, of Ferrara, Dr. Berliner, and notes by Herr Halberstamm. The *Magazin* (1888) has some good emendations by Professor Kaufmann on the poem of Elijah of Norwich, edited by Dr. Berliner.

Bibliography and Biography.

The *Orientalische Bibliographie*, so ably edited by Professor August Müller, of Königsberg (Berlin, 1888), gives, under the heading of *Hebräisch*, a complete list of works and articles concerning the Hebrew and Rabbinical literature. This publication is indispensable for scholars who wish to be well informed upon these branches of studies, since the bibliography in the *Revue des Études Juives* does not pretend to be complete, and Dr. Berliner has not yet begun to continue the excellent work done by Dr. Steinschneider in his *Hebräische Bibliographie*, which ended with the twenty-first volume.—A useful alphabetical index has been made to Dr. Zunz's *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, according to the beginning of the liturgies and hymns; Dr. Zunz's index being alphabetical according the authors. The new index has the title of *Mafteach ha-Pijutim*, by A. Gerstetner, and is published by the *Curatorium* of the *Zunz-Stiftung* (Berlin, 1889, i.; see p. 198) With it the researches in MSS. and rare editions of *Mahazorim* will be easier.—Dr. Berliner gives, in his *Magazin*, etc. (1889), a short description of the Hebrew MSS. in the library of Naples, and Dr. L. Modona publishes a minute catalogue of those of Bologna (*Cataloghi . . d'Italia*, Firenze, 1888).

The editor of the *ha-Assyf* (annual publication in Hebrew, Warsaw, fifth year, 1889), has made an attempt to give biographies of living Jewish writers, many of which are written by themselves. It is arranged alphabetically according to the family names, beginning with Drs. Adler, the venerable chief rabbi and the delegate chief rabbi; there is also a biography of Dr. Gaster. The editor complains about the scanty answers he had to his appeal for his well-intended publication. The title of the work is *Sepher Zykaron, Bio-bibliographisches Lexicon*.—The last issued volume (2te Section, Theil 43) of Ersch and Grubier's *Encyclopædie*, contains concise and full articles on Levi ben Gershom (Ralbag), and on the various Leos, biographical as well as from a literary point of view, by Dr. M. Steinschneider; and on Elijah Levita, by Professor W. Bacher (see p. 197).—Dr. Tauberles has chosen for his doctor-dissertation the biography of Saadiah Gaon. This kind of production is rarely complete, but it is an improvement on the poor article on this important author given in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xxi., p. 120, where the *Agron* is still quoted from the *Orient* x., the nature of the *Sepher haggaluy* is still not clear, and the commentary on Daniel (Bodl. MS. 2486) not mentioned at all.—Dr. D. Cassel made the subject of the programme of the Berlin *Hochschule* the famous Joseph Caro (Berlin, 1888), whose commentary on the *Shulchan Arukh* was not long ago attacked by the anti-Semites in Germany, and gave rise to a lawsuit. He tries to prove that this rabbi was not a kabbalist, and consequently is not the author of the *Maggid Mesharim*, which is usually attributed to him.—Signor Cesare Musatti consecrated fifty-three pages in the *Archivio Veneto* (t. xxxvi., p. ii., 1888) to the biography of the late Maestro Moisé Soave, of Venice, born 1820, who did not write books, but many useful and erudite articles, amongst others on Dante in relation to the famous poet Emmanuele, of Rome. Soave refuted the opinion of the late Dr. Geiger that, by the Daniel mentioned in the Diwân of Emmanuele, Dante is meant.—Dr. Joel Müller gave a lecture (see the *Populäre-wissenschaftliche Monatsblätter*, 1888) on the late Leopold Kompert as a writer on Jewish life and customs in Bohemia.

Palæography and Epigraphy.

Dr. Reinhart Hoerning, of the Department of Oriental MSS., British Museum, has brought out a curious collection of facsimiles, with an exhaustive description of Karaitic MSS. of Biblical fragments, written in Arabic characters and provided with the Hebrew vowel-points. The title of this important book is the following: *Description and Collation of six Karaite Manuscripts of Portions of the Hebrew Bible, in Arabic characters; with a complete reproduction by the autotype process of one, Exodus* i. 1—viii. 5, *in forty-two facsimiles* (Williams and Norgate, 1889). Those MSS. were brought by the late Mr. Shapira, some from the Karaitic Synagogue at Heet (a town situated on the Euphrates, about thirty leagues to the west of Bagdad, inhabited by Arabs and Karaite Jews), and others from Cairo. This is at present the greatest collection of this kind of MSS., of which some are found in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg. Dr. Hoerning's description extends to every detail, to the phonetics, to the accents, and to the massoretical rules; for the last, he had the benefit of Dr. Ginsburg's help. There are also variations from the massoretic text. Dr. Hoerning however does not suggest any explanation why the Bible in Hebrew was written in Arabic characters for these communities. Is it possible that the Karaites in these countries found difficulty in reading Hebrew in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, for those are the dates of these MSS.? Most likely this was the case, for we can scarcely suggest that the transcription was made for the benefit of Mahommedan *lettrés*, for in that case the Arabic vowel-points would have been employed, and the accents and massoretic notes omitted. Besides, the commentary of Yepeth, which is found in them, is in many passages offensive to Islam.—Besides the controversy on the Simeon et Bar Cochba coins between Professor Graetz and M. Th. Reinach, we have to mention many notices by M. Salomon Reinach, based on inscriptions, such as on the Jewish congregation of Athribis, and by M. Th. Reinach on the Jewish inscription of Narbonne in the *Revue des Études Juives;* here we find also notices on the inscription of Narbonne in Latin with the usual Hebrew words שלום על ישראל, and on that found in a mosque at Gaza in Hebrew and Greek, by M. Loeb (1889, p. 100).—We may be allowed to mention here Dr. D. Simonsen's (Rabbi of Copenhagen) edition of inscription of Palmyra (the Biblical Tadmor) to be found on monuments in the *Glyptothèque* of Ny Carlsberg (Copenhagen, 1889). The Palmyrenian dialect is much connected with those of the Talmud and the neo-Hebrew, for instance the word חבל, "alas," which occurs so often on Palmyrenian tomb-stones.—Dr. Harkavy gives (*Russian Archæological Journal*, iv., pp. 83—95) a solution of a formula of exorcising on a Babylonian cup, to be found at Moscow; this kind of inscriptions in Aramaic are not rare in European Museums, on which the late Dr. A. Levy, M. Joseph Halévi, Abbé Hyvernat, and even the omniscient M. Moïse Schwab tried their hands, more or less satisfactorily. Dr. Harkavy, who has not seen the original, doubts the genuineness of the Moscow document.—The epitaphs in the old Jewish cemetery at Algiers were published with biographical notes by the chief Rabbi of that town, M. Isaac Bloch. We find amongst them those of Judah Khallatz, of Tsemah Duran and Samuel Vivas (not Bibas, as M. Bloch writes). This monograph in French has the following title: *Inscriptions tumulaires des*

anciens cimetières israélites d'Alger (Paris, 1888). Some years ago M. M. Weil, chief Rabbi of Tlemcen, published the epitaphs of this town. We hope that this example will be followed for Tunis and Morocco. An epitaph found at Orleans is described in the *Revue*.—Professor Euting also has contributed to this branch of literature with his essay entitled *Ueber die älteren hebräischen Steine in Elsass* (1888), to which some good emendations are proposed by Professor D. Kaufmann (*Revue des Études Juives*, 1889). There are also notices on the epitaphs of Riva, by Baron David de Günzburg and Professor Kaufmann.

Miscellaneous Literature.

Religious controversy between Christians and Jews in the middle ages were treated in the *Expositor* of February and March (1888), and by M. Loeb, mostly of those in France and Spain, in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, (1888), to which he made some additions, more especially concerning the texts, in the *Revue des Études Juives* (1888).—The 4th *Sammelband* of the society מקיצי נרדמים contains texts relating to the lost tribes, on which the articles in the first volume of this Quarterly are based.—M. Moïse Schwab, after having succeeded in lowering the Palestinian Talmud in the eyes of Christian scholars by his unintelligible and mostly inaccurate translation in French, did the same service to the *Revue des Etudes Juives* (1888-9) by his publication of a Hebraico-Italian school vocabulary, called *Makra Dardake*, with the pretension that it is of value for Romanic philology. The French, and certainly the Italian words here given are of no use for philological purposes. French texts of the fourteenth century are plentiful, and there is no necessity for reprinting a few words which are found in the *Makra Dardake*, and much less the Italian translation.—M. Israel Lévi gives from time to time, in the *Revue des Études Juives*, excellent notes and articles on Jewish legends in the Talmud and the Midrashim, early and late ones, of which folk-lorists will have to take notice.—We may also mention Dr. A. Fleischhacker's doctor-dissertation, with the title *Der Tod Moses nach der Sage*, in which the literature is well put together. There is some attempt made in the *Revue* to explain the expression שם המפורש.—M. Loeb connects the *Shemonah Esré* with some Psalms (146 and 147), on which this prayer is, according to him, modelled, and which he considers originally a prayer of the Justes and Poor. There is also an interesting note on the prayer after meals in the *Bet Talmud* (1889).—Dr. N. Brüll has, in his *Jahrbücher* (1889), an essay, or rather a description of MS., headed *Beiträge zur jüdischen Sagen- und Sprachkunde im Mittelalter*, which is full of legends and some poetry, the first of which represents the fight between wine and water, in Hebrew and German, by Zalman Sofer.—We may add here that Dr. Rosenberg has published, in his doctor-dissertation, Judæo-German texts of *Volkslieder*, with philological remarks from a Germanistic point of view, from a Bodleian MS. This dissertation is to be found in the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* (1888-9). Dr. Steinschneider gives literary notices on various mediæval subjects under the title of *Miscellen* in Dr. Brüll's *Jahrbücher* (1889).—The new monthly, edited by Herr Weissmann (Wien, 1889), has not yet accomplished its first year, and it would be premature to give an opinion on the articles contained in it.—The first volume of the late Leopold Löw's (Rabbi at Szegedin in Hungary) collected articles and essays is ably edited and annotated by his son and his successor, Dr. Immanuel Löw.

Samaritan.

The Samaritan literature has been neglected somehow since the premature death of A. Geiger; even Dr. Heidenheim, of Zürich, has published nothing since 1888. We welcome, therefore, two young students who devoted their doctor-dissertations to this branch of study. 1st. Dr. H. Baneth, who gave Marqah's chapter on the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, which form the basis of the Hebrew language, with a German translation and copious notes. 2nd. Dr. Leopold Wreschner's dissertation, entitled *Samaritanische Traditionen mitgeteilt und nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung untersucht* (Berlin, 1888), is important for the history of the casuistical differences between the Rabbanites, Karaites and Samaritans. They are chiefly based upon a MS. of Munaga ibn Tsadakah, but Dr. Wreschner has by no means neglected the data of other writers.

A. Neubauer.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

APRIL, 1890.

ARE THERE TRACES OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN THE SEPTUAGINT?

THE inquiry into the philosophical views of the Greek translators of the Bible has as yet been carried to no definite issue. The researches of German scholars between the years 1830-50, uncertain in method as well as wanting in knowledge, have been rectified, but scarcely carried further or definitely completed by more competent investigators. Much difference of opinion accordingly prevails on the subject even at the present time, and one must endeavour to attain to positive results by means different from those hitherto made use of.

First, let me call to mind the general course that previous inquiries have taken. Humphrey Hody, with whom the scientific investigation of the Septuagint really begins, was also the first to hold the opinion that the influence of a foreign philosophy is discernible in the Greek translation of certain scriptural passages. He finds traces of the wisdom of the Egyptian priests in the title of the first book of Moses (Genesis) and in the translation of Deut. xxxii. 8.[1] About fifty years later, David Michaelis endeavoured to prove[2] that in six passages of the Septuagint traces of Gnostic and Manichæan teaching are evident. But so faint are these traces

[1] *De bibl. text. origin.*, p. 115.

[2] *Dissertatio de indiciis gnosticæ philosophiæ tempore LXX. interpretum et Philonis Judæi*, printed in *Syntagma Commentationum*, Götting., 1767. II., p. 251*f.*

that it was not difficult for Ernesti[1] and Horn[2] to deny their existence, and to show that the interpretations of Michaelis rested upon mere mis-understandings.

Research in this field was now suspended for a long time, and was only renewed in 1831 by A. F. Gfrörer, in his "*Geschichte des Urchristenthums.*"[3] This brilliant and learned, but shallow and untrustworthy scholar sees in the LXX. "the source of the beginnings of the Alexandrian theosophy."[4] The Alexandrian translators sought to avoid, as Gfrörer says, all expressions that refer to a visible God, and this deviation from the customary conception of God's existence had the most important consequences on Jewish theology. It necessarily led up to the doctrine of divine powers, of the existence of creatures between God and men, and to that of a transcendental God, wholly alienated from the finite world, or what perhaps is more correct, this latter doctrine must be presupposed and God's invisibility derived from it.[5] All these opinions Gfrörer finds clearly expressed in different passages of the LXX. He supposes that the Greek translators separate God from the visible world; that they are persuaded of the existence of divine beings subordinate to God, and that they invest the Messiah himself "with an eternal and heavenly character."[6]

A. F. Dähne goes still further in his *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie.*[7] He thinks he can show that not only the most important doctrines of Philo, but also those of the Christian Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, were known to the translators, and are traceable in their work. Like Gfrörer he maintains that they sought in the first place to remove, or to moderate[8] many of the human qualities and passions attributed to God in the Bible. Dähne finds a clear expression in the LXX. of the doctrine of creation which Philo teaches in his philosophical writings, viz.: the creation of the world of ideas before that of sensuous things, the denial of creation out of nothing (*Creatio ex nihilo*), the doctrine of the androgynous Adam, and of the divine creative and preservative powers. Even the ecstasy of the Epopts, the assumption of a two-fold divine revelation, the allegorical exegesis of the Alexandrians,—these and many other strange things Dähne finds in the translation, both of the Pentateuch and of the other portions of Scripture.[9]

---

[1] *Exegetische Bibliothek*, Vol. VIII., p. 716*f*. [2] *Biblische Gnosis*, p. 67*f*.
[3] Vol. II.[2], p. 8*ff*. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 9. [5] Gfrörer, *ibid.*, p. 15.
[6] Gfrörer, *ibid.*, p. 17. [7] Vol. II., p. 2*f*. (Halle, 1834).
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 37*f*. [9] *Ibid.*, II., p. 11*f*.

Dähne bestowed so much learning and acuteness upon the demonstration of his hypothesis, that for a time he made even excellent scholars believe, that the influence of the Alexandrian theosophy on the LXX. was actually proved.[1] But in truth his proofs were so arbitrary and insufficient, based on so little knowledge of the language and the method of translation followed by the LXX., that he soon met with violent opposition. H. G. Thiersch criticised the various errors of Dähne in a now almost forgotten, but excellent work.[2] But Thiersch threw the force of his criticism on details and left uncontested the fundamental views of Dähne. He no less than the latter believed that the Greek translators anticipated the peculiar doctrines of the Alexandrian philosophers.[3]

But other scholars, among whom Zacharias Frankel deserves foremost mention, arrived at very different conclusions. In his epoch-making *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, which appeared in 1841, in his *Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, a work published ten years later, and in smaller essays, Frankel clearly showed that Gfrörer and Dähne not only had committed errors, but that their hypothesis is built up on wholly insecure foundations; that they do not prove the influence of Greek philosophy on the Septuagint; that this influence is certainly less than they supposed, and that it is only the avoidance of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism which is discernible most decidedly in the translation of the Pentateuch, less distinctly in other books of the Bible, which were translated at a later period; and that not Greek philosophy, but Palestinian influence produced this effect.[4]

E. Zeller agrees with Frankel in all essential points about the pretended philosophy of the LXX. The renowned author of the *Philosophie der Griechen* says[5]: Some of the translators were offended at the physical manifestations of Jehovah, but from that circumstance, as well as from the translations of other passages, we dare not conclude that the LXX. were familiar with Platonic or Stoical philosophy, or that the doctrines of the school of Philo were shared by them. There is no reason to suppose "more than a small and superficial contact with Greek ideas."

---

[1] See the remarkable essay of Georgi in Ilgen's *Zeitschrift*, 1839, Vol. IV., p. 50.

[2] *De Pentateuchi Vers. Alexandrina* (Erl., 1841), p. 43*ff*.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 41, p. 43.

[4] See especially *Vorstudien*, p. 175 *s.*; c. *Einfluss*, p. 30*f*, 82*f*, 130*f*; *Palästin. und alexandrin. Schriftforschung*, p. 24.

[5] Vol. III., Part II[3]., 253*ff*.

With this negative result the first researches into the philosophical views of the LXX. close, but we cannot be satisfied with it. For even if all the arguments of Gfrörer and Dähne do not stand the test, does it necessarily follow that their hypothesis itself is false? Cannot new and more careful researches prove the same assertions with other arguments? As long as criticism did not go beyond the refutation of Gfrörer and Dähne, there was no certainty on the subject of the philosophical or non-philosophical spirit of the Greek translation. It hence resulted that the judgments of the most learned inquirers differed widely from one another. Frankel, who by a more accurate explanation of hitherto misunderstood passages had eliminated so many philosophical theories supposed to have been insinuated into the translation, repeatedly speaks of the philosophical exegesis of the LXX.,[1] and regards some words as bearing a philosophical importance, which Zeller thinks quite insignificant.[2]

Though Zeller contradicts the extreme views of Dähne, he nevertheless believes that in some passages traces may be found of the anthropological terminology of Plato and the Stoics.[3] Siegfried, one of the greatest living authorities on Jewish Hellenism, thinks it doubtful whether there are any traces of Greek philosophy in the LXX. Yet he supposes that the doctrine of the intellectual world, the κόσμος νοητός, is expressed in the translation of Gen. i. 2.[4] But if we indeed find that this Platonic, or rather Philonic, doctrine is embodied in the LXX., we should naturally expect to find many other philosophical doctrines more in accord with the ideas that were current in the Alexandrian school.

G. W. Bickell, in fact, discovers such other doctrines. He declares[5] that the avoidance of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism (which, as he thinks, is in no book more rigidly observed than in the translation of the book of Job,) was connected most intimately with Alexandrian theology and the allegorical exegesis, and that both point to a long acquaintance with Greek, especially Platonic, philosophy. He thinks that the doctrine of God's absolute unchangeability, of his complete unity, and of matter as the source of Evil, must have been the cause of certain interpretations of Scriptural passages found in the LXX.

The foregoing facts are enough to show the uncertainty

---

[1] *Einfluss*, pp. 21, 30, 82, 130. [2] *Paläst. und alex. Schriftf.*, p. 24.

[3] *Philos. der Griechen*, III., 2[3], p. 255. [4] *Philo von Alexandria*, p. 8.

[5] *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinæ in interpretando libri Jobi*, p. 5*f*.

still prevalent as to the philosophical level of the LXX., even after the investigations of Frankel and Zeller. The question arises whether there are no means of removing the doubts which have hitherto existed. It is evident that the most cautious and acute exegesis of single passages of the LXX. cannot provide them. For very often the Hebrew original that lay before the translators is no longer discoverable, or the reading and the meaning of the Greek text are alike doubtful. Copyists, commentators and editors, each in their various ways, have contributed to bring the original text of the LXX. to its present state of confusion. Under such circumstances it is impossible from individual passages to recognise the spirit which inspired the translators in their work.[1] But it is probable that the examination of the large linguistic material of the LXX. will lead us to safe results. Researches like those which Frankel, Thiersch and others made in respect to the grammar of the Septuagint, can and must be extended to philosophical questions. Here the sources of errors are fewer, the chance of mistake is reduced by the large number of passages to be examined, and we may therefore hope that cautious researches in this field will lead to the desired end.[2]

In spite of the great difference of opinion as to the sense of single words and expressions in the LXX., we may certainly believe, that if Greek philosophy influenced the translation of the Septuagint, this influence must not only be discernible here and there, but must find its expression in the choice of certain fixed technical terms. As there is no philosophy in a technical sense to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, if the translators of the Septuagint actually were in contact with philosophical ideas, the choice of certain expressions for psychological, ethical and metaphysical notions, must clearly show difference between the original and the translation. To what result do we come, if we look at the LXX. from this point of view?

---

[1] One instance in place of many may demonstrate this fact. The words of the second verse of Genesis והארץ היתה תהו ובהו are translated *καὶ ἡ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος*. Dähne (l.c., p. 11), and Thiersch (l.c., p. 44), see in these words a clear allusion to the doctrine of the creation of a spiritual before the sensual world. Zeller (l.c., p. 255) declares they were chosen without any *arrière pensée*, and Bickell agrees with him (l.c., p. 6). Frankel, however, attacks their genuineness (*Paläst. und Alex. Schriftf.*, p. 24). Siegfried (*Philo*, p. 8), returns to Dähne's opinion.

[2] Not long ago the late Dr. Edwin Hatch, in his learned essays on Biblical Greek (Oxford, 1889, p. 94*f*), examined the sense of some psychological notions in the LXX. He, however, mainly contents himself with the mere reckoning up of the manifold translations of Hebrew words, without entering into the particulars of the meaning and the origin of the ideas expressed.

The investigation of words like ψυχή, αἴσθησις, νοῦς, φρόνησις, ἀνδρεία, ἀρετή, πρόνοια, κόσμος and other philosophical terms gives us an unequivocal answer to this question.

1.—Ψυχή.

The meanings of the Greek word ψυχὴ are equivalent to those of the Hebrew נפש. Therefore the one is the common translation of the other, as we see in a great many passages. But in some respects ψυχὴ deviates from נפש. The Hebrew word, which originally means "breath," "breeze," "blast," denotes ordinarily the principle of life, sensuous as well as spiritual, but occasionally it is used as synonymous with "man," "person"; sometimes it even signifies "dead body," "corpse." To the Greek word ψυχὴ these significations are wanting.[1] When once philosophical reflection had grasped the difference between soul and body, ψυχὴ tended to become more and more abstract, and in educated speech it loses the sensual connotation which it formerly possessed. Where נפש is used in this sensual meaning, the Greek translator, if he had not felt it his duty to translate literally, would have had to deviate from the original. So even the Aramaic translators often render נפש by אנש or בר נש.[2] In the LXX. we very seldom find such deviations, in the Pentateuch only twice (Gen. xiv. 21, and xxxvi. 6), in the rest of the Bible only four times, and that in a single chapter (Joshua x. 28, 30, 35, 39). In the great number of passages, where נפש means "living being," "man," "person," "slave," or "dead body," "corpse," the LXX., heedless of the true sense of the Greek word, uses ψυχή. For instance Gen. i. 24, ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν; xii. 5, καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτήσατο[3]; xlvi. 15, πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαί, υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες, and the same v. 18, 22, 25, 26, 27, and in many other passages. So we read (Lev. vii. 8-10), ψυχή, ἥτις ἐὰν φάγῃ ἀπὸ κρεῶν and (Lev. vii. 11; xxii. 6), ἡ ἂν ἅψηται παντὸς πράγματος or ἐὰν δὲ ψυχὴ πυσφέρῃ δῶρον (Lev. ii. 1), and similar expressions (Lev. iv. 2, 27; v. 1, etc.); Deuter. xxiv. 7 (9), we find κλέπτων ψυχήν.—More decidedly the LXX. deviate from the Greek use

[1] In some dictionaries ψυχὴ is translated by "person" on the ground of passages like Soph. *Œd. Kol.* 1207; *El.* 775, 786, 1127; Aristoph. *Nub.*, 711; *Polyb.* viii. 5, 3. But this translation is not the right one. In all these and similar passages the true sense of ψυχὴ is "life," "soul," or "spirit."

[2] See Frankel, *Einfluss*, p. 126. Isaiah xxix. 8; xliii. 4; Jer. li. 14; Prov. xiii. 4; xvi. 26; xxiv. 12; Psalm xl. 3, and in some other passages the translation of נפש is not literal, but it has its usual sense. Hatch did not take notice of many of these passages.

[3] Frankel sees the influence of the Agadah in this translation (*Einfluss*, p. 48). The analogous translations prove that this opinion is groundless.

of language where they put ψυχὴ instead of νεκρὸς, as Lev. xix. 28, ἐντομίδας οὐ ποιήσετε ἐπὶ ψυχῇ, xxi. 11, ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευκυίᾳ; Num. v. 2 and ix. 6, ἀκάθαρτον ἐπὶ ψυχῇ.

This use of the word explains why ψυχὴ is declared to be identical with blood, even in a passage where the masoretic text does not precisely make this identification. So Levit. xvii. 11, ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, where the Hebrew text reads כי נפש הבשר בדם היא the soul of every living thing is in the blood. (See also Lev. xvii. 14; Deut. xii. 23.) This meaning of נפש and therefore of ψυχὴ occurs in the other books of the Scripture less frequently than in the Pentateuch. But we can quote Jer. xliii. 6 (l. 6); Ezech. xliv. 25; Hag. ii. 13; Psalm civ. (cv.) 18; cxxiii. (cxxiv.) 4; Prov. xiii. 25; 1 Chr. v. 21. These and similar passages show how extensive this use of the word is.[1]

No servile dependency on the Hebrew original can have induced this translation. For in that of the Pentateuch, as well as in that of most books of the Bible, we find very numerous deviations from the original, as Frankel[2] and Thiersch[3] have conclusively proved. We even find the un-Greek use of ψυχὴ where the Hebrew text does not use נפש, but employs quite another word. Thus ψυχὴ is the translation of מת, Ezech. xliv. 25; of בטן, Prov. xiii. 25,[4] of איש, Lev. xvii. 9 (in a great number of manuscripts collated by Holmes). We may therefore conclude, that if the Greek translators give to ψυχὴ the meaning of "person," "slave," "dead body," "corpse," they could not be familiar with the abstract meaning which the word obtained in later Greek, and they could not be conscious of the opposition between body and soul, which is sharply accentuated in Greek philosophy.

2.—*Πνοή.*

The consideration of this word shows how little the Greek translators understood the method of expressing the difference between the sensuous and the spiritual, and how unphilosophically they reasoned. *Πνοή*, etymologically synonymous with πνεῦμα, is not often used in good Greek. It

---

[1] The use of this word in apocryphal books and in the New Testament is the same as in the LXX. See Sap. xii. 6, γονεῖς ψυχῶν ἀβοηθήτων; 1 Macc. x. 33, πᾶσαν ψυχὴν Ἰουδαίων; ii. 38, ἕως χιλίων ψυχῶν ἀνθρώπων; Acts ii. 41; iii. 23; Apocal. xvi. 3.

[2] *Einfluss*, pp. 6, 73, 122, 177, 202.

[3] L.c., p. 59.

[4] Lagarde, *Anmerk. zur griech. Uebers. der Prov.*, p. 46, would not have altered the text of the LXX., if he had noticed these analogies.

means the blowing of the wind, the fire, the breath, the wind itself, and metaphorically the spiritual breath, the storm of feelings and passions. But the word is never used for the principle of spiritual life, it is never synonymous with ψυχὴ or νοῦς. And just in the last-named sense πνοὴ is used in the LXX. We read Prov. xxiv. 12, ὁ πλάσας πνοὴν πᾶσιν for נוצר נפשך; xx. 27, φῶς κυρίου πνοὴ ἀνθρώπων for נר ה' נשמת אדם; Ps. cl. 6, πᾶσα πνοὴ αἰνεσάτω τὸν κύριον for כל הנשמה. Not less remarkable is Prov. i. 23, προήσομαι ὑμῖν ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥῆσιν; Is. lvii. 16, πνοὴν πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ἐποίησα; Job xxxii. 9, and xxx. 4, πνοὴ δὲ παντοκράτορος ἡ διδάσκουσα. The men who translated the Scripture in this manner could not have been acquainted with the terminology of Greek psychology.

3.—*Νοῦς.*

Remarking how often the LXX. substitutes νοῦς for such expressions as: "heart," "ear," "breath," one might be tempted to consider this as due to the influence of Greek philosophy. But a more exact examination shows us, that νοῦς in the LXX. has the same meaning as in common speech, and not as in philosophy. It does not denote the spiritual principle of life, or intellectual activity, but "opinion," "attention," "resolution," and similar notions. So Exod. vii. 23, and Isaiah xli. 22, ἐπέστησε τὸν νοῦν; Job vii. 17, προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν for שום לב, and the same sense is expressed also by καρδίαν τιθέναι (Prov. xxii. 17; xxvii. 23). In a similar sense the word is used Jos. xiv. 7, κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ (or αὐτῶν in many manuscripts) for כאשר עם לבבו "according to his wish"; Job vii. 20, ὁ ἐπιστάμενος τὸν νοῦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "he who knows the intentions," and Isaiah x. 12, ἐπισκέψομαι ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν "I shall watch over the proud mind." In the sense of resolution we find it in Isaiah xl. 13, τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου. That this is the true sense of the word is proved by the parallel idea that follows τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο, and by another passage (Is. x. 7), ἀπαλλάξει[1] ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ for להשמיד בלבבו.

There is much difficulty in deciding on the meaning of a certainly corrupt passage, Prov. xxxi. 3 (xxiv. 71,) where we find a double translation of דרך νοῦς καὶ βίος and Job xxxiii. 16, where אזן "ear" is translated νοῦς. Here probably οὖς was the original translation. That νοῦς δεήσεως (Job xxxvi.

[1] It is necessary to read ἀπαλλάξαι, as we conclude from the synonym ἐξολοθρεῦσαι and from ἀφανίσαι the variant of numerous manuscripts.

19) is not identical with the νοῦς of Greek philosophy, needs no proof.[1]

The fact that where the source of spiritual activity, the principle of thinking and reasoning, is understood, the Greek translators never put νοῦς must be specially marked. We find ψυχή where νοῦς would have been the right expression, Jos. xxiii. 14, γνώσεσθε τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ; Is. x. 7, τῇ ψυχῇ . . . . λελόγισται; xliv. 19, οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ ψυχῇ; Prov. xxiv. 14, αἰσθήσῃ σοφίαν τῇ σῇ ψυχῇ; Ps. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 14, ἡ ψυχή μου γινώσκει, and so on. Καρδία is substituted for νοῦς, Exod. xxxvi. 2, θεὸς ἔδωκεν ἐπιστήμην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ; Deut. xxix. 4, εἰδέναι; 1 Sam. iv. 20, ἐνόησεν ἡ καρδία, Neh. v. 7, ἐβουλεύσατο καρδία μου, and frequently. We find πνοὴ in the same sense, Prov. i. 23, πρόησομαι ὑμῖν ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥῆσιν; Job xxxii. 9, πνοὴ παντοκράτορος ἡ διδάσκουσα, and in other passages (see above p. 212). This fact, too, proves that the sense given by Greek philosophers to the word νοῦς was not known to the LXX.

4.—*Φρόνησις, φρόνιμος, ἄφρων.*

Φρόνησις denotes, in philosophical language, "practical wisdom." Aristotle gives the definition ἕξιν ἀληθῆ μετὰ λόγου πρακτικὴν περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακά (E. N. vi., 5, 1140 *b* 5); the Stoics ἐπιστήμην κακῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ οὐδετέρων (D. L., vii. 92; S. E. Pyrrh. iii. § 271), or ἐπιστήμην ὧν ποιητέον καὶ οὐ ποιητέον καὶ οὐδετέρων (Stob., ecl. ii., p. 102, Heer.) But the LXX. attribute φρόνησις also to God. So 1 Kings iii. 28, φρόνησις θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ; Is. xl. 28, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐξεύρεσις τῆς φρονήσεως αὐτοῦ; Jer. x. 12, τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ ἐξέτεινε τὸν οὐρανόν; Prov. iii. 19, ὁ θεὸς ἡτοίμασεν οὐρανοὺς φρονήσει. It is used simply for "wisdom," 1 Kings iv. 25, 26 (29, 30); Prov. iii. 13; xix. 8, and so on. In the same meaning φρόνιμος appears, 1 Kings. iii. 12; iv. 26 (30); v. 7; Is. xliv. 25, and so on.

Still more unlike the usual Greek is the meaning which the LXX. give to ἄφρων. It is used not only to denote the foolish, thoughtless, unreasonable, but also the morally reprobate man. It is the translation of נבל, 2 Sam. xiii. 13; Jer. xvii. 11; Psalm xiii. (xiv.) 1; xxxviii. (xxxix.) 9; lii. (liii.) 2; lxxiii. (lxxiv.) 18, 22; Prov. xvii. 7; xxx. 22 (xxiv. 57); Job ii. 10; xxx. 8. We find it for מביש, Prov. xvii. 2; for

[1] Eccl. iii. 21, רוח בני אדם is translated πνεῦμα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου instead of νοῦς ἀνθρώπων. This fact would be very important if we knew the original version of Ecclesiastes. But the Greek translation of this book is written by Aquila, or interpolated according to his version. See Graetz *Kohelet*, p. 173, and Freudenthal, *Hellen. Studien*, p. 65. Certainly we must write here, with 12 codd. of Holmes, οἶδε instead of εἶδε.

אוֹן אִישׁ, Job xxxiv. 36; for בְּלִי יָעַל, Prov. vi. 12; xvi. 27; xix. 28. In the same sense *ἀφροσύνη* is put for נְבָלָה, Deut. xxii. 21; Jud. xix. 23, 24; xx. 6[1]; 1 Sam. xxv. 25; 2 Sam. xiii. 12; for תִּפְלָה, Job i. 22.

5, 6.—*Δόξα* and λόγος.

Both words, so frequent in the philosophical writings of the Greeks, hardly ever appear in the LXX. in their philosophical meaning; *δόξα* is used for "glory," "honour," "magnificence," כָּבוֹד, תִּפְאֶרֶת, הָדָר. In the sense of *opinion* we find it only once, Isaiah xi. 3, *οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρινεῖ.* Even *δοξάζειν* does not denote in the LXX. "to mean," "to suggest," but "to praise," "to glorify," and is therefore frequently used for כָּבֵד, פָּאַר, רוֹמֵם, and so forth.

λόγος has in the LXX. only the concrete meaning of "word," "speech," and is never used for "reason," "cause," "reflection." In Prov. v. 1 we read indeed *ἐμοῖς δὲ λόγοις* for וּלְתְבוּנָתִי. But the plural proves that the word bears here merely the sense "words." It is probably interpolated from iv. 20, *τοῖς δ' ἐμοῖς λόγοις*, and has replaced the original *σύνεσις* or *φρόνησις*.[2]

7.—*Αἰσθάνομαι, αἴσθησις.*

These terms are employed, both in the common speech and loosely by writers acquainted with philosophy, not only for sense-perception but also for "mental conception," "observation," and so forth. Thus Euripides (*Electra* 288) speaks of an *αἴσθησις τῶν κακῶν*; Plutarch (*Anton.* 24), of *βραδεῖα αἴσθησις (ἁμαρτημάτων)*. Even Aristotle, though only in his physical and political writings, makes mention of *αἴσθησις ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ* (*Politics* 1, 2. 1253 *a* 17), and *αἴσθησις ἐπιμελητικὴ τῶν τέκνων* (*Anim. Gen.* III. 753 *a* 8). In more exact philosophical usage, however, *αἴσθησις* in the connotation of sense-perception is most strictly opposed to intellectual conception, thinking, or knowing—a statement for which I need offer no proof. The LXX. employ the term solely in its inexact signification, and in this respect go far beyond the usage of Greek writers. They translate Exod. xx. 18, וכל העם רואים את הקולות, *πᾶς δὲ ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνήν*, and similarly with verse 22; for חבין and ידע on the other hand *αἰσθάνεσθαι* is

[1] Many good codd. have here *ἀφροσύνην.*

[2] Like *δόξα* and λόγος, some other words, as *εἶδος, ἰδέα, ὕλη*, which are very frequent in the writings of Greek philosophers, never have in the LXX. the sense given to them in philosophical terminology.

used, *αἴσθησις* being treated as a synonym of *φρόνησις*, *ἐπιστήμη*, *σοφία*. Thus for Exodus xxviii. 3, אשר מלאתי רוח חכמה, we read *οὓς ἐνέπλησα πνεύματος αἰσθήσεως*[1]; in Prov. i. 7, יראת ה' ראשית דעת is rendered *εὐσέβεια εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως*; *ibid.* i. 22. וכסילים ישנאו דעת, *ἀσεβεῖς γενόμενοι ἐμίσησαν αἴσθησιν*; iii. 20, *ἐν αἰσθήσει* (בדעת) *ἄβυσσοι ἐρράγησαν*; xxiii. 12, *τὰ δὲ ὦτά σου ἑτοίμασον τοῖς λόγοις αἰσθήσεως*. In this unusual meaning we find the word most frequently in Proverbs (ii. 10; v. 2; x. 14; xi. 9; xii. 1, 23; xiv. 6, 7, 18; xv. 7, 14, etc.), but besides these instances and the passages from Exodus already quoted, the same use of the term may be noted in Isaiah xlix. 26, *μεθυσθήσονται καὶ αἰσθήσεται*[2] *πᾶσα σάρξ*, and Job xxiii. 5, *αἰσθοίμην δὲ τίνα μοι ἀπαγγελεῖ*.

One may fairly maintain that no one acquainted with the philosophical and more particularly with the psychological terminology of the Greeks, would have used *αἴσθησις* as a synonym with *ἐπιστήμη* or *σοφία*. But as this is done by the translator of Proverbs, who surpasses the majority of the translators of the Bible in knowledge of Greek, he must as decidedly as the others be pronounced ignorant of the fundamental notions of Greek philosophy.

8.—*Ἀρετή*.

Ἀρετή, as is well known, originally signifies man's power and capacity; hence the term serves to denote all bodily and mental excellences, and, though more rarely, their effects or "great achievements," or the "glory," or "fame" acquired in consequence. Thus Sophocles says (*Phil.* 1420) *ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν ἔσχον*, and Pindar (*Isthm.* v. 49) *ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν*. In philosophical language these usages fall into the background, and the abstract sense of "virtue" preponderates. But it is precisely this ethical meaning, which afterwards became universal, that is never found in the Septuagint. *Ἀρετὴ* is there used only as a translation of תהלה חוד, and synonymous terms, in the sense of "praise," "glory," "honour," "excellence," "quality worthy of honour." Thus Isaiah xlii. 8, *οὐ δώσω τὰς ἀρετάς μου τοῖς γλυπτοῖς*; xlii. 12, *τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ . . . ἀναγγελοῦσιν*; Hab. iii. 3, *ἐκάλυψεν οὐρανοὺς ἡ ἀρετὴ αὐτοῦ*. The same may be seen in Zech. vi. 13; Isaiah xliii. 21; lxiii. 7.

---

[1] Later on, *αἰσθήσεως* was altered into *σοφίας*; hence *both* words appear in some codices. One would be inclined to read *νοήσεως* for *αἰσθήσεως*, but that the latter is so often used in this sense.

[2] There is no reason to believe that the Greek translators wrote *αἰσθανθήσεται*, which we read now in the manuscripts and editions of the LXX.

The purely ethical signification of the word is found for the first time in those books of the Apocrypha that were originally written in Greek. Thus 2 Macc. vi. 31, *μνημόσυνον ἀρετῆς καταλιπών*; Wisdom iv. 1, *κρεῖσσον ἀτεκνία μετ' ἀρετῆς*. So with Wisdom v. 13; viii. 7, and frequently in the fourth book of the Maccabees. In the New Testament the word is almost always employed in the same fashion as in the LXX. (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3; Phil. iv. 8). Only in one passage does the word seem used in the philosophical sense, viz.: in 2 Pet. i. 5, where we read: *ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν*, "In your faith supply virtue, and in your virtue knowledge."[1]

9.—*Ἀνδρεία, ἀνδρεῖος.*

No word is less exposed, either by etymology or usage, to mis-interpretation than *ἀνδρεία*. Already popularly used, to express "manliness" and "courage," ethical inquiry restricted the term still more closely within these prescribed limits.[2] The LXX. neglect this usage most markedly. In Prov. xii. 4; xxxi. 10, אשת חיל is translated by *γυνὴ ἀνδρεία* (and consequently, the same is the case with Sir. xxvi. 2; xxviii. 15); in Eccles. ii. 21; iv. 4; v. 10, כשרון, and in Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 7, כושרות is rendered *ἀνδρεία*; in Prov. xv. 19, ישרים become *ἀνδρεῖοι*, and so do the חרוצים of Prov. x. 4; xiii. 4. The word thus denotes here not the "brave" but the "excellent," being used as a synonym with *ἀγαθός*, *χρηστός*. Hence, it is never employed in the LXX. for גבור. In the Apocrypha, the ethical idea again comes clearly to the front (Wisdom viii. 7; 4 Macc. 271, 28. 284, 6 Bekk.); in the New Testament the word is altogether wanting.

10.—*Μεγαλοπρεπής, μεγαλοπρέπεια.*

The latter term has a sharply circumscribed ethical signification, of which Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* iv. 4, 1122 *a*, 18*f.*) gives evidence. It denotes the generosity of the noble man, who is equally removed from petty avarice on the one side and lavish extravagance on the other. The use of the word by the LXX. shows no trace of this ethical meaning. Here it signifies merely external splendour, serving as a translation for הוד

---

[1] Compare Hatch (*loc. cit.*, page 40), who regards this passage as very difficult, and leaves it unexplained.

[2] Compare Plato, *Laches;* Aristotle, *E.N.* III., ch. 9; *Rhet.* I., ch. 9, II., ch. 14.

גאוה, תפארת, הדר. Compare Ps. viii. 2; xx. (xxi.) 5; xxviii. (xxix.) 4; cx. (cxi.) 3, etc.

11.—*Πρόνοια.*

The idea of divine Providence could not have been unknown to the Greek translators of the Bible, for it is presented in every page of Scripture. The LXX. however does not use *πρόνοια*, the term technically expressive of the idea of Providence from the fifth century onwards, but *ἐπισκοπὴ* or other words. *Πρόνοια* occurs only once, and then signifies merely 'knowing" or "deliberating," like the corresponding verb *προνοεῖσθαι*. Compare Job xxiv. 15, *οὐ προνοήσει με ὀφθαλμός*; Prov. iii. 4, *καὶ προνοοῦ καλά* (וְהַשְׂכֵּל טוֹב); Jos. xx. 3, *πατάξαντι ψυχὴν ἀκουσίως ἄνευ προνοίας*.[1] In the Apocrypha we for the first time encounter the word in the connotation given to it by philosophy. The author of the Wisdom, who was very familiar with Platonic and Stoic ideas, says, xiv. 3, *ἡ δὲ σὴ, πάτερ, διακυβερνᾷ πρόνοια* and vi. 8, *ὁμοίως προνοεῖ* (*ὁ θεὸς*) *περὶ πάντων*. So also 2 Macc. xiv. 9, *τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν προνοήθητι*, and in many places in the fourth book of the Maccabees. It is noteworthy that *πρόνοια* in the sense of "divine Providence" is also absent from the New Testament.

12.—*Κόσμος.*

Κόσμος, from the time of Empedocles (v. 299 Sturz) frequently used by philosophers in the sense of "world," or "universe," in almost the same sense as *τὸ πᾶν*, is employed by the LXX. only in the original meaning of "ornament," "arrangement," "drawing up of an army," and even for "army" itself. Thus it is the translation of עדי, תפארת, צבא,[2] while it is never found in the LXX. with the meaning "world." It is otherwise with the Apocrypha and the New Testament. Wisdom contains passages like these: vi. 26, *πλῆθος δὲ σοφῶν σωτηρία κόσμου*; vii. 17, *εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου*; xi. 18, *κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης*, etc. The second and fourth books of the Maccabees also are acquainted with this meaning, which is the usual sense in which the word is used in the New Testament.

---

[1] These last two words are wanting in the great majority of MSS.

[2] Zezschwitz in his stimulative but superficial *Profangräcitat und biblischer Sprachgeist*, p. 22, believes that the LXX., in translating צבא by *κόσμος*, either confused צבא with צבי, or meant to represent the stars as the ornament of heaven. But the true signification is apparent from Nahum ii. 9, where תכונה is rendered *κόσμος*, and from Ezekiel xxiii. 41, and Eccl. vii. 13 (14), where ערך and תקן are translated *κοσμεῖν*. This author's remarks on the use of the word in the New Testament are ingenious but unfounded.

The consideration of the foregoing terms shows that the LXX. were unacquainted with the usages of language which the Greek philosophers had brought into circulation; the philosophical meanings of terms like *αἴσθησις*, *φρόνησις*, *νοῦς*, *ἀνδρεία*, *ἄφρων* remained unknown to them; words in common use like *ἀρετή*, *δοξάζειν*, *κόσμος*, *μεγαλοπρέπεια*, *λόγος*, *εἶδος*, *ἰδεά*, *ὕλη*, *πρόνοια*, they never employ in the sense which philosophy has assigned to them. It is inconceivable that the philosophy of the Greeks can have exercised any considerable influence over men who betray so complete an ignorance of the most common psychological and ethical terms, or that the LXX. were influenced by the Platonic, Aristotelian or Stoic systems. And these conclusions are true not merely for certain portions of the LXX., but for the whole of it. For in regard to the use of these philosophical terms no difference can be detected between the oldest and what are probably the latest translations, between the version of the Pentateuch and that of Job and Nehemiah, between the historical and the poetical books, between the translation of the Prophets and that of the Hagiographa.

The arguments that could be adduced against these conclusions, arguments that have indeed been brought forward to show the influence of philosophy on the LXX., are of no real weight. Objectors point to a few instances of translations which are thought to bear a philosophical stamp. But he who has learnt to recognise the unphilosophical character of the LXX. from the mass of evidence here collected will not be misled by single words and stray expressions. In the unlimited state of corruption in which the text of the LXX. has come down to us, a suspicion of spuriousness must fall upon every word that contradicts a well-established fact. Even an appeal to the oldest LXX. text could not entirely weaken this suspicion, since, as Philo's quotations prove, the text of the LXX. was already at the earliest period disfigured with corruptions of manifold character.

We do not however need this method of escape, a method always dubious in the eyes of timid critics. He who does not venture to follow Gfrörer and Dähne, in introducing into the Greek translation of the Bible, Platonic, Stoic, Philonic and Gnostic dogmas, on the strength of arbitrary and forced interpretations that violate the rules of the language; who, with Thiersch, Frankel and Zeller, stigmatises the procedure of these writers as unscientific, will expect to find the trace of foreign systems of philosophy at the most in but few pas-

sages, and even this diminutive trace to vanish on closer examination.

The LXX. translation of Job vii. 15, and of Psalm l. (li.) 14 reminds Zeller[1] of the anthropological terminology of Plato and the Stoics. In the first passage, where the original runs ותבחר מחנק נפשי, we find *ἀπάλλαξεις ἀπὸ πνεύματός μου τὴν ψυχήν μου.* It is, however, not clear what these words would signify in Platonic or Stoical terminology. With Plato *πνεῦμα* plays so subordinate a part that I cannot understand why the translators should have here introduced this idea. In the doctrine of the Stoics, moreover, the soul itself is a *πνεῦμα*, and therefore there can be no reference to this doctrine in the passage before us, where a separation of the *πνεῦμα* from the *ψυχὴ* is spoken of. As a matter of fact, there is probably some corruption in the text under consideration. It is not the habit of the translator of Job without pressing reasons to depart from the original to the extent that he must have done in this instance, if the text were genuine. We must therefore, in accordance with the *Cod. Alex.* and 157 (Parsons), eliminate *μου*, and with a very slight emendation read *πνίγματος* for *πνεύματος*, just as in Nahum ii. 13 (12), מְחַנֵּק is translated *ἐπέπνιξε.* In this way only do the Greek words receive a good meaning, and correspond with the thought expressed in the second part of the verse. The words of Ps. l. (li.) 4, ורוח נדיבה תסמכני are represented in the LXX. by *καὶ πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ στήριξόν με.* The words refer to God, not at all to the spirit of man. Interpreted in a Stoic sense they would therefore introduce into the Bible the grossest materialism, comparing God to a breath. As we cannot attribute this to the LXX., we must perceive in the rendering before us but an echo of Stoic phraseology, and no sign of the influence of Stoic teaching. In fact, Zeller,[2] with his delicate tact, speaks only of the "terminology" and not of the "philosophy" of the Stoics. It may, however, be that *ἡγεμονικὸν* was selected as an equivalent for נדיבה without the faintest influence of Stoicism. For the ordinary translation of נדיב is *ἄρχων* or *δυνάστης.* (Compare Is. xxxii. 5; Ps. lxxxii. 12; cvi. 40; Job xii. 21; xxi. 28; Jud. v. 9[3]; Prov. xvii. 27; xxv. 7, and frequently).

The word *ἀόρατον* for תהו in the second verse of Genesis was according to Zeller[4] chosen without any *arrière pensée.*

---

[1] *Philos. d. Griechen*, III., 1[3], p. 195*f.* [2] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

[3] For *δυνάσται* many MSS. have *ἐκουσιαζόμενοι*, which, however, is easily seen to be a later emendation of the original translation.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

Frankel and Siegfried[1] differ from this view and both see in the phrase an echo of the *κόσμος νοητὸς* of Philo. This is untenable. For *ἀορασία* is the standing expression in the LXX. for "darkness" and "confusion," and is regularly employed for עורון, סנורים, מסתר, אפלה (compare Gen. xix. 11; Deut. xxviii. 28; Isaiah xlv. 3; lix. 9). That a distinction between the invisible world of ideas and the world of sensible things could not have been intended in this place is shown by the co-ordinate expression *ἀκατασκεύαστος* which has no meaning if applied to the *κόσμος νοητός*.

Significant is the translation of Exodus iii. 14, אהיה אשר אהיה, by *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν*, and of אהיה שלחני by *ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με*. It cannot well be denied that God is here described as the eternally existent, and it is difficult to suppose that any change has occurred in the text. Still there is here nothing that compels us to assume the influence of Stoic or Neo-Pythagorean philosophy. For Palestinian exegesis explains these important words in the same manner,[2] and the terminology of the philosophers would have required *τὸ ὂν* in place of *ὁ ὤν*.[3]

Technical expressions borrowed from the psychological writings of the Greeks seem to meet us, in the occasionally used *αἰσθητικὸς* and *αἰσθητήριον*; Prov. xiv. 10, *καρδία ἀνδρὸς αἰσθητικὴ λυπηρὰ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ* (following Lagarde); *Ibid.* v. 30, *σῆς δὲ ὀστέων καρδία αἰσθητική* and Jeremiah iv. 19, *αἰσθητήρια καρδίας κ.τ.λ.* Precisely in these passages, however, it is conclusively seen how unphilosophically the LXX. went to work. *Αἰσθητικός* is in neither passage what Greek philosophy would have conveyed by the term—it is used not for "what is capable of perception by the senses," but for *ἐμπαθής*, "perceptible," "sensible"; in the latter passage indeed it is used to translate קנאה="jealous." Thus there is no ground for assuming here the actual influence of Greek psychology. The LXX. merely used a word made current by Greek psy-

---

[1] Frankel, *Paläst. und alex. Schriftf.*, p. 24; Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 8.—Frankel thinks, however, that *ἀόρατος* must be regarded as spurious, since Philo does not cite it. But compare Philo *De opif.*, § 7, p. 8, 17 (ed. Cohn), where the passage occurs *ἐποίει οὐρανὸν ἀσώματον καὶ γὴν ἀόρατον.*

[2] Compare Frankel *Vorstud.* p. 179. Frankel there proves that in Jer. xiv. 13; xxxii. (xxxix.) 17, *ὁ ὤν* has been corrupted from *ὤ*.

[3] Greek philosophy expresses the indeterminateness and generality of the divine nature by the neuter. Parmenides speaks of *ἐόν*, Plato of *τὸ ἀγαθόν*. The Stoics also, when they do not purposely employ popular language, call the deity *τὸ ὂν* (Stob., ecl. 1, 374, *Diels. doxogr.* p. 463, 14*f.*) The deity to the Neo-Platonists is *τὸ ἕν* (Plotinus, Enn. vi. 9, 3, etc.) It is only Philo who calls God now *τὸ ὂν* and now *ὁ ὤν*. This is because he taught the personal God of the Bible, and was influenced by the passages in the LXX. quoted above.

chology, but they misinterpreted it and gave it a thoroughly unphilosophical meaning. The same inference, though to a lesser extent, may be drawn from Jeremiah iv. 19, where *αἰσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας* is spoken of. For the plural here employed does not accord with philosophical usage, in which the heart—or according to others the brain—is the single common organ of sense, *αἰσθητήριον*, while it would be impossible to speak of the "sense-organs of the heart."[1]

Bickell finds an indication of the influence of Greek philosophy on the LXX. in the efforts of the translators to avoid ascribing human form and feelings to God. His remarks run thus: (l. c., p. 5), "Hæc autem detestatio anthropomorphismorum et anthropopathismorum arctissime cohæret et cum theologia alexandrina et cum interpretatione allegorica; utraque autem nonnisi post longiorem philosophiæ græcæ, imprimis platonicæ cognitionem oriri potuit. Apud Philonem perspicere possumus omnes causas illius detestationis e philosophia græca desumptas esse, nempe immutabilitatem Dei absolutam (*ἄτρεπτον τὸ θεῖον*), ejusdem simplicatem perfectam, e quacum omnibus qualitatibus, nedum membris et affectibus carere concludit, opinionem denique quæ materiæ et corpori causam mali et peccati tribuit. Hæc ergo dogmata philosophica antecedebant, rejectio anthropomorphismorum ea consecuta est."

We must pronounce this argument absolutely groundless. It is improper calmly to assign to the translators of the LXX. the same reasons that Philo gives for his assumption of a Deity without attributes—grounds which certainly coincide most closely with the views of the Greek philosophers. Such a method of historical inquiry is hardly better than the procedure of Dähne, which no one has more sternly censured than Bickell himself.[2] The LXX. did not need the stimulus of Greek philosophers to induce them to assign an interpretation different from the literal one to numerous passages in the Bible, in which bodily parts and properties are ascribed to God,—to soften or to paraphrase a pictorial or poetical mode of expression. The Bible itself was bound to lead to a spiritual interpretation of such passages by remarks such as we find in Numbers xxiii. 19; Deut. iv. 15; 1 Sam. xv. 29; Is. xl. 18; Mal. iii. 6. And that, as a matter of fact, the endeavour to weaken and paraphrase anthropomorphisms and anthropo-

---

[1] Compare Aristotle, *De somno*, 2, 455, *a* 21; *De juvent.*, 1, 467, *b* 28; *De vita*, 3. 469, *a* 12, and the Stoics, Plut., *De plac.*, iv. 8; *Diels doxogr.*, 394, 5 *s.*; Galen, *Hipp. et Plat.*, p. 28*f.*

[2] *Ibid.*, page 6, note 8.

pathisms grew up on national ground[1] is proved by the circumstance that the tendency manifested itself in Palestine at a period when there can be no question of the presence of Greek influence, and that it found expression in the תקוני סופרים as well as in the Samaritan and Aramaic translations of the Pentateuch. For who would venture to ascribe to the Soferim, Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan a knowledge of systems of philosophy which could only be acquired after a long devotion to their study ?

Whoever cannot bring himself to dispute these arguments can find no ground on which to dispute the conclusions arrived at from the foregoing examination. He will, therefore, recognise that the translation of the so-called Septuagint bears no traces of the inroad of Greek philosophy into Jewish Hellenism.

J. FREUDENTHAL.

---

[1] Frankel also accepts this view, but the grounds upon which he supports it are untenable. His words are (*Vorstudien*, p. 175) : " From the fact that the anthropomorphisms recur more frequently in the most recent portions of the LXX., which were composed at a time when Platonism and Greek philosophy in general were more prevalent and widely known, it may be deduced that Greek philosophic theories exercised but little influence upon the translators. The very desire, indeed, to avoid anthropomorphisms by euphemistic turns of speech seems to have been borrowed from Palestine." The fact on which Frankel here relies is incapable of proof. It is not true that in the later translated books the anthropomorphisms become more and more numerous. In no part of the translation are they avoided more markedly (as Bickell has shown) than in Job, which was certainly only composed at a late date. But Bickell is himself entirely in error, when he says (l.c.) that apart from Job the conscious avoidance of anthropomorphisms is only visible in seven other passages of the LXX. One needs to give but a very moderate attention to the Greek translation of the Bible, and a mere glance into the ample material collected by Frankel to rebut this strange assertion, which is apparently based upon the few instances used by Gfrörer.

THE ZENDAVESTA AND THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS.

In a paper read before the Jewish Ministers' Association of America, in May, 1889, I showed that many legends told of Zoroaster are founded on the accounts of men celebrated in the Bible. Moreover we find that not only did the Parsees not disdain from embellishing the story of their teacher with traits derived from Biblical heroes, but even their sacred Book the Zendavesta seems to be based, to some extent, on our Bible. Remember that Zoroaster's home, according to Spiegel, was not Bactria, as is generally supposed, but Westerân, near Ararât, where the Indo-Germanic tribes from the earliest ages bordered on Semitic nations, and Erân seems to be identical with Harân, whence the Hebrews derive their origin. The Parsees, therefore, very easily had access to the old Hebrew traditions, and very probably made use of them in shaping their ideas and the system of their religion. To say that the opposite is true, that the Parsic ideas were original, is impossible, for the Zendavesta is of a later date; and, besides, at the time when the Parsees were wrapped in legendary rudiments, the Hebrews already stood on the height of monotheism, and possessed a pure conception of the God idea. True, during the later period of Jewish history, in the Babylonian exile, the Jews borrowed some ideas from their Parsic neighbours, as I have already proven;[1] we may, however, still assume that they also gave to the Parsees many fundamental principles of faith and many traditions, especially those on cosmogony.

In connection with and partly supplementary to my essay in the *Zeitschrift d. d. M.G.*, vol. xxv., pp. 59 ff., I would draw attention to the following points, which I hope will be received with welcome by English readers. The very fact that the Parsees assume for the creation of the world six periods, and that man is the crown of creation, reminds us at the very outset of the first chapter of Genesis. But a parallelism in minute

[1] See my "Angelology" and several essays in the *Z. d. d. M. G.*

details can be followed out by comparing the Yima legend of the Zendavesta with the scriptural account, and this leaves us without doubt that the Hebrew tradition lies at the basis.

The second Fargard of the Vendidâd, devoted to the first man, Yima, should be analysed in this connection.

I. After having told in §§ 4 and 5 how Ahuramazda first spoke with Yima, and how (§§ 6-11) Yima refused to disseminate and teach the Law, the account tells us:

"If thou, Yima, wilt not be bearer and propagator of the Law, then propagate my worlds, fructify my worlds, be the nourisher, guardian and sovereign of my earthly creatures."[1] Compare with this address, Gen. i. 28, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over," etc.

§§ 20-23 dwell on the extraordinary blessings that will replenish the earth with cattle and fowl of every kind—a description strongly reminding us of Gen. i. 22.

II. The next paragraph is difficult. It reads[2] in Spiegel's translation: "Thereupon Yima went forth toward the stars, toward the south, the path toward the sun." The commentators are at a loss to explain this, and as a guess, suggest that the text intended to admonish man to pray a "Yathâ ahû vairyô," before setting out on business, and that in consequence he would prosper.[3] I fail, however, to see how this meaning can be contained in the passage quoted; besides this does not fit in with the context of the whole passage.

If we, on the other hand, compare this passage with Gen. ii. 8, we clearly see its meaning. The Bible tells us: "And the Lord planted a garden מקדם eastward in Eden, and placed therein the man he had formed." Now then, if Yima turn his steps eastward toward the sun, he does what we would expect him to do, and thus the similarity of the two passages is confirmed. And the proof of the identity of the sources is the following paragraph: "He pierced the earth with a golden lancet,—he pricked it with a prickle, saying lovingly: O Çpenta Armait (earth), go forth and spread out those bearers of cattle

---

[1] Cf. Vendidâd Sâde, edit. Brockhaus. Yêzi mê yima nôit vîvîçê meretô beretaca daênyâi, âaṭ mê gaêthaô frâdaya ââṭ mê gaêthaô varedhaya aâṭ mê vîçpâi gaêthanãm thrâtâca haretâca aiwyâkhçtaca.

[2] Aâṭ yimô frasûçat raocâo â upa rapithwãm hû paiti adhwanem.

[3] Cf. Spiegel's Commentary to Avesta, p. 59, and his Introduction to the Parsic Traditions, ii. 83. Similarly Berach, 14*a*, אסור לו לאדם לעשות חפציו קודם שיתפלל "It is forbidden to go to one's task without having first prayed."

and men."[1] Accordingly Yima tilled the ground, as Adam is said to have done. (Gen. ii. 5, 15.)

III. That this interpretation is correct, and "toward the sun" means eastward (מקדם), is clearly shown in the following paragraph:

"There Ahuramazda, the creator, made a gathering of the heavenly Yazatas around the renowned Airyana-vaêja of the good creation." And further on in § 45 we are told "That Yima, the beautiful, was in that assembly."[2] Now we also understand whither Yima went when he turned his steps eastward, for the Airyana-vaêja was in the extreme East.[3]

Moreover vaêjarih means "fountain place" corresponding to גן עדן where the sources of four rivers were. (Gen. ii. 10.) Let me here mention the fact that the Parsees also had a legend of two trees, one named Gaokerena, bearing the white Haoma fruit, which will be used at the resurrection, and the other tree bears fruit assuring freedom from suffering.[4]

IV. From § 46 onward, the author of the second Fargard has in mind the account of the deluge. The commentaries refer to the rain Malkoshân (מלקוש), which, according to a prophecy, is to descend in torrents in the last days. § 59 however clearly shows that the deluge is meant. This is the sense of the following passage:

"Clouds, O Yima, will come to the crowded place" (of men).[5]

And the "Vara," the piece of ground which Yima was to fence around all sides closely resembles not only in general outlines, but even in small details the ark of Noah, cf. § 61-129. Thus the first of these paragraphs tells us how Yima was ordered to make the circuit of a race-course with its four corners. Noah's ark was also secluded from without and within. (Gen. vi. 14.)

V. In the next paragraph Yima is commanded to bring the seeds of cattle and men, even as Noah should bring "of every living thing, of all flesh . . into the ark to keep them alive" (Gen. vi. 19), and in § 66, as in Gen. vi. 20, fowl are especially mentioned.

---

[1] Hô imãm zãm aiwisvaṭ çuwrya zaramaênya avidim çifaṭ astraya uiti aojanô fritha çpeñta armaiti fracasava vaca nemaṅha berethra paçvãmca çtaoranãmca maskyânãmca.

[2] Hañjamanem frabereta yô adhvâo ahurô mazdâo hathra mainyaobyô yazataêibyô çrûtô airyaênê vaêjahê vanuhyâo daîtîayâo.

[3] Cf. Justi Zendlexicon, p. 259.

[4] See my Eschatology, &c., in *Z. d. d. M. G.* vol. 21, 589, ff.

[5] Abdaca idha Yima aṅuhê açtvaitê cadayâṭ I followed the translation of Spiegel in rendering *abdaca* with "clouds" which is only suitable to the deluge. (Gen. vi. 13 ff.)

§ 67 says: Bring (fowl) with yellow grain and inexhaustible food:"[1] compare therewith Gen. vi. 21, "And take thou unto thee all food that is eaten and gather it to thee."

In § 76 this is brought out more prominently: "And thither bring the seed of all food."[2] §§ 70 and 72 again repeat: Bring the seed of men and of all kinds of cattle, just as it is again repeated, Gen. vii. 2.

VI. In this Vara, Yima was ordered (§§ 68 and 69) to erect lodgings in several lofts, to have pillars, yards and fences.[3] So Noah built his Ark with a lower, second and a third story. (Gen. vi. 16.)

And if we are told (§ 78) that of all cattle and beasts there came two and two,[4] who would not suppose it to be an almost literal translation of Gen. vi. 20: "Two of every sort shall come unto thee to be kept alive."

Similarly in § 92 Ahuramazda tells Yima[5] to make around the circuit a high door,[6] and a window to illumine the interior even as Noah is told (Gen. vi. 16), "Make thou a light (צהר) for the Ark, and place its door in the side thereof." It is remarkable that the Hebrew word, just mentioned, is rendered "window," and also "self-lighting," and the Zend word is equally ambiguous.

VII. The paragraphs following this, up to § 129 give a full account of how Yima acted in accordance with the received instruction, and the Vendidâd-sâde[7] add the clause: "And Yima did as Ahuramazda wanted," just as Gen. vii. 5 says: "And Noah did according to all that the Lord commanded him."

Important also for our parallelism are §§ 123, 124,[8] viz.: "On the top he made nine bridges, in the middle he made six, and below three," referable to תחתים שנים ושלשים (Gen. vi. 16).

---

[1] Aoi mat̰ zairi gaonem mat̰ quairyêitê ajyamnem.

[2] Hathra viçpanãm quaretanãm taokhma upa bara.

[3] Hathra nmânâo avaçtaya katemca fraçkembemca fravâremca pairi vâremca.

[4] Tê kerenâva mithwarê ajyamnem vîçpem â ahmât̰.

[5] Aipitâtem varem marezud-varem raocanem qaraukhsnem aĩtare naêmât̰.

[6] Marezudvara is to be translated with "door," as Windischman renders it, and not with "wall," as Spiegel has it. The Minokhired in the like manner says: "Then they will open the doors of the vâr which Jemshîd (=Yima) made, and out of that doors men, cattle, and every creature will go forth to restore the world," (cf. Spiegel *Parsigram*, p. 167, §21 ff.). This can be understood only in the light of our interpretation, that the passage refers to the deluge, for only so can we suppose men, cattle, and creatures to repopulate the world.

[7] Aat̰ yimô avathô kerenôit yatha dem isat̰ ahurô mazdâo.

[8] Fratemem dainhéus nava perethwô kerenaoit madhemô khsavas nitemô tisarô.

VIII. Nor are the closing paragraphs (132-136) to be overlooked. The first two of these tell us that[1] "at one step there are to be seen the stars, the moon and the sun. They hold a year for one day." The sense of this statement is, according to Spiegel,[2] there is no difference between night and day to the happy inhabitants of Yima's vâr. In my opinion this remark is an outgrowth of the Biblical ויהי ערב ויהי בקר (Gen. i. 5), understood by the author of the second Fargard to mean that evening and morning coincided so as to make one day.

IX. The remark of § 134 that every forty years, a pair, a female and a male child, is born from the two men is so far in accordance with the Biblical account that Eden was inhabited only by one pair of human beings.

These abrupt reflections, however, are in themselves incoherent and very likely added by a later writer.[3] And indeed the Fargard in several passages[4] indicates that there were many in Yima's vâr. Consequently the expression taêca narô "those men" of § 136 refers to the many people about Yima.

X. To these proofs of coinciding ideas between the Fargard of the Zendavesta and the Biblical account, may be added some taken from the Bundehesh, a compilation of cosmogonic and theogonic traditions, from an unknown author, whose date is not yet fixed. That these traditions of Parsic folk-lore, however, are very old, perhaps of not very much more recent date than the Zendavesta itself, was made evident by Windischman and Spiegel.

The Bundehesh calls the first human beings Meshia and Meshiâne, and devotes to their history the whole of the very interesting fifteenth chapter.

Our attention, however, is already attracted by some previous remarks. In the third chapter, for instance, we find the narration of how the evil spirit Ganâmino (Ahriman) battled against the good spirit (Ahura), and finally leapt from heaven to earth in the shape of a serpent to spoil the creatures. Who is not reminded of the serpent tempting Eve?[5] This book also knows of the two trees and the four rivers of

---

[1] Hakereṭ zî irikhtahê çadhayaca vaênaêta çtaraçca mâoçca hvareca.

[2] See Spiegel's *Translation of the Avesta*, p. 77 note 3.

[3] Cf. Roth: Die Sage vom Dschemschid in the *Zeitschrift der d. M. G.*, vol. iv., p. 417 ff.

[4] See §§ 43, 63, 70, 79, 125.

[5] A very remarkable conformity with the Parsic conception is to be found in Yalkut, Gen. §25, cf. Kohut, "Angelology," etc., p. 65.

Paradise;[1] it affirms furthermore, that the world was created in six periods, namely: Ormuzd first created the heaven, then water, then the earth, the trees, animals and finally man. The fourth chapter tells us how primeval man, Gayomarth, emanated from the right side of the primeval bull.[2] The Mugmil ut-tewârich[3] has a different version. After an interval of thirty days, it narrates, the bull died, and its seed fell from its loins to the ground. Of this seed purified in the moon man was made, and the *breath of life* was breathed into his body (chap. 10). The background of this myth is the shaping of Eve from Adam's side, and with the last quoted phrase compare Gen. ii. 7, ויפח באפיו נשמת חיים, which is to be translated: "And he breathed into his FACE a breath of life."

XI. As has been mentioned before, full particulars of the history of the first man are found in the fifteenth chapter. Here we are informed how Ahura, after having created Meshia and Meshiâne, addressed them, saying:

"Ye are men, beings of life are ye," parallel to the Hebrew text: "And man was a living being" (soul), Gen. ii. 7.

XII. Flesh of animals is prohibited to the first men; only after they had transgressed the commandment of Ahura they were permitted to eat it. With this compare Gen. i. 30, and ix. 3. The fifteenth chapter continues to tell us how the first men disobeyed Ahura by hunting (cf. the characters of Nimrod, Ishmael and Esau), and how they clad themselves in fur (cf. Gen. iii. 21).

XIII. Thereupon they dug in the earth and found iron, which they sharpened to a hatchet (cf. Gen. iv. 22, where it is said of Tubal Cain that he was "the forger of copper and iron cutlery").

XIV. After this men felled a tree and made tents for themselves. Cf. ibidem 20, "He was the father of all tent-dwellers."

XV. Hereafter they aroused against each other wicked (aparun) envy, and smote one another (Gen. iv. 5; envy led Cain to fratricide).

---

[1] See note 4, page 225.

[2] The primeval bull (gaûs aêvo-dâtô) and the primeval man (gayômaratha,) are often mentioned in the Zend text, cf. "Angelology," 46. So in the Talmud (Ab. Zara 8*a*; Sabb. 28*b*, Chul. 60*a*,) Adam is brought in connection with the fabulous bull—but with a moral tendency, see my remark in the *Zeitsch. d. d. M. G.*, vol. xxv., p. 78.

[3] Cf. Windischman *Zoroastrische Studien*, p. 212 ff.

XVI. After a lapse of fifty years from the loss of their innocence, first Meshia, then Meshiâne felt the pangs of desire (Gen. iv. 1, after the departure from Eden, והאדם ידע את חוה אשתו).

XVII. To Meshia and Meshiâne (cf. Gen. iv. 1) were born seven pairs of children, of which the third pair was named Fravâk and Fravâkam, a word often met with in the Zendavesta connected with Ahuramazda's name.[1] He seems, accordingly, to have been a sort of Enosh, in whose days "men began to call on the name of the Lord" (Gen. iv. 26).

XVIII. The human race increasing thus by pairs, from whom the advancement of generations of the living originated (cf. Gen. x. 25, 32), scattered and disseminated itself in the different parts of the earth. The fifteenth chapter of the Bundehesh winds up its rich contents with the remark that is made in Gen. xi. 1 too, that after the increase of the human race migration began.

XIX. Thus by diligently comparing similar features of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, with the counterparts in the Yima legend of the Zendavesta, and the Meshia legend of the Bundehesh, we cannot but come to the conclusion that the former is the original, while the latter, though shaped and fashioned in Eranian manner, used the Bible as model. On the other hand we can prove a reciprocity; namely, that these same Yima and Meshia legends, divested of their Parsic stamp and remoulded with Jewish conceptions, served as patterns for Talmudic-Midrashic legends and myths concerning Adam. Of this topic a second article shall treat. This separation, of not only technical but of material importance, should remind us that in the interchange of type and model, we must carefully draw the demarcation lines and be guided by the just axiom: *Suum cuique!*

ALEXANDER KOHUT.

---

[1] Cf. Visper xviii. 7, 13; Yaçna xix. 37, 57; Din. Y. 3, etc.

BROWNING AS A RELIGIOUS TEACHER.

I.

RIGHTLY to estimate the extent and worth of a man's teaching and influence upon his time must always be a difficult matter, and especially so when he is a poet, and his day our own. Time, and time alone, can fix the due proportion of his mental stature, and give the true perspective to his position among the great teachers of the world. And if it is true that a man can only be judged rightly by his peers, it must remain a hopeless task for one generation to fix adequately the poet's place and claim to permanent recognition. But though the task is doubly difficult with a writer of so essentially an intellectual and unusual type as Browning, yet there are other sides than the purely poetic one upon which it is easier to approach him, and of which the men and women of his own day, who owe most to him of help and guidance in their mental and spiritual life, may be forgiven for attempting some rough generalisation.

It is especially difficult, as I have said, to estimate a poet's influence, for teaching is not his first and ostensible object, and he might justly disclaim any intention to dogmatise and instruct. But in so far as he is the true poet, he is also the seer. It is not merely that he gives a melodious and satisfying utterance to the dumb emotions of commonplace life and people, but he has gone beyond his fellows in the world of thought or imagination. He is in truth a seer, whose mental vision has pierced through the outer husks of circumstance, whose perception is quicker and keener than other men's for the subtler unseen elements hidden beneath the tangible objects of life, for the union underlying its discords; and whose emotions are probably deeper and more penetrating in proportion to his deeper insight. He shares the common life of other men and women, and treads the ordinary human paths of happiness or misery, but to him they are instinct with a meaning they do not possess for ordinary men. His ears are attuned to catch the music of the spheres, his eyes see the common human lot in "the light of setting suns diffused," and one essential difference between ordinary men, who perhaps have one or two such moments of inspiration in their lives,

and the poet is that he has the gift of expression which fixes and crystallises such passing moments and emotions into an enduring form capable of renewing the emotion afresh, while they

. . . . come back and cannot tell the world.

When the poet comes back, whether he speaks of the "secrets of the prison-house," or the common loves and sorrows of our life, he brings to them some of the magic of the unseen from which he comes; and in the reflected light of his "undiscovered country" plain men and women can recognise and feel a depth and meaning in their lives, undreamed of before, which infuses a new dignity into the commonest incidents of their lot.

> For, don't you mark? we're made so that we love
> First when we see them painted, things we have passed
> Perhaps a hundred times nor cared to see;
> . . . . Art was given for that;
> God uses us to help each other so,
> Lending our minds out.[1]

And like some far traveller who returns to tell of all the marvels and wonders his eyes have actually seen, so the poet holds his listening crowd, and if they cannot follow in imagination and faith as far as his sight has gone, at least they catch from his voice and words intimations of another world than theirs, and recognise the limitations of their own surroundings. And were it only for this, were the task of the poet simply to remain a witness for the reality of things unseen, his influence would be almost incalculable in an age when the struggle for existence, power, place or position consumes the greater part of men's lives and energies.

But, whatever may be the case with other poets, Browning's aim and its accomplishment goes far indeed beyond this. He is not a poet merely, he is a dramatic poet, and he is a thinker. Human nature, in conflict with human life and circumstance, is the subject of his drama, the world is his stage, men and women, with their passions and their sorrows, their crimes and heroisms, are his *dramatis personæ*. His interest in them is absorbing and vivid, to him nothing is "common or unclean," it is all instinct with meaning, and "it means intensely." Beyond the stage, beyond the actual drama we see in action there and follow with interest for its own sake, lies the source and meaning of the whole. We stand with him in the dark

---

[1] *Fra Lippo Lippi.*

and silent auditorium, and long before the curtain falls we feel

> There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough-hew them as we will.

It is upon this he has been concentrating our attention, this he sees ever moving there below the small strife and fret of human life and circumstance, and below each outward form of man or woman, which hides and yet reveals the mysterious essence of individual life within. And Browning is essentially a modern and the true poet of his time in this, that the attitude of his mind towards the problems of existence is philosophical. In this partly lies the cause of some of his highest achievements, and also of that overwhelming and obscuring of the form which is also perhaps his greatest defect. He is not content with offering occasional propitiatory oblations to the blind forces crossing men's paths, and violently altering or shattering their destinies in an unforeseen and arbitrary manner. To him life has a central meaning, a meaning too deep and infinite for the mind of man to pierce: but what he was set on earth for, and what should be his final aim in life, is to seek the utmost limit of such knowledge attainable (though by the very nature of our being and lot, no absolute knowledge is possible, or possibly even desirable), and to bring his finite life and will into conformity with the greater infinite will and meaning lying beyond. In short, it is his duty to accomplish himself and his true being in this life as fully as it lies within his power to do so. No one perhaps before has ever helped educated men and women, as Browning has, to a right estimation of what constitutes the *real* and permanent, among the perishing yet obtruding shows and circumstances of life.

Yet we must not look to him for any elaborate metaphysical system, nor for anything approaching to the laborious following up of abstract ideas, or their metaphysical expression. He is first and essentially a poet, and real life, whether of action or feeling, and the struggles of men and women are what first interest him. With him philosophy is apparently rather an attitude of mind than a definite study. This has been well defined by a writer[1] (the importance of whose work to a full understanding of the poet must be gratefully acknowledged) in the passages which follow.

"To show that Mr. Browning is a metaphysical poet, is to show that he is not a metaphysical *thinker*, though he is a

---

[1] Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *Handbook to Robert Browning's Works.*

thinker whose thought is metaphysical so far as principle goes. . . . . It is essential to bear in mind that Mr. Browning is a metaphysical poet and not a metaphysical thinker, to do justice to the depth and originality of his creative power, for his imagination includes everything, which, at a given moment, a human being can think or feel, and often finds itself, therefore at some point to which other minds have *reasoned* their way."

Nor must we expect to find in Browning any assertion of religious dogma, or the profession of any distinct religious creed. Dogma, to speak frankly, does not appear to interest him, except as illustrating the various ways in which light and inspiration can reach men's souls. It is the human effect rather than the dogma itself which even there apparently arrests his attention; and should we come to a study of his works prepared to find in him the apologist or teacher of any special creed or form of religion, though many scattered passages in his writings would encourage our hopes, we should have missed, I venture to think, the real key-note of the whole, and the message he has to give us. His deeply religious attitude of mind strikes us no less than the bold confidence with which he seeks truth *everywhere*, rather than within the confines of any creed, however wide. His was too deep a passion and too wide a range of sympathy to be held within the hedges and palisades of dogma, which weaker men have wisely built around themselves as props and defences. It is obvious that any such absolute and definite limitation which, though framed as a support, implies by its existence not only a pause in development, but a barrier of separation between man and man, was not in harmony with the mind of the poet, who saw growth and development everywhere, and in everything, from the stars in their courses to the worm beneath his foot, recognised the manifestation of God himself in his two attributes of Power and Love, fulfilling himself "in many ways."

That Browning is to many a deep and powerful spiritual force, and in very truth a religious teacher of the highest order can no longer be denied. That in his writings we must look for the spirit and essence of belief rather than the clearly defined form is equally clear. And it will be well therefore, whatever our own personal religious convictions may be, to endeavour to lay them so far aside that we can follow for the time being where the poet has led the way, and try to form for ourselves, however inadequately, some general view of the root of the faith which inspired a long life, and found such noble and triumphant expression at its close:—

One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.[1]

Perhaps no other five consecutive lines of his poems touch on so many characteristic and salient points of his teaching, and they therefore form a good introduction to its closer study. They show his courageous optimism, his absolute faith in the triumph of good over evil, the splendid width shown in his views of apparent failure and success in this life, which proceed from the faith in immortality underlying them—a faith which implies the belief that this life is only one stage in a progress of infinite development.

Leaving then the debateable region of dogma behind, what is it which first strikes us in Browning's theory of life, and which finds a continuous expression in his works from the

I believe in God and truth
And love;

in the immature "Pauline" to this "Epilogue" which so touchingly closes the last volume; an expression only growing stronger and more triumphant towards the close? It is surely an unswerving and deeply-rooted faith in the fact of God's existence, and the ultimate victory of good over evil A robust and ever-present faith—which breathes through the whole of his writings, and is the more striking in an age which to many appears to have passed through the convulsions of doubt, only to be lulled into indifferentism. And so strong is it, and so unshaken the calm consciousness of power which springs from it, that it can accept even doubt itself as an auxiliary and almost necessary consequence of its own existence, and hails the apparently confusing discoveries of science as only new contributions to the force of truth. And the vitality of this faith is shown in the way it dominates his whole view of life, and seems to centralise every other aspect of thought, and weld the different spheres of thought and experience into a living whole. What to so many men and women seems nothing, in ordinary happy moments, but a tranquil opinion, is to him a vital essence, fusing whatever it touches, and touching every side and every particle of life: in fact, implicit in life itself and finding its highest expression in man.

And this central fact once secure, what a new world "swims into our ken," what a robust and healthy optimism is the

[1] *Epilogue in Asolando.*

result, an optimism wholly unlike the more common one of a satisfied emotionalism. When it finds expression in Browning's writings it carries a deeper meaning than the words alone convey, for the consciousness is ever present with us of the rock from whence it was hewn, the foundations on which it stands. If to him the world is all right, at least we know why—

> God's in His Heaven,
> All's right with the world

sang Pippa.

> This world's no blot for us,
> Nor blank, it means intensely, and means good

says Fra Lippo Lippi, and again in "The Guardian Angel" the poet speaks in his own person—

> O world, as God has made it! All is beauty:
> And knowing this, is love, and love is duty.
> What further may be sought for or declared?

And here, before going further, it will be well to examine briefly the form under which we have to seek the expression of Browning's views of life, in which his own faith and its teaching lies. Throughout his volumes the occasions when he speaks in his own person are few, though perhaps they number among them some of the most beautiful of all his poems, notably "By the Fireside." He is, as we have said, a dramatic poet, though the form adopted is an unconventional one. Still in its essence his poetry is dramatic. Men and women are what interest him chiefly in life, the problems involved in the clash of their personalities and circumstance, the problems of human beings in friction with each other, and human nature in friction with itself; the problems, in fact, of life, of character and thought. And these clothe themselves in the most distinctive and different shapes and personalities, and if in his prefatory poem he speaks of his fifty men and women we can now add a far larger number to them. And while noticing the incisive distinctness of type, and the clearest individuality in his *dramatis personæ*, the wide range of sympathy and high dramatic power displayed in their delineation, we are equally struck with the strong subjective vein running through all his characters, and putting into their distinctive utterances a touch which is only of the poet himself, and is born of his own deeply-rooted philosophy of life. The characteristics are too strong in all his ideal portraits for any possibility of confusion; his men and women stand out boldly, whether historical or ideal, as the great ones of the past against the misty background of time. Whether

the pathetic figure of the nameless poet of Valladolid who had passed

> Through a whole campaign of the world's life and death,
> Doing the King's work all the dim day long,[1]

or the great of history, from Saul to Strafford, they live equally distinctly for us, and we scarcely question the reality of the portraiture, or whether or no they had actually moved across the world's stage.

This being the case, it adds a double point to the other almost equally distinct expression and portraiture running through them all of the mind of the poet himself. His view of life, the meaning of its riddle, his faith in the unseen, of which this world is but one of many expressions, lies below, and is involved in all the varying expressions of human life before us. Passed in review they seem as clearly the many facets of the one transparent whole as each is distinctive in itself. It would be interesting and instructive, did space allow, to run through even the bare subject of each poem, as illustrative of the points in life which interested the poet, and were deliberately chosen by him. Of course, in utterances of a dramatic kind, the temptation is obvious of forcing or wresting them unfairly to suit or prove a preconceived view, and it is principally for this reason that I venture to think a review of the whole, *as a whole,* of importance. Browning, himself, in a note to the *Dramatic Lyrics,* probably as well known as his poems themselves, guards against a misuse of the sentiments he puts into the mouths of his characters. He speaks of the poems as "though often Lyric in expression, always Dramatic in principle, and so many utterances of so many imaginary persons, not mine."

In face of such a clear disclaimer, it is obvious that the greatest care should be taken against wresting quotations, and it is only such views as seem to underlie each separate instance, and are the groundwork of them all and clearly characteristic of the writer, which we have any excuse for presenting as our own debt to him as a teacher. That such and such views of life, and such and such faith is to be found even through the speech of some of his ideal characters, no attentive student of his writings will question, though probably in each case they will be modified by the individual views and temperament of the reader. He himself seems to admit it, in the very poem to which the note is appended, when he says :—

---

[1] *How it Strikes a Contemporary.*

Love, you saw me gather men and women,
° ° ° ° °
Enter each and all, and use their service,
Speak from every mouth,—[1]

And in dedicating this special collection of poems to his wife it is difficult not to believe that the impulse which prompted him was the closely personal interests which were expressed through the mouths of his men and women.

To return then to our inquiry into these steadfast and apparently subjective views which seem to underlie each varying expression. It would be needless to add quotations or evidence to prove this first and unshaken belief in God's existence. It is the key-note of the whole, and is reflected in almost everything he wrote, and it will be well to study it rather more in its details and conclusions, which will lead us back at the end to the completed chord of faith.

God, then, exists, and rules the world and life; men are his children, they are the clay and he the potter, time and circumstance the wheel on which they are shaped. His also is the natural order. Our knowledge of him, of ourselves, of the uses and meaning of the present existence is bounded by it, but, though full of apparent contradictions and wholly incomplete, it is not necessarily false, unless we make it so by judging of existence as a whole from our limited standpoint, and with our limited powers of observation:

Therefore to whom turn I but to Thee, the ineffable Name?
Builder and maker, Thou, of houses not made with hands!
What, have fear of change from Thee who art ever the same?
Doubt that Thy power can fill the heart that Thy power expands?
There shall never be one lost good! What was shall live as before:
The evil is null, is nought, is silence implying sound;
What was good, shall be good, with, for evil, so much good more;
On the earth the broken arcs, in the heaven, a perfect round.[2]

This leads us to one of his most characteristic views, on which he insists in all his more serious poems, and which underlies much of his lighter work, namely, the incompleteness of man's life, such as we know it, and the necessary incompleteness of his knowledge. Nowhere, perhaps, is Browning's strength greater, nor finds a more characteristic expression than in his attitude towards this stumbling-block of thought. He neither elevates the present life into the whole with the more modern materialists, and declines to consider or even acknowledge any outcome of experience or thought which cannot be tabulated and explained; nor does he degrade this life to a mere painful stage of probation, which it is sinful to care

[1] *One Word More.* [2] *Abt Vogler.*

greatly for or to rejoice in, with one section of earnest religionists to whom doubt is simply the tempting of the Evil One. His view, as we should expect, is something robuster and more spiritual than either. He fixes on the word "probation," and employs it in a wider sense. This world and life he recognises, as we have seen, as a part, possibly a small and obscure part, of a great whole, to which this is merely one stage of development. It is thus impossible for the creatures of a day, men cramped by the conditions of their temporal existence, to conceive of the whole. That is the attribute of God himself. Man can but believe that, could he do so, the contradictions of his present being and lot would disappear, and he would acquiesce in a complete moral order, of which he has here but fragmentary intuitions and knowledge.

It is only thus that the hardest problems of life can find their solution, and be faced with courage. Change, decay, and death, these are stern foes, obtruding themselves upon life at every turn, before whom all faith drops groundward unless equipped to face them.

> Nothing can be as it has been before ;
> Better, so call it, only not the same.
> ⁂ ⁂ ⁂ ⁂ ⁂
> Simple? Why this is the old woe o' the world ;
> Tune to whose rise and fall we live and die.
> Rise with it, then! Rejoice that man is hurled
> From change to change unceasingly,
> His soul's wings never furled!
>
> That's a new question ; still replies the fact
> Nothing endures : the wind moans, saying so ;
> We moan in acquiescence : there's life's pact,
> Perhaps probation—do *I* know?
> God does : endure his act![1]

We cannot explain, we can but acquiesce in change, and its apparent sequel death, and the contradictions they involve. We must "moan" as we do so, unless some confidence is ours of a fixed point beyond them, and yet within ourselves, over which they are for ever powerless; of a greater harmony which has power to include the discords. It is thus that Browning teaches us to think of them and yet "rejoice," in one of the finest poems and noblest expressions of faith in our language—[2]

> Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life, for which the first was made:
> Our times are in His hand
> Who saith "A whole I planned,
> Youth shows but half; trust God: see all, nor be afraid!"

[1] *James Lee's Wife.* [2] *Rabbi Ben Ezra.*

So he leads us, and we feel a new strength inspire us even at the outset. For he has found the fixed points over which age and death have no power, in God and the human soul, which, emanating from him, must become one with him again.

> *Rejoice* we are allied
> To That which doth provide
> And not partake, effect and not receive!
> A spark disturbs our clod,
> Nearer we hold of God
> Who gives, than of His tribes that take, I must believe.
>
> Then welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough,
> Each sting that bids not sit nor stand, but go!
> Be our joys three-parts pain ——, etc.

This has struck a high courageous note! He recognises life as a field of ceaseless effort, a struggle from the lower to the higher; and man, despite his finite nature, as ultimately one with God—

> Therefore I summon age,

he says,

> To grant youth's heritage,
> Life's struggle having so far reached its term.
> Thence shall I pass, approved
> A man, for aye removed
> From the developed brute; a God though in the germ.
>
> And I shall thereupon
> Take rest, e'er I be gone
> Once more on my adventures brave and new:
> Fearless and unperplexed,
> When I wage battle next,
> What weapons to select, what armour to endue.

So much for age—it has no terrors for him; and he adds with equal confidence—

> Thou waitest age: wait death nor be afraid!
>
> ⁘ ⁘ ⁘ ⁘ ⁘
>
> Fool! All that is, at all,
> Lasts ever, past recall;
> *Earth changes, but thy soul and God stand sure:*
> What entered into thee,
> *That* was, is, and shall be:
> Time's wheel runs back or stops: Potter and clay endure.
>
> He fixed thee 'mid this dance
> Of plastic circumstance,
> This Present, thou, forsooth, wouldst fain arrest:
> Machinery just meant
> To give thy soul its bent,
> Try thee and turn thee forth, sufficiently impressed.

Here, therefore, we have the spectacle of man in the bonds and boundaries of finite existence, yet conscious within himself of a spark of immortal life, over which they have no power: for ever doomed to be "looking forward to those things which are before," to lead a double existence in which flesh and spirit must be at warfare—

> Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
> Or what's a heaven for ——[1]

It is this intimation of immortality which, in varying forms, beneath the disguises of change, and decay, and doubt, is perpetually presented to us in Browning's writings. Fully to understand God would be to limit him to finite conditions, to make him in the likeness of man, and to degrade what is indeed the essence of faith itself. As he makes Johannes of Agricola say—

> God whom I praise; how could I praise,
> If such as I might understand,
> Make out and reckon on His ways,
> And bargain for His love.

And this leads us to, perhaps, the most characteristic of all Browning's theories, drawn as it is from this belief that the life of man on earth is only one stage in his development—his view of doubt. His attitude towards it is one of singular boldness. To him it is, as we have said, almost an integral part of belief, under the conditions of our limited existence and knowledge. He faces it with a faith bolder than itself, a faith so vital and powerful that it dares to claim it as an auxiliary force. To him it is an ever-springing protest against the incompleteness of our life and knowledge as a final condition, which leads to "the assurance of things hoped for;" the perpetual emphasis of the contradictions of our existence, which is the most emphatic denial of their final reality.

> And what is failure here, but a triumph's evidence
> For the fulness of the days? ——

he makes Abt Vogler say; and again in that wonderful poem, "A Death in the Desert," the dying ancient Apostle, prophetically confronting the new doubts which should arise in the world, accepts with equal power the necessary progress, even in the appreciation of truth, which must be reached through error. For as he says—

---

[1] *Andrea del Sarto.*

—— this gift of truth
Once grasped, were this our soul's gain safe, and sure
To prosper as the body's gain is wont,—
Why, man's probation would conclude, his earth
Crumbles; for he both reasons and decides,
Weighs first, then chooses: will he give up fire
For gold or purple once he knows its worth?
Could he give Christ up were His worth as plain?
Therefore, I say, to test man, the proofs shift,
Nor may he grasp that fact like other fact ——

And again in a long argument he shows how man's place stands midway between the lower perfection of the beast and the highest perfection, God; that he is—

a thing nor God nor beast,
Made to know that he can know and not more:
* * * * *
While man knows partly but conceives beside,
Creeps ever on from fancies to the fact,
And in this striving, this converting air
Into a solid he may grasp and use,
Finds progress, man's distinctive mark alone,
Not God's and not the beast's: God is, they are,
Man partly is, and wholly hopes to be.
Such progress could no more attend his soul
Were all it struggles after found at first
And guesses changed to knowledge absolute——

This being the case, why should doubt so shake our souls? It is but one step in a certain progress towards the only reality, truth—

Do I remonstrate: folly wide the mark!
Rather I prize the doubt
Low kinds exist without,
Finished and finite clods, untroubled by a spark.[1]

It would be interesting, did space allow, to follow up the poet's meaning as it is illustrated in one of the last poems of the new volume, where he describes the deliverance of the speaker from life in the perfect star Rephan, and proves that perfection attained without struggle has no vitality or existence. The poet's words alone will suffice—

No want—whatever should be, is now:
No growth—that's change— . . .
* * * *
No hope, no fear: as to-day, shall be
To-morrow: advance or retreat need we
At our standstill through eternity?
* * * *

[1] *Rabbi Ben Ezra.*

No fellowship—

* * * *

Was it Thou, above all lights that are,
Prime Potency, did thy hand unbar
The prison-gate of Rephan my star?

* * * *

I stagnated there where weak and strong,
The wise and the foolish, right and wrong

Are merged alike in a neutral Best,
Can I tell? No more than at whose behest
The passion arose in my passive breast.

And I yearned for no sameness but difference
In thing and thing, *that should shock my sense*
With a want of worth in them all, and thence

Startle me up, by an Infinite
Discovered above and below me—— . . .

* * * * *

Enough: for you doubt, you hope, O men,
You fear, you agonize, die: what then?
Is an end to your life's work out of ken?

Have you no assurance that, earth at end,
Wrong will prove right? Who made shall mend
In the higher sphere to which yearnings tend?

Why should I speak? You divine the test—
When the trouble grew in my pregnant breast
A voice said "So wouldst thou strive, not rest?

"Burn and not smoulder, win by worth,
Not rest content with a wealth that's death?
Thou art past Rephan, thy place be Earth!"

Here and now, as we have seen, our judgment of existence as a whole must be incomplete. We can but recognise a law of progress, and snatch at all such indications of the final order as are given us. And this leads us to one of the most important points in the poet's faith, and the large humanity which characterises his judgments of men and women. For the same reason, he says, it is impossible to judge from our limited standpoint of the ultimate failure and success of a man's life. "What are we set on earth for?" is a question which must be answered before we can attempt to judge whether or no each man has attained the object of his existence here. And as this object and its attainment is not bounded by our knowledge, our attitude should be one of extreme charity to our fellows. The remembrance of this should temper our proneness to judge hardly the motives and actions of other men and women, and should destroy the bigotry of the conventional moral judgment, which confines goodness and

the moral sphere within the limits of a philosophy or creed applicable only to certain conditions of life. Of all things the world's ordinary view of success is the most delusive—

> All service ranks the same with God—
> With God whose puppets, best and worst,
> Are we : there is no last nor first.[1]

Its view of failure is even more shallow, and upon this Browning insists in poem after poem, though possibly it finds its highest expression in the words of Andrea del Sarto, the faultless painter—

> I do what many dream of all their lives,
> —Dream ? Strive to do, and agonise to do,
> And fail in doing. . . .
> Who strive—you don't know how the others strive
> ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁
> Yet do much less. . . .
> Well, less is more, Lucrezia : I am judged.
> There burns a truer light of God in them,
> In their vexed beating stuffed and stopped-up brain,
> Heart, or whate'er else, than goes on to prompt
> This low-pulsed forth-right craftsman's hand of mine.
> Their works drop groundward, but themselves, I know,
> Reach many a time a heaven that's shut to me,
> Enter and take their place there sure enough,
> Though they come back and cannot tell the world.
> My works are nearer heaven, but I sit here.
> ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁
> In this world who can do a thing, will not ;
> And who would do it, cannot, I perceive :
> Yet the will's somewhat—somewhat, too, the power—
> And thus we half-men struggle—
> ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁
> . . . . . What would one have ?
> In heaven, perhaps, new chances, one more chance—

I have quoted more of the poem than would have sufficed for my purpose, which was to show how the idea of a completion elsewhere annihilates the ordinary conception of success and failure, as it brings out the intimations of a further life in the limitations here, and the positive need of doubt and the sense of incompletion, which in some natures is essential to their development.

So far I have endeavoured to express in a necessarily rapid and incomplete summary, what appears to me to be the general groundwork of the poet's religious views; though within the limits of an article it has been impossible even

---

[1] *Pippa Passes.*

to attempt to show their most characteristic development in his theories of love. For those conversant with his poems I venture to think that illustrations will have risen at every turn to their memories; though it is rather on the sum total of impressions left by his writings that I would rely for confirmation of my views of his meaning, than on any definite selections, however adequate.

No final judgment, as we have seen, is possible in this life, of its failure or success, nor any adequate conception of its place in the scheme of being. Far less can we conceive of God, and it is only through those attributes which are appreciable by man's finite nature, that we can approach him.

Of these, two stand out clearly in Browning's writings, and it is here that he comes most nearly into touch with Christianity, and his own individual faith seems to blend and become almost one with it. God, then, we find according to the poet, has manifested himself to man as Power and Love. The one is inconceivable, the other the mysterious vital keystone of the arch between God and man. And even here the universal law of progress has held good. At first man could but see, and bend beneath the might of power, yet "past mind's conception—power." And this the poet shows is inevitable. We see and feel it everywhere, but, do we seek to understand it as it is manifested even in its smallest works, the bird, the worm, the beast, we "cower back from the search."

Knowledge has laid a load on man's mind, prostrate before the loveless Power it ever tries vainly to withstand. "Ever resistless fact" lies before us, compelling our awe, our admiration, but not our love. No more, says Browning, can the clay withstand the Potter, than

> . . Can the whelmed mind disobey
> Knowledge, the cataract.
>
> All is effect of cause:
> As it would, has willed and done
> Power: and my mind's applause
> Goes, passing laws each one,
> To Omnipotence, Lord of laws.
>
> Head praises, but heart refrains
> From loving's acknowledgment.[1]

And then into this word of force before which man and his poor life shrink and dwindle into protesting nothingness, has come a new and stronger power, Love. This was the sudden

[1] *Reverie in Asolando.*

vision which since it "was made flesh and dwelt among us," has transformed not only the life here, but all else besides. This, which, did we understand it more fully, is only another aspect of power, is the same, made perfect, "come full into play." It was a prophetic vision of such divine love, beyond the resistless fact, and yet one with it, which rose in David's breast with his own yearning love and pity for the stricken soul of King Saul, whom no promised renewal of earthly power and grandeur could comfort. David had seen the power of God everywhere—

> I but open my eyes,—and perfection, no more and no less,
> In the kind I imagined, full fronts me, and God is seen God
> In the star, in the stone, in the flesh, in the soul, and the clod.

This he *sees*, but within him rises that divine overflow of love and pity, in which he recognises something of an invisible presence, which unites him suddenly and mysteriously, but, as his whole soul attests, eternally, with God himself. He recognises from his own finite love the infinity of love and power, and their union in the Godhead. He has sought to

> Interpose at the difficult minute, snatch Saul, the mistake,
> Saul, the failure, the ruin he seems now,—and bid him awake
> From the dream, the probation, the prelude, to find himself set
> Clear and safe in new light and new life,—a new harmony yet
> To be run, and continued, and ended—who knows?—or endure!
> The man taught enough by life's dream, of the rest to make sure;
> By the pain-throb, triumphantly winning intensified bliss,
> And the next world's reward and repose, by the struggles in this.

This he has sought by the might of his love and its "impotent yearning" to accomplish, and it brings the vision of love perfected.

> Would I suffer for him that I love? So wouldst thou—so wilt thou!
> So shall crown thee the topmost, ineffablest, uttermost crown—
> And thy love fill infinitude wholly, nor leave up nor down
> One spot for the creature to stand in! It is by no breath,
> Turn of eye, wave of hand, that salvation joins issue with death!
> As thy love is discovered almighty, almighty be proved
> Thy power, that exists with and for it, of being beloved!
> He who did most, shall bear most; the strongest shall stand the most weak.
> 'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for! my flesh, that I seek
> In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
> A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me,
> Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: A Hand like this hand
> Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!

We turn from this rapture of new faith and knowledge to

another picture which the poet gives us. And here he speaks of Lazarus; Lazarus raised from the dead,

> Earth forced on a soul's use while seeing heaven,[1]

and treading the more perplexedly his earthly path for it. He is

> Professedly the faultier that he knows
> God's secret.

He simply waits in prone submission for death to restore his equilibrium: "premature full growth" having come to him. As we read the touching picture which the Arab physician draws of him, some of the already noticed points of Browning's theory of life will revert to our minds: such as the necessity for incompleteness and uncertainty, and their naturalness in this life. But the whole picture is shown in its touching details only to turn us with a sudden powerful movement back upon the mind of the Arab physician, who excusing his detailed account of the man's life on the ground that it is valuable as illustrating one form of epilepsy, suddenly breaks from his critical attitude, and lets the consuming wonder that holds him, as he stands on the threshold of a new truth, have vent—

> The very God! think, Abib: dost thou think?
> So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
> So through the thunder comes a human voice
> Saying, "O heart I made, a heart beats here!
> Face my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
> *Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine,*
> *But love I gave thee, with myself to love,*
> And thou must love me who have died for thee!

The Christian doctrine of man's redemption, by love and sacrifice, could hardly find a higher expression.

We shall find a somewhat different treatment in "A Death in the Desert." Here the ancient dying Apostle John becomes prophetically conscious of the new doubts which would be born into the world, as David before him had foreseen the new faith. He who leaned upon the breast of Jesus, now hears men question, not only whether Christ himself ever lived, but whether he, John, "was at all." His mode of answering is most instructive and interesting. First he does not re-assert the facts as things he has *seen;* he admits that influenced by physical fear he has even denied them once in Christ's lifetime, so how can he judge those who deny what

[1] *The Epistle of Karshish.*

they never saw? Let "the proofs shift" he seems to say, man will be "tested" so. The real denial which leads to death is of the inward truth, once apprehended by the soul. And there he leaves off contesting about the seen fact altogether, and reverts to the only method by which man apprehends truth—*i.e.*, by the principle of growth and progress within his own consciousness—

> I say that man was made to grow, not stop;
> That help, he needed once, and needs no more,
> Having grown but an inch by, is withdrawn:
> For he hath new needs, and new helps to these.
> This imports solely, man should mount on each
> New height in view; the help whereby he mounts,
> The ladder-rung his foot has left, may fall,
> Since all things suffer change save God the Truth.
> Man apprehends Him newly at each stage
> Whereat earth's ladder drops, its service done;
> And nothing shall prove twice what once was proved.

Thus, a real living truth once apprehended, he stays asserting "proofs" no longer, but goes on to the next. "This," John adds, "might be pagan teaching; now hear mine." He however himself goes on to show that, the need for miracles having ceased, they, or their appearance, ceased also; faith having grown and not needing longer to be compelled; that, when once the truth, involved in God becoming man, has been grasped by the soul, it must be *used*, not re-stated. And here, he again imagines himself questioned plainly and narrowly as to the *facts*. Did Christ live, die, rise again—is, in brief, the story true?

But the dying Apostle has got into a region of reality more vivid than any presentment of facts at any given moment of a life on earth. Such questions have no longer any meaning to the man to whom truth "*is* now, and ever shall be," to whom the vital essence of the Love of God has been, is, and will be

> When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.

Why stop, he seems to ask, at any one stage of God's manifestation of himself? Accept each step, and pass on to the next.

> God's gift was that man should conceive of truth
> And yearn to gain it, catching at mistake,
> As midway help till he reach fact indeed.

Man was obliged at first to learn by facts, as the brutes;

> Next as man, obliged by his own mind,
> Bent, habit, nature, knowledge turned to law.

And the Apostle goes on to urge him to "reach the type," through a perpetual search after truth in the varying forms which rise with varying times, the truth that "shall make you free." And he adds—

> If ye demur, this judgment on your head,
> Never to reach the ultimate, angels' law,
> Indulging every instinct of the soul
> There where law, life, joy, impulse are one thing!

Whether he speaks through the mouth of the aged Apostle, or the ancient Rabbi, we find Browning conceives of truth as being definitely spiritual, at harmony with itself, and manifesting itself through an endless progress of development. It is difficult not to accept as the poet's personal expression, the lines—

> . . . Praise be Thine!
> I see the whole design,
> I, who saw power, see now Love perfect too:
> Perfect I call Thy plan:
> Thanks that I was a man!
> Maker, remake, complete,—I trust what Thou shalt do![1]

Or again in the "Reverie" he seems to sum up his expression of faith:

> Then life is—to wake not sleep,
> Rise and not rest, but press
> From earth's level where blindly creep
> Things perfected more or less,
> To the heaven's height, far and steep,
>
> Where, amid what strifes and storms
> May wait the adventurous quest,
> Power is Love—transports, transforms
> Who aspired from worst to best,
> Sought the soul's world, spurned the worms.
>
> I have faith such end shall be:
> From the first, Power was—I knew.
> Life has made clear to me
> That, strive but for closer view,
> Love were as plain to see.
>
> When see? When there dawns a day,
> If not on the homely earth,
> Then yonder, worlds away,
> Where the strange and new have birth,
> And Power comes full in play.[2]

Let such as are interested in the matter decide for themselves whether or no they can fit Browning into the ranks

---

[1] *Rabbi Ben Ezra.* [2] *Asolando*, p. 154.

of pure Theism or Christianity; his large humanity and extraordinary power of intellectual sympathy made it possible for him to recognise the same truth under many forms, and share in many of its expressions. I would rather think of him as a leader and fellow-comrade to all those who "seek after God," and say in the words of his own Pompilia—[1]

> Through such souls alone
> God stooping shows sufficient of His light
> For us i' the dark to rise by. And I rise.

MARIAN VON GLEHN.

II.—BROWNING'S THEOLOGY.

There is at the first blush a superficial resemblance between a poet and a theologian. Both the one and the other give formal expression in accurate phraseology to some of our profoundest feelings. The poet, as well as the theologian, expresses explicitly what we feel most deeply. The theologian, equally with the poet, deals with the ideals of life, and especially the architectonic ideals that organise life and make it, or should make it, one vast grand poem. A little more harping on the same string, and especially a little more mixture of metaphors, and it would not be difficult to make out a good case for calling poet, priest, and theologian, poet writ large.

But when we come to the mode in which the poet and the theologian respectively give expression to the ideal elements within us, all these resemblances vanish at once. Think for a moment what is implied in the formal expression which a poet and a theologian respectively would give of the yearning after immortality. While the artist in words and moods would endeavour so to express the yearning as to invoke in his reader the same feeling that moves him with all its *nuances* of hope and doubt, rapture and shrinking, the theologian will be thinking under which section of what chapter of his Treatise on Eschatology the subject will most logically be introduced For the theologian as such appeals, or at least ought to appeal, solely to the reason, whereas the poet has the whole diapason of human nature to work upon.

---

[1] *The Ring and the Book.*

I seem to have cut away the ground beneath my own feet, if the thing be possible and the metaphor allowable, in thus distinguishing so sharply the respective functions of poet and theologian. If they be so distinct, how treat of Browning's theology, on which I am to speak a few words from the Jewish point of view? But Browning, in this as in so many things, struck out a new line for himself. Regardless of the canon that a poet cannot be a theologian, he wrote theological poems in which the reasoning is at least as close and certainly as difficult to follow as that of many professed theologians. It is true they are mostly in dramatic form; instead of discussing anthropomorphism or fetishism, he gave us *Caliban on Setebos;* instead of answering Strauss directly, he wrote *Christmas Eve* and *Easter Day;* instead of writing an essay on miracles, he pictures for us Karshish's reflections on the case of Lazarus. It is not, however, so difficult as one might think to penetrate beneath the mask of the *dramatis personæ* and gain access to the thoughts of Robert Browning himself on the higher problems and obscurest difficulties of life. It is these that constitute him a theologian in the strict sense of the word, and should enable us to place the poet in one or other of the categories into which the theologians of the day may be divided.

In one case, indeed, Browning drops the mask of impersonation altogether, and speaks out on a theological subject of great importance. Stirred to the inmost depths by the sudden death of a friend, he discusses at some length in *La Saisiaz* the question of the immortality of the soul. Interesting as his treatment is, it scarcely comes within the scope of these remarks to consider it. For the dogma of immortality is one of natural religion, one common to all the creeds (except perhaps Buddhism). It is not more Jewish than Christian, Moslem than Greek, and in seeking to define Robert Browning's relation to Judaism, we must deal with the dogmas more distinctive of the creeds, and consider his attitude towards them, and its relation to that of other religious thinkers of his time.

His opinions show him to have been a member of the Broad Church School, as represented by Dean Stanley and the men of *Essays and Reviews.* A certain amount of sympathy is shown with what used to be known as German neologism, which in *Christmas Eve* is regarded as being even one of the ways of knowing Christ. But at the same time the inadequateness of the rationalistic attitude towards the Divinity of Christ is also insisted upon, and the assumption is

left that this, with all its consequences, the Incarnation and the Atonement, must be accepted by faith, if not to be definitely established by reason. Throughout this poem, the figure of Christ appears in such a form as would be impossible without a thorough faith in his Divinity. It must therefore be owned that so far as the evidence of his works goes, the jubilation of the orthodox Christian over the faith of Browning is to a certain extent justified, and there is little or no reason to suppose, as some Jewish students of the poet have thought, that his creed was a pure monotheism with a rejection of the Incarnation. Browning's theology was distinctively Christian, and in no way can be said to approximate to Judaism on the chief point that separates the two religions.

At the same time, outside *Christmas Eve* very little stress is laid on the influence of the Mediator in the spiritual life, the practical side by which the Divinity of Christ is made operative in the Christian life. But herein Browning is only at one with the rest of the Broad Church who tend to attenuate the function of mediation till Christ becomes little more than the spiritual brother in God, and Christ-worship becomes practically impossible. Another tendency which he likewise shares with the school of thought with which I am identifying him is the practical disappearance of the third person of the Trinity from his theology. Except in such vague form as "God's Spirit" or the "Spirit of Love" there is scarcely any reference to the Holy Spirit in his writings.

Speaking generally then, Browning's theology is that of the Broad Church with all its catholicity, but also with all its vagueness, and its want of touch with the practical religious life. So far as Browning's thought on religious matter seems Jewish, it is because of its Broad Church tone. In a fuller treatment of the subject it would be necessary, as it would be interesting, to discuss from a Jewish point of view the whole Broad Church movement, before determining how far Browning approximates to the Jewish position. In many Jewish circles it was thought, and is still thought, that the Broad Church was a tendency in Christianity towards Judaism. This is, however, erroneous; it is a tendency towards Unitarianism, not towards Judaism, as indeed both Mr. Voysey and Mr. Stopford Brooke have practically shown. Now, however much we may differ as to what Judaism is, and of recent years we have agreed to differ exceedingly, there is one point on which we are all agreed. Judaism is differentiated from Unitarianism by an additional element which may be called either racial or historical. The practical recog-

nition of God in History, and of a divine mission for Israel is a necessary part of Judaism according to all schools, however much they may differ as to the mode of operation of the Divine Spirit in men's affairs, or as to the exact character of the function Israel is to play in order to fulfil the designs of that Spirit. It is this quality that makes Judaism, which, at first sight, seems so akin to Unitarianism, on closer investigation turn out to show a closer kinship with the Roman Catholic Church, as is after all only natural, as their historical relationship is really that of mother and daughter.

The Broad Church is singularly unsusceptible to the claims of History and of development in religion, and Browning shares in this quality of his school. Indeed he extends this unsympathy with the conception of history as a divine process so far as to limit very much his general poetic treatment of historic subjects. For a poet who dealt so much with the past as he did, there is singularly little of the nationalist point of view of treating history. I mean the conception that nations, just as religions, have their main function in the creation of specific types of human character. Considering that he lived so much in Italy when her noblest elements were most deeply imbued with this conception, considering also that Mrs. Browning had the deepest sympathy with it, it is curious how very little there is in Browning that strikes the patriotic or nationalist note. Here again he chimes in with the general sentiments of his school of religious thought, who have been cosmopolitan to a fault.

Perhaps the most distinctive point in Browning's teaching is the view which I have elsewhere ventured to sum up in the formula "Aspiration is achievement" (*Athenæum*, Dec. 21st, 1889, p. 859). This, as applied to theology, would perhaps lead to one of the most striking doctrines of the Broad Church in one of its more recent developments. I refer to Dr. Abbot's remarkable view of the religious use of illusion as leading on to higher forms of truth. From a Jewish point of view, this is of interest, as chiming in with Maimonides' conception of Christianity and Islam being two forms of useful illusion that will lead on to Judaism. But there is no evidence that Browning shared Dr. Abbot's view, and for this reason I have affiliated him with the school of Stanley.

Hitherto in regarding Browning as a theologian of the Broad Church School we have been dealing rather with the points in which he and his school, or rather his school and he, differ from the Jewish way of looking at things religious. But there remains one other point besides the tendency to Unitarianism wherein the Broad Church approaches Judaism,

as Jews have every reason to know and be thankful for. With all its vagueness of doctrine and attenuation of dogma, the Broad School has been ever honourably distinguished by its toleration both in theory and practice. Both in eschatology and in the doctrine of sin, Judaism and the Broad Church are at one in declaring a man's deeds, and not his creed, to be the criterion of his claims to the higher life both here and hereafter. Here universalism and nationalism are at one.

It is here of course that Browning's Jewish poems come in as part of his general theological attitude, and it may be of interest to review those that deal most directly with Jewish subjects. "Holy Cross Day" puts with considerable humour the case against conversion in the form of a Roman Jew's soliloquy while attending but not listening to a sermon which the Jews of the Ghetto were forced to endure once a year. No Jew could wish to have the *Apologia pro domo suâ* put with more force than in the ringing lines in which the poet makes his Rabbi address the Christ—

> O thou, if that martyr-gash
> Fell on thee coming to take thine own,
> And we gave the Cross, when we owed the Throne—
>
> Thou art the Judge. We are bruised thus.
> But, the judgment over, join sides with us!
> Thine too is the cause! and not more thine
> Than ours, is the work of these dogs and swine,
> Whose life laughs through and spits at their creed,
> Who maintain thee in word, and defy thee in deed.
>
> ⁂ ⁂ ⁂ ⁂ ⁂
>
> By the torture, prolonged from age to age,
> By the infamy, Israel's heritage,
> By the Ghetto's plague, by the garb's disgrace,
> By the badge of shame, by the felon's place,
> By the branding tool, the bloody whip,
> And the summons to Christian fellowship,—
>
> We boast our proof that at least the Jew
> Would wrest Christ's name from the Devil's crew.

Another less well known poem of toleration is that entitled "Filippo Baldunecci on the Privilege of Burial," telling how a petty-minded painter annoyed the Jews by putting up a picture of the Virgin overlooking their graveyard, and when he had agreed to remove it for a consideration, replacing it by one of the Crucifixion. At last the Jews buy both pictures, on the plea that they may have them in their possession, just as a Christian would not scruple to have one of Venus or of Zeus. The scorn of the Jews at Baldunecci's

action, and the meanness shown by it is heightened by their dignified and lofty rebuke at being plagued even in their graves.

Death's luxury we now rehearse
While, living, through your streets we fare,
And take your hatred: nothing worse
Have we, once dead and safe, to bear.

Another slight poem of Browning's, never printed, I believe, in any of his works—it appeared in *The Keepsake*, 1856—expands a well-known saying of the "Ethics of the Fathers":

BEN KARSHOOK'S WISDOM.

I.

Would a man 'scape the rod,
Rabbi Ben Karshook saith,
"See that he turn to God
The day before his death."

"Ay, could a man inquire
When it shall come?" I say,
The Rabbi's eye shoots fire,
"Then let him turn to-day!"

II.

Quoth a young Sadducee,
"Reader of many rolls,
Is it so certain we
Have, as they tell us, souls?"

"Son, there is no reply!"
The Rabbi bit his beard,
"Certain, a soul have *I*—
We may have none," he sneer'd.

Thus Karshook, the Hiram's Hammer
The Right-hand Temple-column
Taught babes in grace their grammar
And struck the simple, solemn.

Browning's toleration is shown in even a higher way than in these direct attacks on intolerance. It cannot have been by accident that he chose to give two of the most important summaries of his *Weltweisheit* by means of Jewish speakers, "Rabbi Ben Ezra" and "Jochanan Hakkadosh." "Rabbi Ben Ezra" is by many considered Browning's most striking poem, and certainly it yields to none of his in dignity and lucidity. It is of peculiar interest to English Jews as the eponymous hero is Abraham ibn Ezra, who was himself in England, "the island of the corner of the earth" (a pun on Angle terre) as he calls it, in the spring and summer of 1158. It is scarcely likely that Browning knew more of him than that he was a distinguished Rabbi of the Middle Ages. Certainly the poem has none of those satiric touches with which Abraham ibn Ezra's name is associated in the mind of the student of Jewish literature. Nothing can be more dignified and stoical than the soliloquy of the old Rabbi reviewing life, and seeing that it is very good both in youth, with its pleasure, and in age, with its experience. The image of the

Potter and the Wheel, hackneyed as it has been by the homilists, has never been more finely utilised than in the concluding lines of the poem. Man as clay in the making is thus addressed—

> What though the earlier grooves
> Which ran the laughing loves
> Around thy base, no longer pause and press?
> What though, about thy rim,
> Scull-things in order grim
> Grow out, in graver mood, obey the sterner stress?
>
> Look not thou down, but up!
> To uses of a cup,
> The festal board, lamp's flash and trumpet's peal,
> The new wine's foaming flow,
> The Master's lips a-glow!
> Thou, heaven's consummate cup, what need'st thou with
> earth's wheel?
>
> But I need, now as then,
> Thee, God, who mouldest men!
> And since, not even while the whirl was worst,
> Did I, to the wheel of life
> With shapes and colours rife,
> Bound dizzily,—mistake my end, to slake Thy thirst.
>
> So, take and use Thy work,
> Amend what flaws may lurk,
> What strain o' the stuff, what warpings past the aim!
> My times be in Thy hand!
> Perfect the cup as planned!
> Let age approve of youth, and death complete the same!

There remain a number of poems which go even further than toleration of the Jewish life and creed. They imply a certain sympathy with Jewish ways of thought and fancy, and a certain acquaintance, though not a very profound one, with Rabbinic literature. These are chiefly contained in the volume called *Jocoseria*. This contains one of the Midrashic legends of the Queen of Sheba, though diluted through Arabic sources, as is indicated by the title "Solomon and Balkis." It is scarcely more than a *jeu d'esprit*.

The most important of these poems is, however, the legend of "Jochanan Hakkadosh," a sort of Rabbinic Hagada on the theme "Unless ye be as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." The great Rabbi Jochanan, on the point of dying, has a year of additional life granted him by the expedient of certain younger men giving up three months of their lives to the venerated sage. He lives their life, and thus at the height of his wisdom is enabled to judge of the

value of their various occupations. "Vanity of Vanity" is the refrain four times in succession, as his disciple Tsaddik visited Jochanan, after he had lived three months the life of a married lover, a warrior, a poet and a statesman. But by accident some little child had also pressed upon the sage three months of its life, and this additional experience harmonizes all the discrepancies of the others, and allows the sage to depart in peace and assured that life is not vain.

Attached to "Jochanan Hakkadosh" are three sonnets on the well known Talmudic *Lügenmärchen*, to use the folk-lore term, of the legend of Og's bones and bedstead. They are said to be from a work משך של רבים בדים which I need scarcely say neither exists nor could exist under such a title. Much head breaking has been caused by the bad Hebrew of the title, but Browning would probably have given the Johnsonian explanation of "Ignorance, madam, ignorance." As some indication of the slightness of his acquaintance with Hebrew idiom, I may mention that he was going to call his Jochanan "Hakkadosh Jochanan" (=John Saint). Through a common friend I pointed out the error to the poet, and the adjective was put in its proper position. The fact seems to be that Browning could read his Hebrew Bible, and that was about the extent of his Hebrew learning, though it was a foible of his to give an impression of recondite learning.

But it is not in the minutiæ of Hebrew scholarship that we are to look for Browning's sympathy with the Jewish spirit. This comes out in the lines I have been quoting and in his poems of toleration. That this sympathy was not due to any agreement with the characteristic features of Jewish faith is, I think, undoubted. All the more honour to the poet who could rise above differences of creed and pierce to the human nature which is common to Christian and Jew because it is the gift of a Common Father.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

NOTE.—The following passages in some recently published correspondence of Browning throw interesting light on his attitude to Jewish questions:—"The two Hebrew quotations (put in to give a grave look to what is mere fun and invention) being translated amount to—1st, 'A Collection of many lies'; and the 2nd is an old saying: 'From Moses to Moses arose none like Moses.' . . . . . The Hebrew quotations are put in for a purpose, as a direct acknowledgment that certain doctrines may be found in the Old Book, which the Concocters of Novel Schemes of Morality put forth as discoveries of their own."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JUDAISM FOR THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.

II.

THE inquiry whether fixed articles of faith form the essential kernel of Judaism, learnedly discussed in this Review by Mr. Schechter, and the accuracy of the classification of the differences in religious opinion among English Jews, so cleverly elaborated by Mr. Israel Zangwill, are both internal questions which have only a very incidental relation to the real subject-matter of my former article.

I had not then, nor have I now, to deal with what may be considered as orthodox or heterodox in Judaism, whether touching the importance of the ritual or even the apparently fundamental dogma of Revelation, of which the denial in Rabbinic language is expressed by האומר אין תורה מן השמים or in modern phraseology, by doubt in the supernatural. According to Mr. Zangwill's classification, there is among English Jews a group of persons "professing natural Judaism." This might, indeed, occasion a practical question within the Jewish community itself. For the question might arise whether holding such heterodox opinions would unfit a man for giving evidence in a matter of ritual, as *e.g.*, in a marriage or a divorce "*more Judaico.*" In such a case, a rabbi would be not a little puzzled to decide whether the marriage or the divorce would be ritually valid. For the code-book he would have to consult would not enlighten him on matters of dogma. It would, for instance, give him no information how to act in the case of a witness who had never violated the sabbath in his actions, but who was not thoroughly imbued with a belief in the supernatural command to obey it. Moses Mendelssohn's dictum that Judaism only judges actions and not religious opinions remains unshaken. Whether an intelligent Jew finds more happiness, assurance, and solace from his convinced belief in the ideal principle of Judaism and its ethical consequences than a Russian or Polish Chasid from the mechanical

performance of some ritual ceremony, and from a vague messianic hope is purely a matter of sentiment. It could only become practically important if the externalities of the synagogue were undergoing transformation. We might then have to determine whether more consideration was to be shown to Moses Mendelssohn, who rejoiced in the thought that the essentials of Judaism were in perfect harmony with deistic philosophy, or to Steinheim, who was filled with joy at the conviction that the truths of revealed Judaism were at variance with the dogmas of philosophy. Translating these differences of theory into practice, we might then have to decide whether the repulsive abuses commonly regarded as Jewish and religious should be abandoned, or whether the feelings of a naïve believer should rather be spared who finds his spiritual bliss in the noisy shaking of the willow branches upon the Feast of Tabernacles.

But, as aforesaid, these reflections are foreign to my subject. I only desire to consider whether Judaism has still a real significance and value in the critically-minded present, and in that future which may be yet more estranged from all religious forms, only to show that those who are deeply convinced of its fundamental principle and historic influence, may joyfully make it their vocation to hold by Judaism steadfastly, and so transmit it to posterity. Taking as my guides the Bible, the Talmud, and the intelligent rabbis, I have endeavoured to prove that this fundamental principle must be sought for in ethical idealism (humanity in the highest sense of the word), and in pure rational monotheism, adverse to all mysticism and disfigurement. I have also attempted to show that for the future of mankind these qualities have not yet become superfluous for the education and regeneration of society.

The immense influence, which these two most closely connected sides of the law of Moses, "the heritage of the congregation of Israel," have exercised on the development of human civilization, has indeed been freely admitted even by Christian thinkers. No matter how much Mr. Zangwill may doubt the validity of this statement and oppose to it the argument that Confucius and Sophocles, and Aryan celebrities in general, were equally impressed with the categorical imperative of the moral law, he cannot maintain that these individuals caused a world-wide and historic change in the thoughts and actions of the whole civilized portion of mankind, or that they looked upon their own convictions as material for what we may call an ethical circulation of the blood. Socrates may have had a more accurate conception of

the Deity than his countrymen and the Sophists, but only a paradoxical disputatiousness could assert that he was fully penetrated with the conviction that this conception of the Deity postulated the sanctity of life and the purest morality. Plato and Aristotle might indeed have learnt "practical reason" from the Jews, for their ethical doctrine compares most disadvantageously with that of Judaism, as was already known to Philo.

Christianity was perfectly justified in priding itself on having vanquished the essential corruption of paganism, but it ought not to have ignored the fact that it was only the organ and interpreter of an original inspiration behind it, and that it had not itself remained free from some heathen contamination. As long as Judaism was gagged and silent, Bossuet could attribute the whole progress of civilization to Christianity, a view in which Ranke, undisturbed by Buckle's conclusions, has partly followed him. But at the present day, the ban which suffered no dispute to the assertion that salvation came forth from Golgotha and not from Zion is gradually being broken through. For it is now admitted as an undeniable historical fact by many earnest Christian thinkers, such as Kuenen and Renan, and even half-and-half by German historians despite a touch of anti-Semitism, that the ethical consciousness is the property of the people of Israel, that it was called into the world by the three great prophets, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, and that they may be said to have been evangelists eight hundred years before the rise of Christianity, although without the mystic bye-taste of a kingdom of heaven. To this admission we must cling fast, without at present examining closely whether this ethical revelation was first proclaimed from Mount Sinai, or from the wilderness of Tekoa. A part, I might say the flower, of this pure ethical system, has become the common property of the world, through the medium of Christianity—justice, charity even towards the stranger, care for the poor, the sanctity of life, conscientiousness. But the world has not yet fully appreciated the root of this rich development, that pure monotheism which teaches that God is the father of the fatherless and the protector of the widow, and that, as holiness is the essence of his nature, all unholiness, unchastity, and self-pollution,[1] are an abomination to him. Neither has

[1] The Talmudists very keenly realised this element in the Jewish conception of God אלהיהם של אלו שונא זמה. "The God of Israel hates unchastity, bestiality."

the world always adequately realized that this lofty conception of Deity is the true teaching of Judaism.

What relation then exists between the ceremonial system and this fundamental principle or essence of Judaism? It cannot be denied that in its constitutive document, the Pentateuch, in which ethical laws fill a considerable space, we find also prescribed a whole series of ritual enactments, though the prophets treat these ordinances almost with contempt. Through Talmudism and Rabbinism they have been so improperly exaggerated, and received so enormous an extension in the various codes, that the ethical element seems to have been almost entirely crowded out, and Judaism has consequently appeared to consist of nothing but outward ceremonies, and to place the highest value in the mechanical performance of an infinite series of ritual acts. Let us now inquire whether this ritualism in *its original form* was related to the ethical element, or whether it is to be considered as something foreign to its purpose, an interpolation from without. From the earliest times, both Jewish and non-Jewish circles have been in the habit of considering Judaism as composed of two distinct parts—articles of faith and moral laws on the one side, ceremonies and ritual observances on the other. It was reckoned as one of the merits of the founder of Christianity, that he aided the progress of religious consciousness by eliminating the ceremonial law. On this view he becomes in a sense the founder of a reformed Judaism. The reform party of modern times sought to justify the transformation of Judaism by means of another line of argument. They held that the national character, which the Jewish law has always retained, was unessential as compared with its religious and ethical features, and as much of the former had necessarily been given up with the destruction of the national independence, all that had any tinge of nationality might now also be eradicated. Judaism was thus to adopt a universal or cosmopolitan character, and be able, as it were, to compete with Christianity, at any rate with Unitarianism. This is the point of view of a large number of Jews in America.

The value or worthlessness of the ceremonial element in Judaism, and its original signification, are well worth considering. That it has some deeper meaning is sufficiently proved by the testimony of the book of Deuteronomy, which was found in the temple by the high priest Hilkiah. Although it places the ethical laws in the foreground, it also enforces ritual observances, though on a far less extensive scale than in the other books of the Pentateuch.

The ceremonies must therefore possess at least a certain value and some definite relation to the ethical elements. It is worth while to investigate what this relation is.

When the prophets gave frequent utterance to the prediction, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the seas" — full, that is, according to our interpretation, of ethical idealism and submission to God— they did not delude themselves with the belief that this "kingdom of heaven" was near at hand. They relegated the realization of the ideal to "the end of days." The two prophets, Isaiah and Micah, who predicted eternal peace on earth in connection with Israel's mission, that "nation shall not draw the sword against nation, and that they shall not learn war again," preface this statement with the words, "and it shall come to pass in the last days." They were gifted with the prevision that the teaching which goes forth from Zion would have power to effect a great moral transformation over the whole world—in some distant age.

But how is this teaching to endure to the end of days? How is it to be taught and to spread its influence abroad? A doctrine must possess its teachers. It must therefore have created for itself an organ, an interpreter, who should proclaim it and preserve it, and lead it to victory. Not an association, pledged by contract to carry on the work, not an order which has to be constantly recruited lest it should die out, was chosen to be the bearer of this teaching, but a *tribe* which, united in itself, even after apparent extermination is ever again renewed. The oldest record, the Scriptures, tells of the selection of a race of guardians for the regenerating doctrine. Abraham was chosen, so that he might command his sons and their descendants after them to keep the way of the Lord and to practise justice and righteousness. The promise to Abraham was that he would thus become the father of many nations, because his tribe, the people of Israel, was entrusted with the mission and the task of guarding the teaching of salvation until the end of days. Such is the language of Scripture. Or did this tribe become the guardian and preserver of the teaching because in it the ethical consciousness, though but in feeble outline, had been awakened and developed very early, and it was therefore more fitted than other nations for this ethical office?

In whichever way the fact be expressed, Israel, the descendant of Abraham, has played its part in the history of the world as guardian and propagator of a peculiar regenerative teaching. The Hebrew language has created a special name for the ideal import of this tribe. It is called Jeshurun

(ישורון), of which word the etymological meaning is, "The perfection of uprightness, or integrity." In this one term is comprehended what is elsewhere described as, "Thy people shall be all righteous, the work of my hands that I may be glorified"; or again: "a kingdom of priests and a holy people." As such an ideal, Israel, the servant of God, is destined to be a light to the nations and to bring unto them righteousness or salvation. If Israel possesses this lofty destiny and historic mission "for the latter days," its existence has an *exceptional* significance. Its beginnings are therefore represented in a peculiar light, and certainly were of an extraordinary character. It is an undoubted fact that the Israelites were slaves in Egypt, an undoubted fact that they left the land of their captivity, and equally certain that in order to reach the land in which they undeniably lived for seven hundred years, they had to pass through a terrible wilderness. These events, together with the passage of the Red Sea and the revelation of the Decalogue, which the older poetry glorified, and in so doing confirmed, were looked upon as the gracious proofs of a special Divine guidance. The prophet Jeremiah calls those days the bridal state of Israel. These first chapters of Israel's national history were to be all the more zealously remembered, inasmuch as they were to serve as an encouragement to remain steadfast through thousands of years of inward and outward trials and temptations. Israel's servitude and misfortunes at the beginning of its history, and its subsequent deliverance through a wonderful providence, were therefore immortalised by special ritual observances. The law itself does not enforce these observances as ends in themselves, but designates them as *means* for a higher end, "so that thou mayest remember all the days of thy life." In these words the connection between the spiritual essence of Judaism and a considerable part of its ritual observances is clearly designated: they are the means to an end, and that end is the memory of the past. National memories are dear to every nation; they urge it on to activity, to the maintenance of what it has already achieved, and to the increase of its fame. But the people of Israel was to pride itself not on the great deeds of its ancestors, but on the Divine guidance, which had shaped its destiny; and its national memories were intended to keep alive and unforgotten its own exceptional position and significance.

Another consideration is the following. This tribe was to be the bearer and guardian of what, in modern language, we should call moral and religious truth. But it lived among nations who despised these truths, or rather it lived among

a polytheistic and orgiastic world. Contagion from this world was inevitable and did not fail to come. Polytheistic error had so entirely undermined morality, that the law had to threaten with severe punishment fathers who sacrificed their children to Moloch, or who sacrificed their daughters' purity to other shameful divinities. It had to forbid the price of prostitution being brought into the temple. Sins which we now regard as impossible, and cannot reflect on without a shudder, must therefore have become domiciled amongst the Israelites just as they were in Babylon, Tyre, Corinth, and throughout the ancient world. Hence the continual relapse of the people to the abominations of polytheism and apostasy, which recurred even after the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, until at the return from the Babylonian captivity the apparently inexhaustible tendency to idolatry was finally overcome.[1]

The law, the "Torah," had therefore to take measures by which to wean the people from its polytheistic aberrations. Just as the Great Synagogue in the post-exilian period introduced "hedges" forbidding certain things that had been hitherto permitted, in order to prevent some essential law from being transgressed, so the Torah prescribed a series of ritual observances, which were intended to counteract polytheism and its worship. We may call them anti-polytheistic observances. Separatism followed as necessarily as B follows upon A. In the Pentateuch, stress is even laid upon separatism. The preservation of national memories and the necessity of exclusiveness made ceremonialism indispensable. The observances have thus either a mnemonic or a prophylactic character. Those which were to remind the people of their early history have necessarily a national character. First comes the institution of the festivals. The rationalists at the end of the last and beginning of the present century thought they were attaching an ineradicable stigma to

---

[1] The views of modern criticism, that represent both David and Solomon as polytheists, and fix the date when Yahvism developed into monotheism at as late a period as possible, are contradicted by the fact that in Solomon's Temple the Holy of Holies (דביר) lay towards the west, just as in the description of the Tabernacle, the entrance to it was in the east, and the Holy of Holies in the west. As Helios was worshipped by almost all nations, the centre of the temple, the *Adyton*, was turned towards the east. The contrast between the Israelitish and the polytheistic temple arrangements is strikingly given in Ezekiel viii. 17. He saw twenty-five Israelites, worshippers of idols, standing at the entrance of the inner temple, towards which they turned their backs, while they looked towards the east, and prayed to the sun in the east, והמה משתחויתם קדמה לשמש. If Solomon had been still a polytheist, he must have placed the Holy of Holies in his temple in the east.

Judaism by proving that the two great festivals of Passover and Tabernacles were originally nature festivals, commemorating the beginning and end of the harvest. No doubt they were so originally, but they were converted into national festivals. In this assimilation or metamorphosis, is shown the spiritual energy which stamped its mark on all it found. The new ethical and religious conceptions had no *tabula rasa* before them; it was a people already accustomed to certain habits and institutions, which had to receive, preserve, and develop them. Thus the festival of the spring was converted into a national festival, to remind the people of their deliverance from slavery; and the harvest festival, the grape and fig harvest, which was spent in the open air and in booths, became a reminder of the many years spent in the wilderness. The exodus from Egypt was further to be called to mind by the redemption and sanctification of the first-born, by the removal of leavened bread, by the wearing of certain visible signs (phylacteries and tefillin) on forehead and hands, and possibly also by the blue fringes on the edges of the garment. If it should be proved that the nobles of Egypt wore fringes either for ornament or in compliance with some religious custom, we should here again have an example of the transformation of an old custom into a symbol of a loftier conception of life. It has not yet been made quite clear in what the so-called phylacteries (טוטפות, זכרון) and tefillin (אות) originally consisted. As they are enforced in Deuteronomy, they must have been of considerable importance, inasmuch as the fifth book of Moses frequently modifies the injunctions of the central three.

As the book of Deuteronomy accentuates more sharply than the others the fundamental monotheistic doctrine, it uses the law of Tefillin and Phylacteries, as well as that of the Mezuzot, to impress and to sharpen the monotheistic idea. The special significance of this commandment lay, no doubt, in the words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one," which were to be fastened to every door-post, so that everybody at every moment of the day might be exhorted to conceive the God of Israel as a perfect Unity.

As I have already explained in my first article, this confession, or more accurately, this consciousness of monotheism, was not intended to be an article of faith, but an antithetical protest against polytheism; and polytheism was abhorred, not so much on account of its logical error, but first and foremost because of its incitement to ethical corruption. Hence the prophylactic ceremonials. Paganism laid special stress upon sacrifices to the dead, which originated in hero-

worship. The departed kings, national leaders and heroes, were represented as continuing to exist in Hades or elsewhere, transfigured into divinities (*manes divi*). This was the foundation of the superstition respecting evil spirits and demons. In Egypt especially, the deceased kings entombed in their pyramids, were made the objects of an elaborate system of worship. The mummies were considered sacred. The Israelite conception of God had to protest energetically against adoration of the dead, and it consequently pronounced the state of death to be unclean and a source of pollution. To touch a corpse, even that of a parent or a king, made a man unclean. Whoever had come in contact with a corpse, a skeleton, or a funeral feast, was not permitted to enter the sanctuary of the holy God until he had submitted himself to a seven days' purification, which purification had also a symbolical meaning. This is the probable origin of the Levitical laws of purification, against which so many objections have been raised. Perhaps it is only a natural sequence that dead animals were also pronounced unclean, with reference to the Egyptian custom of holding sacred the dead bodies of animals that were worshipped as divine.

It is possible that the command not to eat the flesh of certain quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and reptiles also had its origin in the reaction against the Egyptian worship of animals, which even included reptiles (רמש). This explanation is further suggested by the warning to avoid uncleanness by touching the carcases of such animals, and also by the motive given for the institution of these laws: "Ye shall sanctify yourselves and be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy, therefore you shall not defile yourselves."

Two of the sacrificial rites were certainly introduced as a counterblast against the Egyptian animal worship. The laws respecting the *red heifer* are extremely remarkable. A red heifer, that had never borne a yoke, was to be taken outside the camp and burnt to ashes. The person who accomplished the process was thereby rendered unclean, and yet the ashes were to be used for purification in cases of Levitical pollution. Even to the Talmudists, who were not apt to be taken aback by irrationalities, this ceremony appeared exceedingly strange. But when we remember that the bull (Mnevis) worshipped in certain districts by the Egyptians had always to be red in colour and never to have borne the yoke, the Pentateuchal ritual of the *red heifer* becomes intelligible. The god-ox or god-heifer was to be destroyed, and the "Parah adumah" represents the climax of pollution. The ceremony of mixing the ashes with water and sprinkling it with a bunch of

hyssop, as a means of purification had, no doubt, also a symbolical meaning.

The rite of the scape-goat, which has so often served in the past as well as in the present for the slandering of Judaism, finds a complete explanation by reference to the Egyptian worship. In that country the goat was worshipped on account of its lasciviousness, as is related by two eye-witnesses, Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus. One could not possibly repeat in a living language the horrible details given by the latter historian concerning this worship. A Latin translation may be quoted here.[1] Women used openly to practise bestiality with goats; this was part of the religious ceremonial. The Israelites were wont to imitate even this abominable goat worship; therefore the Law (Lev. xvii. 7) admonishes them "to sacrifice no more unto *goats*, after whom they have gone a whoring." For this reason the scape-goat, *i.e.*, the symbol or essence of unchastity, was to be sent away into the wilderness, to "a land cut off" (ארץ גזרה), which was called Azaz-El, and there, according to the traditional interpretation of the passage, it was to be flung over a precipice. But before this conclusion of the ceremony, the high priest was to lay his hands upon the scape-goat and confess and renounce all the sins and transgressions of the people of Israel, that is to say all idolatrous and obscene worship. With all this the celebration of the Day of Atonement is also closely connected, and certainly the Israelites could not do sufficient penance for having yielded to the debasing and disgusting worship of Astarte and the goats.

It is thus evident that the ceremonial system in its origin stood in near relation to the fundamental idea or essence of Judaism; that its office was to promote and combine with that essence, and that it was not by any means invested with a magical character (as was the case with the cult of ancient religion generally), in order to check the interference of demoniacal powers (ἀποτροπιασμός) or to conciliate the gods and appease their anger. Now the sacrificial ritual in the Pentateuch accords so little with the essence of Judaism that some prophets openly proclaimed its inappropriateness. The combination of these heterogeneous elements into one

---

[1] *Diodorus Siculus*, I., 88. Hircum ob genitale membrum inter Deos retulere, quomodo apud Græcos etiam Priapum honorari perhibent. Animal enim hoc in Venerem eximie propensum; et membrum illud corporis, generationis instrumentum, honore dignum esse, quod abeo natura animantium ortum suum derivet. Denique pudenda, ajunt, non apud Aegyptios tantum, sed apud alios quoque non paucos in mysteriorum ritibus religiose habentur, ut a quibus generatio animalium promanat.

uniform teaching positively invites criticism. The explanation given by Maimonides was that the sacrificial ritual was a concession to the customs of the Israelites, who were used to heathen ideas, and that the commands concerning it were only a pedagogical means for setting bounds to the craving after sacrifice (*Moreh Nebuchim*, 3, 32). But this explanation leaves the contradiction unsolved. If it was really a pedagogic means, it failed to attain its end, for the multitude considered the sacrificial worship so essentially important, and the ethical laws of so little value in comparison to it, that the prophet Isaiah was compelled to declare: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me. . . . Make you clean, put away the evil of your doings" (chapter i.).

This part of Leviticus, however, shows itself externally as well as internally to be a foreign element. A fortunate chance led, in the reign of Josiah, to the discovery of the beautiful book of Deuteronomy, which has an obvious tendency to modify the sacrificial worship, and reduce it to a minimum. One of its most noticeable injunctions is: "If thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee" (Deut. xxiii. 22). Next, there is not a word about sin offerings or guilt offerings, but only about peace and thank offerings, which were to be sacrificed, and eaten in the family circle. The ethical side of the ceremony is, moreover, strongly insisted on. The Levites, who had "no part or possession" of their own, the poor, the widow, the orphan, and the stranger, were to be invited to share the feast. Unlike the older code, the book of Deuteronomy attaches no sacred character to the firstlings of the cattle; and, instead of assigning them to the priesthood, ordains that they are to be eaten (like the festive offerings) in the family circle, while the poor must be allowed to have their share. Only on one ceremonial point does Deuteronomy lay special stress, and that is that no sacrifices were to be offered except in the one central and chosen locality.

Deuteronomy sought to deprive the priesthood of the greater portion of the tribute assigned to it in Leviticus; only a small part of the sacrifices, together with the first-fruits of corn, wine, oil and wool were to be allotted for its support. The tithes were to be the property of the owners of the cattle and the ground, on condition that they shared them with the poor.

The book of Deuteronomy breathes another atmosphere than Leviticus. Ceremonialism occupies only a small portion

of it, while the ethical precepts are treated at length and enforced with heart-moving earnestness. It is one of the fatalities that have hindered the development of Judaism that the line laid down by Deuteronomy was not followed up. On the contrary, one excess has caused another. Because the Torah was known and valued but little and by few during the centuries of the first temple, while the tendency to polytheism remained persistent till the time of the Babylonian captivity, and because during that period the conviction became vivid and strong that the chastisements threatened by the prophets had come to pass in consequence of obstinate transgression of the Law, the general post-exilic view was, that all its commands and precepts must be minutely and conscientiously obeyed or else a new judgment would overtake the guilty community. As there was then more opportunity for carrying out the ceremonial than the moral laws, these came to the front, and post-exilian Judaism received a ceremonial character. In addition to this there came the advice of the Great Synagogue to make a fence round the law, without considering the injunction not to set the fence above the plantation.[1] Thus in order to prevent some remotely possible infringement of a law, the erewhile permitted became now forbidden. The rigorousness of the Talmudists was grafted on the hedge of the Soferim, and on that of the Talmudists the scrupulousness of Rabbinism and the superstitions of the Kabbala. During the long years of persecution and suffering, the few voices that were raised in warning against this excess of ceremonialism passed unheard; Judaism gradually assumed a repellent aspect. As a consequence there followed (and there follows still) apostasy. The pure well-spring of Judaism, the Bible, was so buried under all this accumulation that it almost seemed to have disappeared altogether. The system of instruction was as erroneous as the habitual method of thought. The natural consequence was that as soon as the first ray of enlightenment penetrated the Ghetto, throwing upon the outward aspect of Judaism a sudden and glaring light, indifference and apostasy followed close upon each other. Nothing but the strong sense of family union, deepened and fortified by centuries of suffering, offered resistance. Now that at the present day the outward appearance of Judaism has assumed a more attractive form, and the uncultivated Polish customs have been nearly banished from the public ceremonial (while Christianity, on the other hand, has lost something of its ancient halo), the apostates from Judaism are less numerous than those who are merely

[1] *Aboth di R. Nathan*, ed. Schechter, Version II., page 2.

indifferent; indifference is chiefly caused by ignorance. For Judaism, which does not rest upon the broad basis of State institutions, indifference is far more deadly than apostasy. If this indifference is to be shaken into life, Judaism must more lavishly display and make use of its civilising riches; it must seek to engrain the conviction that its apostolic mission is not yet ended. Long ago it lifted the ancient world out of the slough of moral corruption into which it had sunk, and although its right of original priority is ignored or denied, a part of its moral principles has been crystallised in State institutions, and has passed into the consciousness of all civilized humanity. Whereas the Latin race is more permeated with the spirit of Hellenism, the Anglo-Saxon race is penetrated with the Biblico-Judaic spirit; because its mind is more directed to truth than to beauty. Now what has not been crushed by the mailed footsteps of history must be indestructible and of lasting value. Not in vain has the Jewish people continued to exist for more than three thousand years; not in vain has it survived all catastrophes, caused by a succession of hostile forces, and even the immense disadvantage through the past eighteen hundred years of struggling as a small and a feeble minority against a powerful and hostile majority. Its continued existence—in itself a wonderful fact—is an irrefutable proof of its historical necessity, and what would the Jews be without Judaism, the body without the soul, the Levitical bearers without the ark of the covenant?

H. GRAETZ.

JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

FOR those of us who wish our children to grow up Jews in faith as well as in name, the subject of religious education must always be one of deep and serious responsibility. We want our children to be not merely well acquainted with the tenets and observances of Judaism; we want them also to hold the former and practise the latter—more than this, we desire them to do so willingly and intelligently, when they shall have grown to manhood and womanhood. We wish them to remain true to the religion of their fathers, not from filial piety, still less from habit or superstition, but from a sincere and enlightened attachment to their religion, an attachment which we earnestly hope may enable them to say through life, in the words of the late Dr. Frankl, "Ich bin so glücklich in meinem Judenthum" (I am so happy in my Judaism.)

The means by which we may attain this end will be the subject of the present paper, and its scope is to be clearly understood as dealing, not with the most fundamental but also most general tenets of our religion, such as the existence of God or the immortality of the soul, but with those specifically Jewish doctrines which distinguish Judaism from theism. There are, however, at the present day many varieties of Judaism, and there should, therefore, logically be also many forms of Jewish religious education. At the risk, therefore, of introducing an unduly personal element, I feel that before advancing any educational theories it will be necessary to give some indications of my own variety of Judaism, not to urge its truth or its superiority over others, but merely to explain the point of view from which I look at religious education, and the goal which I *individually* aim at.

My Judaism then is the Judaism of the Pentateuch, modified no doubt by changes of time and place, and a gradual development, not in the spirit of the religion itself, but in the spirit in which man is able to conceive it. My Judaism teaches me that the people of Israel were and are divinely chosen by God to carry the knowledge of his unity through countless centuries, until "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of

the Lord as the waters cover the seas." It includes the belief that the record of the early history of Israel has been preserved for us in the Bible, together with a number of laws, which, though they do not appear to us to be all of the same value, are yet due to the will of God and to God's inspiration. Thus the Bible is the corner-stone of my Judaism. I can conceive monotheism without the Bible, but not Judaism, and it therefore becomes necessary to indicate my own point of view with regard to the Bible before I can explain how I would have it taught to others.

I do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, nor even in the inspired character of the *whole* book. I do not pretend to sufficient scholarship to enter into such debated questions as the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch or the dates of its component parts. Nor can I say that I desire to do so. My Judaism is shaped by the belief in God's election of the people of Israel to be the proclaimers of his unity, and by the firm conviction that in the Pentateuchal narrative between the exodus from Egypt and the death of Moses, we have a record of divine revelation and a code of divinely given laws for our religious and moral guidance. And the firmness with which I hold these beliefs would not be lessened if it were mathematically proved to me that Moses was not the actual writer of the Pentateuch, nor increased if the reverse were as absolutely and positively demonstrated. Judaism for me is happily independent of the establishment of dates or the determination of the authorship of certain, or any, books of the Scriptures.

So far, then, I find it easy enough to define what I have called my point of view with regard to the Bible, but when I come to ask myself what is my attitude towards the early parts of Genesis and the post-Pentateuchal portion of the Scriptures, it is for many reasons less easy to answer categorically. Nor does it appear to me necessary to do so here: I am at present only concerned with a brief outline of my own form of Judaism, and for all practical purposes the principles of my Judaism[1] are those which I have just laid down. I therefore pass at once from Jewish articles of faith to the customs, rites and observances of Judaism, considered (again with a seemingly undue but necessary prominence of the personal element), from my own point of view. I divide them roughly into

[1] I do not say all my religious principles, because, as it is hardly necessary to point out, the immortality of the soul and the kindred doctrines of its spiritual nature, and of its relation to God, are not touched upon before the post-Pentateuchal parts of the Bible.

Sabbath and festival observances, synagogue attendance, and ritual and dietary laws.

No sooner do we approach the ritual and ceremonial part of Judaism than we are at once brought into contact with the Mishnah and the Talmud, two powers that have left their mark on almost every item of Jewish ceremonialism—a mark so deep, that at times it has well-nigh effaced the original biblical impression. It is difficult for me to approach this subject without being conscious of a strong personal bias. The Mishnah and Talmud form no part of my Judaism, they represent for me no religious authority, and never have done so at any period of my life. Consequently, I look upon them from the point of view of a spectator, who sees much to venerate, much to admire, but also much to disregard and disapprove of, and nothing to accept as religious dogma or precept. Again, in the ceremonial as in the dogmatic part of Judaism, I seek my authority in the pages of the Pentateuch, and let it regulate my observance of the Sabbath and of the festivals instituted therein (Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, the Day of Memorial and the Day of Atonement), subject only to the inevitable modifications of time and place.

I have no specially personal views to record here as to the ritual and synagogue attendance, and therefore pass at once to the dietary laws, to which every writer on Jewish ceremonialism has to devote a disproportionate space, in consequence of the Talmud's special elaboration of the subject. How endlessly, and I do not hesitate to add, how needlessly and even harmfully, it has amplified and complicated the biblical commands with regard to food! Three passages in Exodus,[1] three in Leviticus and three in Deuteronomy make up the whole. Thrice (Exodus xxiii. 19 and xxxiv. 26, and Deut. xiv. 21) we find the command not to seethe a kid in its mother's milk: the eleventh chapter of Leviticus and the fourteenth of Deuteronomy each contain the list of forbidden animals, &c., and the remaining passages are devoted to prohibitions respecting eating the flesh of any animal that has been "torn of beasts in the field" or "died of itself," together with the frequently repeated injunction, "only be sure that you eat not the blood." These com-

[1] The extraordinary theory with regard to eating the leg of an animal only after it has gone through certain preparations, has always appeared to me (even from the most orthodox point of view) to be based on a misconception of Genesis xxxii. 32. "Therefore the childen of Israel eat not," &c., is surely chronicling a custom, in a note, as it were, not uttering a command or prohibition.

mandments I endeavour to keep. Neither I nor anybody else would wittingly or willingly eat that which is "torn of beasts" or that "died of itself," nor would it occur to anybody to "seethe a kid in its mother's milk," a literal and simple prohibition, which only rabbinical ingenuity could have developed into a system culminating in having separate dishes and other utensils for cooking "milk and meat." The animals forbidden in the Bible, I look upon as still prohibited to Jews, and therefore to be avoided by all who, like myself, desire to preserve as much as possible of the Mosaic ritual. Finally, as regards the "kosher meat" system (in other words the Jewish method of killing the animals, and in very orthodox families of preparing the meat), there is no doubt that it is a rabbinical elaboration of the biblical command not to eat the blood (a command which nobody would desire to infringe in the ancient sense of the words), and was unknown in Bible times. I therefore place the matter on a wholly secular footing: the Jewish method of killing, with all its attendant precautions, tends to make the meat wholesomer and safer for human consumption,[1] and for this reason only I give the preference to "kosher meat," when I can obtain it easily; but I do not do so on any religious grounds, and I make it consequently not a matter of conscience, but one of health or convenience.

Having thus given a brief outline of my own form of Judaism, I now turn to my real subject, namely, the religious education of Jewish children, and I will begin at once by pointing out three things, which make it a difficult and complicated matter in this generation. First, the all pervading spirit of theological and biblical criticism, secondly, the tendency of the age to laxity and indifference to the ceremonial, and what may be called, the disciplinarian part of religion, and thirdly, among the Jews themselves, the ever-increasing difficulty of holding the middle course (which I assume to be as desirable to others as it appears to me) between those who for various reasons desire to throw down all barriers that separate them from the Gentile world and those who endeavour not only to keep up those barriers in their entirety, but even to fill up the breaches which time and altered circumstances have made.

One of the consequences of this state of things, which confronts us at the very threshold of religious education, and adds

---

[1] This is especially the case among our poor, whose immunity from certain diseases is ascribed, I believe on good authority, to their avoidance of the inferior meat often sold at low rates by non-Jewish butchers.

not a little to our difficulties, is the absence of uniformity between our own particular form of Judaism and Jewish observances and those of our co-religionists, no matter whether they or we be orthodox, reform, new, old, critical, biblical, talmudical, or a mixture of any. How are we to bring up our children to adhere, as we naturally wish them to do, to our own form of Judaism without making them intolerant of other forms—or, on the other hand, how are we to make them really tolerant, without letting toleration become indifference? It is impossible, now-a-days, to bring up children in the belief that all Jews believe and observe exactly what their parents believe themselves and teach them to believe. Others around us are either more or less orthodox, or more or less "broad," as the phrase goes, than we are ourselves, and sooner or later our children must discover this. It is better to anticipate the discovery by telling them, what is after all the simple fact: "I believe this, I think it is right to do that, and I teach you to believe and do the same, because I think it right. But other people, whom you see acting differently, do so because they hold different opinions—we have therefore no right to judge them or to blame them. Let us only hold firm to what we ourselves believe to be right." If this is impressed upon a child from his earliest years, there is little fear of his becoming intolerant. It is never too early to set as a watch-word before our children: "Faith in our own beliefs—toleration and respect for those of others."

Our first object then should be to create in our children an attachment to their religion, which shall last their lives. This is not a difficult task if we feel this attachment ourselves, and if we are not ashamed of owning it. I believe this sort of false shame is common to many Jews, who are sincerely attached to and proud of their religion, but who think they will appear narrow and intolerant if they say so openly and honestly. What is the consequence to the children of such Jews? They see their parents remain Jews, both as to belief and observances, but all is done in a half-hearted way, as if they were perpetually apologising to the world at large for the forms and ceremonies which really they would be most unwilling to forsake. But this deeper feeling they hide from their children as carefully as from the outer world, and these children grow up with the same apologetic attitude (only in their case it is real, not assumed), until after a time the whole thing becomes a mere form that gradually slips away altogether. What we desire to attain is precisely the opposite result, and in order to do this we must make our children conscious from a very early age that we and they are Jews, and rejoice in our Judaism,

and that we have moreover no desire to conceal either our religion or our attachment to it from the eyes of the world. There is, as I have already observed, a tendency among the Jews of our own generation to minimise as much as possible the differences between themselves and their Gentile surroundings. I will not waste time in discoursing on their motives for doing so; suffice it that the tendency exists, and that it is our duty to combat it. Let us not be afraid of the often used accusation of narrowness and exclusiveness, or rather let us not be afraid of being what some people call narrow and exclusive, so long as we know that we are keeping clear of bigotry and intolerance. We *are* Jews, and if we wish our children to be Jews also—in faith as well as in name—we must begin by letting them know that they are Jews by birth, that they are bound to be grateful and devoted to their native land, but, at the same time, never wanting in faithful love and loyalty to their religion and their race.

It is obvious that a child, as soon as he is made acquainted with any distinctively Jewish observances, must perceive a difference between himself and his non-Jewish surroundings. That is the moment at which Jewish religious education begins; but before I enter upon the details of its gradual progress with individual children, there are certain general points to be considered.

I have already remarked that Judaism, as a religion distinct from pure monotheism, is founded on the Bible. But even though our belief with regard to the chief Jewish *dogmas* found in the Pentateuch remain unchanged, it is very probable that the advance of biblical criticism has more or less altered our attitude towards the Bible as a whole. Are then our children to possess the Bible of our childhood or that of our riper years? It is a most difficult question, and one which I am inclined (at the risk, I admit, of pleasing nobody) to answer with a compromise. I would not thrust biblical criticism upon children, but I would not hide its existence from them, nor, when they become aware of it (which at the present day, they cannot fail to do sooner or later), would I let them think it wrong doing, or incompatible with love and reverence for the Bible. On the contrary, I would tell them that interest in and attachment to the divinely (but not verbally) inspired book prompts many learned men to devote their time and labour to its study; to find out all they can concerning it, the dates at which its various parts were written, and other matters, which children could not be expected to understand, more especially as the students themselves are by no means all agreed as to the results of their labours. Bible history, simply and suitably

taught,[1] must be among the first steps of a child's religious education. It then remains for individual parents to decide whether they will lead their children along the road of biblical criticism, or whether, having shown them that there is such a road, they will bid them turn aside from it even as they themselves have done. If children are thus made aware of the existence of biblical criticism, and have been taught to consider it neither wrong nor unlawful, it will be no sudden wrench to them, if their minds are so constituted as to cause them to plunge into its depths. If, on the other hand, nature and education lead them to avoid it, they will not commit the wrong of judging intolerantly those whose views on the subject are different from their own. It may be that many orthodox parents will think that children ought either to be kept unaware of the existence of biblical criticism, or, if this is not possible, to have it represented to them as something reprehensible. This appears to me both unjust and unwise—unjust, because it assumes such criticism to be irreligious and irreverent, and unwise, because nobody can know beforehand what turn the mind of a child may take when he has grown to manhood. The child of orthodox parents may, indeed, continue through life to believe with unquestioning faith the teaching of his youth, but he may also become one of that no less earnest and religiously minded number, in whose "honest doubt" there lies more faith "than in half the creeds."

The next general point to be considered is, with regard to the ritual and ceremonial side of Judaism, whether we should make our children, *as children*, keep more strictly to observances and ceremonies than we perhaps do ourselves, or than we think would be necessary for them in after life. Experience shows that they are likely to cast off something—shall we of set purpose give them what we consider a superfluity, so that when that is dropped they may still retain what we consider the essentials? It *sounds* expedient; but the word expedient has a false ring in connection with religion, and I for one should avoid the plan. The only case in which such a method appears to me desirable is where the parents themselves are in a transition state, attached to Judaism, yet doubtful of the *binding* nature of its ceremonial observances. Such parents will probably desire their children, as children, to keep to what they themselves were taught, and leaving the future undecided will desire them to begin life, conforming to those forms and observances which now appeal to them (the parents) more from associations and filial piety than from absolutely

[1] I shall return to Bible teaching in detail later on.

religious convictions. But these are somewhat exceptional cases, where the parent, in spite of what his own views may now be, desires his children's early years to be safeguarded by religious observances, even though he doubts their power over maturer age. Exceptional, too, I venture to add, is the case of those who keep exactly to all that their parents did before them, and desire to bind their children to do the same now and always. It is unnecessary here to touch upon those who openly desire to cast off as much of Judaism and Jewish observances as possible, without absolutely ceasing to be Jews. The larger number look at the matter from a different point of view; there are certain forms, customs and observances that they keep themselves, and desire their children to keep. Still they have a consciousness that they themselves have cast off some things that their parents kept; will not their children do likewise? This is a possibility which we must face boldly and do our best to avoid, even though we are constrained to admit that our utmost efforts may be insufficient to ward it off altogether. One weapon, indeed, we have which our parents had not, fore-knowledge. They did not contemplate the probability of such a thing, and consequently to *guard* against it did not enter into their scheme of religious education. We, in our childhood, were carefully instructed—some of us in the Biblical Judaism I have endeavoured to outline on a previous page, some of us in what I venture to call Biblico-Talmudical Judaism, and were duly taught that this was what we were bound to believe and to practise as Jews and Jewesses. But I for one do not remember that we were ever explicitly bidden to keep to those laws and observances after we had grown to manhood and womanhood, in spite of what we might see others do, and in spite of all temptations to the contrary. It was taken for granted that having been duly trained in certain forms and observances, we should keep to them without change. But at the present day all is different. The ceremonial part of religion is maintained less firmly, and if we want to prevent our children from letting it slip from their grasp we must warn them of the possibility of their doing so, and guard against it as best we can. To achieve this end, we must ask ourselves frankly this question: are we prepared not only to make certain sacrifices ourselves for our religion, and for those religious observances which we consider part of that religion, but what seems harder to many of us, are we prepared to demand them of our children? If not, if we allow the claims of convenience, pleasure, or secular education to set aside these observances, we are unbinding with one hand what we bound with the other, and religious in-

struction becomes a mockery. I need hardly say that when I speak of a sacrifice, I am far from wishing that our children should consider they are making one. On the contrary, I would for every reason far rather that they remained unconscious of any sacrifice being made, and were simply happy in the performance of their religious duties, and unaware of the possibility of setting them aside. But this is made difficult now-a-days both by the want of uniformity among Jews themselves, and the closeness of their intercourse with their non-Jewish surroundings, both of which causes must sometimes expose even young children to the temptation of, at any rate, desiring to set aside some observance that deprives them of a pleasure enjoyed by others. When this occurs, it is our duty to demand of our children the voluntary sacrifice which we must otherwise insist on their making, even though it be unwillingly. It is important to remember that a voluntary sacrifice in childhood is more likely than a compulsory one to be followed in manhood by similar offerings on the shrine of religion, and if we have succeeded in making our children love Judaism and "the yoke of the law," and have moreover shown them by word and deed that we do not ourselves hold back from similar sacrifices, we may feel sure that we shall not be asking more of them than they will be willing to give.

But it is hard, some parents say, for children to have to make voluntary sacrifices for their religion. Why? Do we not, as soon as they have reached the age of reason, frequently and necessarily require of them sacrifices of enjoyment and leisure in the interests of health and of education, or even, as they grow older, of certain conventional rules of society, certain persons, certain circumstances? And is not our religion as well worth a sacrifice as these? By all means let us impose on our children no sacrifice that can be avoided at the cost of trouble to ourselves, but let us not hesitate to demand it of them, if it can only be avoided at the cost of infringing what we consider, and have taught them to consider, a binding law[1] of our religion, that religion for which our forefathers sacrificed not only their own lives, but, what was far dearer to them, the lives of their children.

I have hitherto laid down only such general suggestions as would be equally appropriate to all, or nearly all, forms of Judaism. In passing on to the religious education as applied

[1] It is hardly needful to observe that there are cases of necessity, where the infringement of a law may become a duty; but, fortunately, this is not an every-day occurrence.

to individual children, it is impossible to avoid following more or less the lines of my own particular form, and building upon them a certain system of education. Of this system I can only say, that I do not advocate it as the one and only method, but merely as the logical outcome of my own religious opinions.

The special doctrines that distinguish Judaism from theism, *i.e.*, a firm belief in the revelation of the Pentateuch, and an equally firm one in God's election of the people of Israel to be the proclaimers of his unity and the witnesses to his truth, are so simple and so forcible that there can be no difficulty in impressing them on our children when they have once become acquainted with the first principle of monotheism. These two doctrines form the centre point round which our Jewish teaching revolves and with which it is indissolubly connected. They form the spirit that gives life to the whole framework of ceremonialism, and they must be our guides at every step of our children's religious education. Pure monotheism, however, comes first, and the religious education of every child begins with a few words of daily prayer, and the first simple instruction as regards the existence of God. For some considerable period it is not to be expected that a child's prayer should be anything but a habit that has nothing in common with a devotional frame of mind. "Douce religion, qui s'égaie et qui rit," is what Victor Hugo has aptly called a child's prayer. Still, it is impossible for us to say how soon some feeling beyond that of mere habit is awakened, and it will be aroused all the sooner if we carefully impress on the child that we (his parents) are as much dependent on a beneficent providence as he is himself; that we, too, say our prayers as he does, and that we are as weak and unwise in comparison with God as he is. It may seem puerile to insist on what is apparently so obvious, but children are singularly prone to consider customs as applying only to themselves, and it is more than likely that a young child, unless otherwise taught, might for some time look on prayer as a discipline arranged for the benefit of children only.

The first distinctively *Jewish* feature in a child's religious education is probably almost contemporaneous with his first prayer: it is the observance of the Sabbath. As soon as he is old enough to find pleasure in anything beyond the toys of absolute infancy, as soon, for instance, as he can amuse himself with scribbling on bits of paper, it is time to put that and similar occupations out of reach on Saturday. We have merely to say: "We do not do these things to-day; it is the Sabbath. You will know what that means when you are

older." Thus the habit of keeping the Sabbath, of making a difference between its occupations and those of other days, becomes fixed long before the child is old enough to understand the commandment with regard to it. He will probably have been for a year or more accustomed to the daily prayer and elementary Sabbath-keeping before it is time for the next step, namely, some form of home service on Saturdays.

It is rightly not the usual custom to take children to synagogue at a very early age. There is, moreover, the probability of their spending some weeks, or even months, of every year in some locality where there is no synagogue. The home service is therefore an important point in Jewish religious education. If the word service is, however, supposed to mean transferring the Sabbath service as read in the synagogue to our home, I would prefer to substitute the words "Saturday reading." To those who are accustomed to the synagogue ritual, it may seem natural to let that "reading" consist of a more or less lengthy portion of the Sabbath service, and a brief selection from the law. But to children, and especially to those who are unused to the synagogue ritual, and are too young to read the Bible for themselves, this is monotonous and somewhat profitless. I suggest reversing the process, and making a reading from the Bible the principal feature of the children's home service, followed by a *very brief* portion of the ritual, which portion should not be varied, but gradually lengthened as the child grows older. It is difficult to say at what age these readings should begin. I should consider four years not too young for a child of average intelligence, and the necessary discipline of sitting still is not without its value. It is a child's earliest experience of "keeping his foot" when he goes into the house of God, and the instinct of reverence is cultivated even before the reverence itself is there. At whatever age the Bible readings are begun, it is incumbent upon every Jewish parent, when he *does* begin them, to make his child clearly and distinctly conscious of two things: first, that the Bible teaches him his religion, his duty towards God and man, and, secondly, that he will learn from it the history of his own race, the history of the Jewish people. This latter is a point which cannot be too strongly insisted on in the religious education of every Jewish child; the distinct consciousness of his racial identity with the Jews of Bible times will quicken his interest in their history as contained in the Scripture narrative, and the study of Judaism as a religion must go hand in hand with that history.

Bible-reading is thus in our home service a feature the importance of which it is impossible to overrate, and I use

the words Bible-reading in their most literal sense. Read the Bible itself to your children. Let them, on the one hand, hear no "Bible stories" that reduce the grand simplicity of the Scriptures to the petty level of childish tales; let them, on the other hand, read no Bible history that secularises and makes a school-book of the sacred narrative.[1] Read to them from the Bible itself what you judge to be fit for them to hear, picking out the salient chapters that make a connected history; and omitting not merely the many parts unsuitable for children, but also at the first reading all that is unlikely to interest them. Do not neglect to explain fully and carefully as you go on, and, above all (if you wish them to take a real interest in the Scriptures), allow any and every question that they wish to put to you about what you have read. It is not always easy to answer these questions, but it is our duty to endeavour to do so. I do not say we "must" answer them, for there are some unanswerable questions, to which only the following replies can be made. First, "I do not know that sufficiently well or positively myself to be able to tell you." Secondly, "You are not yet old enough to understand that thoroughly, be satisfied for the present with what I have told you." And, thirdly (when a child is a little older), I would bid him remember that God's ways are not as our ways, and that the wisest of us are unable to understand them. If I am told that all this is "begging the question," I reply that it is the simple truth, and, being so, will satisfy the most inquiring children.

It would lead me into unwarrantable lengths if I attempted to answer in detail the difficult question of what to omit and what to retain in reading the Bible to children. Moreover, any scheme for the purpose would have to be a progressive one, suited to the gradual development of children from the ages of—let us say—four to fourteen. I will merely suggest the following points that appear to me worthy of notice.

With regard to the historical part of the Bible, we must remember that, with the exception of the early chapters of Genesis, it is neither more nor less than a continuous history of the Jewish people. We must therefore present it to children

---

[1] I would not be understood to condemn all Bible histories for children above the age of twelve or thirteen, but I would prefer doing without them if possible, and depending on verbal commentaries and explanations, and certainly the first knowledge of the Scriptures should be gained from the Bible itself. The difficulty of placing the Bible in the hands of children to read for themselves is not met by either "Bible stories" or "Bible history." It *is* a difficulty which appears to me best met by expurgated Bibles, to be given to children after they have been carefully taught the history of the Bible, as already suggested.

in that light, and, in order to do so, it will be best to omit at first all passages and incidents that do not bear directly upon this main purport—the election and divine mission of Israel, as exemplified in its history. Not only will such a course place the Bible before the child's mind as a historic whole, but it will also guide us in the omission of the many incidents likely to confuse the young mind by too soon awakening either the sense of doubt as to the literal truth of such and such a passage, or the spirit of criticism concerning the right and wrong of such and such an incident.[1]

There are many passages of this nature which do not really affect the history of the origin and subsequent career of the Jewish nation, and consequently it is not necessary for a child to be made acquainted with them under the age of ten or twelve, according to the quicker or slower development of his character. Afterwards, when the important and epoch-making events of Scripture have been firmly rooted in his mind, such details will take their rightful place in his comprehension, and will not affect his feelings towards the Bible as a whole.

We should, on the other hand, avoid the common habit of giving undue prominence to such chapters as are likely to take a child's fancy, such as the history of Joseph, of the infant Samuel, of David and Goliath, a system which leads children to consider the Bible as a mere series of episodic narratives, instead of a continuous history.

It is less superfluous than it appears to add a reminder that, if we wish children to remember anything of Bible history after the death of Moses, it is useless to read the rest through to them once only, and after that confine ourselves to reading and re-reading the Pentateuch. The latter is, indeed, of the most vital importance, but post-Pentateuchal history should not therefore be neglected as is too often the case, but should be made both familiar and interesting to our children. Their interest being once fairly aroused in the history of their own people, they will not only be eager to follow it to the confines of the Bible, but beyond it, through the heroic period of the Maccabees, and still further, after the final dispersion of the Jewish nation. At the risk of appearing irrelevant, I cannot help here remarking on the incredible ignorance of Jewish children in our own country (I do not know how it is abroad) with regard to post-Biblical Jewish history. The Maccabean epoch is probably more or less familiar to them, they are just aware of the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of

[1] I do not here refer to the many passages which are absolutely unsuitable for children.

the Jews, and they have been made acquainted with the gloomy story of the Inquisition in their general historical studies, but beyond that they know nothing of the history of the people of Israel during the last eighteen hundred years. Surely this state of things is inconsistent with the interest we take ourselves and wish our children to take also in the history of our own race, and with the stress we lay on their being familiar with the minutest details of that race's origin as related in the Bible. I do not place the knowledge of post-Biblical Jewish history on anything like a religious footing; I only plead against its being so neglected as it certainly is at present, not only because of the reasons just given, but also because some knowledge of the trials and sufferings through which our forefathers remained faithful to their religion will deepen our children's love for that religion which has passed unscathed through so many centuries of persecution and peril.

The non-historical parts of the Bible offer a wide field for Sabbath readings. The Pentateuchal code, both ceremonial and ethical, copious selections from the Psalms, certain portions of Proverbs, and, finally, carefully made selections from the books of the Prophets, can all be brought within the comprehension of children, though the Prophets (with the exception of a few isolated verses here and there) will hardly be suitable for those under the age of ten. The ceremonial and ethical code of the Pentateuch and the Psalms will be amply sufficient until at least that age. With regard to the ceremonial code, we should avoid wearying children with what is neither interesting nor necessary for them to hear. A very brief selection from the portions concerning the sacrifices, the land and sanitary laws, and the building of the Tabernacle, will be all that is needed to prevent their being wholly ignorant of these subjects, and will leave us free to give all details of the institutions that form our present ritual code, as well as of the ethical precepts. It is needless at the present day to insist on the place the latter occupy, both in the Pentateuch and other parts of the Bible, nor on the forcible manner in which is demonstrated the futility of outward signs of religion, if unaccompanied by the religion of the heart. Nor does it come within my province to show how the pure monotheism of the Bible can and should be taught to children, but there is one point which appears to me is not always sufficiently emphasized, on which, therefore, I venture to touch, namely, that it is this pure monotheism which gives a religious motive to morality.

The non-historical parts of the Bible fall naturally into three

(or counting the purely Prophetic writings into four) divisions: First, what is in truth the spiritual essence of Judaism, the doctrine of monotheism and its kindred subjects, the relations of God to man; secondly, the ceremonialism, framed as we know for the use of the Jewish race; and thirdly, the ethical precepts, which have gradually become the property, not of Judaism only, but of the whole civilised world. In making our children acquainted with these three divisions, it should be our constant aim to show them how religion in its widest, purest, and most spiritual sense—love of and faith in God and obedience to his will—is indeed the key-note, the mainspring, the vivifying principle, both of the ceremonial and ethical laws. Unless we succeed in convincing them of this truth, ceremonialism can never be anything but an outward form, nor shall we attain the great object of making the love of God an incentive to virtue. This key-note, as I have called it, is struck with no uncertain sound in the Pentateuch. It is true that rewards and punishments are there distinctly held out as inducements to that adherence to monotheism, which the Israelites were so apt to neglect, but it is no less true that many exhortations to obedience to the divine Law, are constantly followed by the words: "You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God, am holy." Accompanying the ethical precepts, we find no threats of punishment in cases of transgression, and but rarely (as, for instance, Deut. xxiv. 19) a promise of reward for obedience. If we turn to one chapter, among many, of ethical precepts, Leviticus xix., we shall see that no inducement of reward is held out for obedience, but, as is also the case in almost all other kindred passages, each clause is followed by the significant words: "I am the Lord," words surely not to be considered as a mere statement, but as an exhortation to obey, because such obedience is pleasing to God. The Psalms and Prophets are animated by a similar spirit, and it is by dwelling with special emphasis on this aspect of Bible teaching that we shall succeed in impressing it on our children, and, as I said before, in giving a religious motive to morality. If we can attain this object, we shall have made a great step in religious education, in the widest sense of the word, and that a study of the Bible will enable us to attain it, I fully believe.

Much more might be said on the important subject of Bible-readings, but the little I have suggested must suffice to show their importance in a child's religious education.

Home service or, later on, synagogue attendance, is a feature in the Sabbath morning of every Jewish family that has more of Judaism than the name; but the question how the rest of

the day is to be kept is very variously answered. My own reply is something after this fashion. In our observance of the Sabbath, we, for ourselves and our children, have to keep three objects in view. First, we desire to devote a portion of it to religious duties and to make it an aid to our moral and spiritual development; secondly, we wish to set the day apart and create a distinction between it and others; and thirdly, it should be our aim to make it a day, not only of rest, but also of happiness. Of the first of these three objects I have already spoken. In considering the second and third, we cannot fail to observe that at the present day there is a decided tendency to neglect the second for the sake of the third. We should, I need hardly say, endeavour as much as possible to combine the two. The old rabbinical rules that made it a Sabbath-breaking act to take a walk, to pick a flower, to carry an umbrella, have nearly universally fallen into abeyance. This, I must admit, does not seem to me to be regrettable, but there is, moreover, amongst many of us a strong inclination to disregard any fixed scheme of Sabbath-keeping, and to preach the doctrine of "every man doing what is right in his own eyes." It is one thing to lay aside certain outward laws from a conscientious conviction that keeping them does not increase, but rather lessens, the spiritual influence of the Sabbath; this is a matter of opinion, with which we may, or may not, agree, but which we have no right to blame. It is another and very different thing to cast aside such laws, because keeping them interferes with our convenience or our pleasure. This is an attitude which we are certainly justified in deprecating, but I am not here concerned with the Sabbath as regards adults, but merely as regards children.

The generally prohibited occupations[1] may be briefly catalogued as including all forms of manual occupation, such as writing, drawing or needlework, all riding or driving, and all such amusements as theatres and dances. To these, universal custom has added games of chance, such as cards, and almost equally universally the use of musical instruments. Custom has also to a considerable extent vetoed outdoor amusements, such as cricket and other athletic sports. Personally, I much regret that this should be the case, and I think there is so much to be said against their exclusion, that I cannot but hope that a change will ere long be made in this particular. One additional word as to not writing on Saturday, which many now-

[1] It is needful to repeat again that I am writing neither of the ultra orthodox nor of the reverse.

a-days consider an unnecessary and undesirable restriction. It is, however, one which I should be very unwilling to see withdrawn, inasmuch as writing on the Sabbath tends to lessen the difference between that and other days. A child's lessons, a woman's household and social duties, a man's business, are all to a great extent carried on in writing; for many of us it is almost synonymous with our daily work, and if we once begin it on the Sabbath it is most difficult to draw the line and say, this letter is for pleasure, that for business, this piece of writing is an amusement, that a labour. I therefore think it right to refrain from writing on Saturday, and to cause our children to refrain from it likewise, though as an exceptional matter I should not hesitate to transgress the rule.

This "index expurgatorius," though no doubt many may find something to add to it and many more something to exclude, appears to me very fairly calculated to meet both objects in view—*i.e.*, it makes a decided difference between Sabbath and week-days, and yet leaves much room for enjoyment both for adults and children. Books of all kinds, walks, many in-door and some out-door games and sports, and the social and family intercourse, which has always been considered especially appropriate to Sabbath afternoons, ought to be enough to make the day enjoyable. It is, moreover, the special duty of Jewish parents to make the day pleasant to their children. The claims of business and society on the one hand and of education on the other necessarily separate us a good deal from our children in the week; let us, therefore, spend the Saturday together as much as possible, and let them see that we find it a day of rest and happiness, "a delight and the holy of the Lord." It behoves us always to remember, moreover, that our religion is not that of the State, and that it is much more necessary for us to fence round our Sabbath and other ceremonial institutions with careful observances than it is for those whose day of rest is that of the whole country. On the other hand, it is neither to be expected nor to be desired that we should re-enclose these observances with the double and treble Talmudical fence of bygone days. We must endeavour to keep the middle road, and, if we wish our children to do the same, we must remember that example is better than precept, and that children are proverbially quick both to listen and to imitate. Let them never hear from our lips an expression of annoyance at the fact of the Sabbath preventing our enjoyment of some pleasure or the following of some occupation, let them see that we keep it as we desire them to do—cheerfully and conscientiously—and we shall then have

done all that is in our power to make them keep it thus through life.

I may appear to have dwelt at a disproportionate length on the Sabbath and its ordinances, but it is a very important item in Jewish ceremonialism, the one, which more perhaps than any other, combines the inner and outer religion, the one moreover which most strongly and constantly affects the manner of our daily life. It is obvious this must be so, since it concerns a seventh part of our time, and since its careful observance demands, more than that of any other institution, a certain amount of self-sacrifice, both from us and from our children. But is equally obvious that at the present day the Sabbath is one of the most valuable instruments for keeping Jews and Judaism in the close union in which they ought to dwell. Therefore (setting aside the question of religious duty as to the Sabbath in itself and for itself) it is incumbent on those parents who wish their children to be Jews and not theists, to enforce its observance both by precept and example, and to make keeping it, if I may speak so plainly, a matter of conscience, not of convenience.

The festival code is another of those outward signs of religion which should come as events of importance in the life of a Jewish child. It is surely unnecessary to enter here into a detailed account of the various Jewish holidays. I assume that their purport and the ritual observances connected with them, will be duly explained to children, and that as soon as they are old enough they will be taken to synagogue on festivals as well as on the Sabbath. As with the latter so with the former. If we wish our children to lay stress on and value the holidays, we must begin by doing so ourselves. Moreover, we should be careful to let them share with us in the ceremonial we are observing. Nothing is more typical of the Jewish blending of religious and family ties than the ceremony of the first nights of Passover—the Seder—in which a child is made to take so distinct and yet so childlike a part. It is most impressive for adults, and at the same time admirably calculated to awaken first a child's curiosity and interest, and then an increasing attachment for his religion and his race. Such was clearly the intention of the ancient compilers of the ritual, who carefully classified the four kinds of children to be instructed—"the wise son, the wicked son, the simple son, and the son who has not capacity to inquire," and though the quaintness of the wording may cause a smile, yet it suggests much over which parents will do well to ponder.

I have on a previous page already spoken at some length on

the remaining division of Jewish ritual observances, namely, the dietary laws. It is unnecessary, therefore, to recur to the subject, more especially as children at home have little or no voluntary action in the matter. Subsequently, I would endeavour to lead them on the lines I have already indicated as those I follow myself.

The study of Hebrew is so closely connected with Jewish ceremonialism that it may be considered a part of religious education. May the day be far distant, or rather may it never dawn, when Hebrew is excluded from our synagogues. I am aware that there is a diversity of opinion on this point, but at any rate all will agree that at present everybody attending synagogue ought to have some knowledge of the Hebrew language. "Some knowledge" is, however, an elastic term, and many people now-a-days are much inclined to interpret it by "as little as possible." It does not to me appear to be an unreasonable expectation that a child of thirteen should be able to translate grammatically the Sabbath and Festival Ritual, a considerable portion of the Pentateuch, a certain number of the Psalms, and perhaps some parts of the Prophets. To accomplish this, he must have had some years' regular lessons, and must have acquired the language in the same way as he would be taught Greek or Latin. I am willing to admit that there is a difficulty with boys, as they are most frequently obliged to begin the study of the two above-named languages, in addition to Hebrew, before that age. Still I think it is very possible by beginning *young*, and working regularly and little by little for six or seven years, to achieve that result. It is an especially desirable one in their case, as boys, unless brought up entirely at home, will for educational reasons have less time allotted for their Hebrew studies after than before that age. This is a necessity which we must face, unless we alter the whole curriculum of secular education; but if that point has once been reached, a good foundation will have been laid, and a small amount of regular work will enable a boy to maintain himself throughout his school life on the same level of proficiency. Nor is it then too much to expect that when he has grown to manhood he will be able to "follow" intelligently in Hebrew the prayer-book ritual, the law, and the customary portion from the Prophets. With girls the case is different. The classics are not indispensable in their education, and there is no reason why they should not continue their Hebrew lessons with the same exact regularity as their other studies throughout the years of their early girlhood as well as of their childhood.

It is very usual for children to receive instruction in the dogmas and rites of Judaism, and also in Bible history, at the same time as instruction in Hebrew; and the usual "Bar-mitzvah," or confirmation ceremony, is now almost invariably preceded by several months of careful non-parental religious teaching, in which girls frequently also take part. But if parents have done their duty by their children, this course of instruction should be little more than a repetition, and to some extent a development, of all that the children have already been taught. There is, indeed, one topic, which certainly should not be touched on in early childhood, and we may even doubt whether it should be handled, even at the age of which we are speaking. I mean the doctrines of Christianity. The reason generally given in favour of Jewish children (I am not speaking of those under the age of twelve at the earliest) being made acquainted with the dogmas of the Christian faith is that, if we do not do so ourselves, we run the risk of others representing it to them in so alluring a light as to endanger their adherence to Judaism. Our efforts to attach our children to our own religion would have been useless indeed if this danger is really to be feared! Still, it is as well to guard even against the most improbable events, besides which, as children grow towards adolescence, it becomes difficult, almost impossible, to keep them from all literature or conversation likely to give them information on the subject. It seems, therefore, on the whole, best to give them, quite simply and with a careful avoidance of intolerance, some general outline of the tenets of Christianity, showing them that the leading principle of its religious teaching is diametrically opposed to that of Judaism, while its ethics, on the other hand, are developed on the lines laid down in the Old Testament. This appears to me all that is either necessary or desirable.

I have endeavoured, in these pages, to trace the religious education of the Jewish child, or rather a part of such education, for according to my original intention, I have not dealt with the most fundamental but most general principles of our religion, such as the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, nor have I touched, except in passing, on the wide field of Bible ethics. My sole topic has been the specific doctrines and ritual observances that separate Judaism from theism, considered with reference to religious education; and I am well aware that I am far from having exhausted that topic, even as regards home teaching, while I have been compelled to leave wholly unexplored the important subject of school life at the present day in connection with Judaism—

not from want of interest, but from lack of personal knowledge and experience.

One word in conclusion: if we wish Judaism to be a reality to our children we must carry it into our daily life. We must not treat it as a machine, wound up and set going on certain special occasions, and at all other times locked away carefully with our prayer-book and Talith. It must be with us on week-days as well as on Sabbaths. Not that I would needlessly multiply religious observances and ceremonies, other than those I have already enumerated, either for ourselves or our children, but I would make the spirit of Judaism the constantly present mainspring of our actions, so that it may colour our secular as well as our religious life. But to achieve this end, our Judaism, with its doctrines and its ritual observances, must be with us, not only in our synagogues, but in our homes; not only in our homes, but abroad. We must carry it with us wherever we go, and we must train our children to do so likewise. Let them go out into the world as Jews, not as religious cosmopolitans, in whose breasts the words, "I am a Jew," awaken no responsive thrill; as Jews, whose Judaism is the religion in which they live and in which they are prepared to die, not merely one of many creeds, touching them not more closely than any of the others. Let them join heartily with their fellow-countrymen in all good and useful labour, let them serve their native land to the utmost of their power, but let them never forsake the banner, which every Jew ought to be proud to bear until —to repeat the passage that cannot be too often quoted— "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the seas," the banner, on which are inscribed the words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One."

ALICE LUCAS.

DON JOSEPH NASSI, FOUNDER OF COLONIES IN THE HOLY LAND, AND THE COMMUNITY OF CORI IN THE CAMPAGNA.

We are at Cori, a little world-forgotten town of the Roman Campagna, a day's journey from Rome, in a southerly direction. The year is 1566. As in all parts of the Papal States, so in this nook, a Jewish congregation nestles, counting in all barely two hundred souls. They derive but a meagre livelihood from the handicrafts they exercise. As a compensation, however, they live on the most friendly and harmonious terms with their Christian neighbours. Unimpeded in the practice of their religion, they are provided with all the requisite institutions of a Jewish community. Their Rabbi, Maleachi Galliko, acts at the same time as the physician and teacher of his flock. In his days the various functions of Rabbi, preacher, teacher, and congregational secretary were not unseldom combined in the same individual.[1] This happy state of affairs was not long to continue. On the 13th of May, 1555, Paul IV., Caraffa, was elected to the pontifical chair, and proved a very scourge to the Jews in the Papal States, and in many Christian countries far around. Like earthquake shocks which lay whole towns in ruin, his papal bulls prostrated all the Jewish communities of his kingdom. The severity of his decrees was only exceeded by the rigorous cruelty with which they were enforced. Ecclesiastical commissioners traversed the country, and spread terror and dismay wherever they came. They confiscated the property of the Jews, passed sentences of death on many of them, and sent those whom they spared to the galleys. The cordiality that had existed between Hebrew and Gentile was destroyed at a blow. Intercourse between the two sections of the population was forbidden, and the Jews found themselves suddenly deprived of their livelihood. The accession of the gentle Pius IV. to the Papal throne did not much mend matters. The wounds inflicted by the iron hand of his predecessor, the Haman-like

[1] See R. Meïr, *Katzenellenbogen's Responsa*, No. 40.

Caraffa, could not be healed in his humane but all too short reign. The slight good he did effect was completely neutralised in the reaction of the next pontificate. Pius V. resumed Caraffa's policy of terror, and unmistakably showed that his aim was the extermination of his Jewish subjects. In every town where the children of Israel lived, stone walls were reared to isolate their Jewish quarter, as if it were a plague spot. The Ghetto became a universal institution. Commerce was taken out of the hands of the Hebrew. The only means of livelihood henceforth permitted to them was the sale of old clothes. Paul IV.'s bulls were revived with increased severity. Christians feared to bestow a kindness, or even a friendly greeting, upon a Jew. Many Hebrews, in order to escape this intolerable oppression, renounced their faith. Entire families sought the sheltering bosom of the Church. Amidst the general apostasy, religious fidelity became all the more difficult. Why, asked their persecutors, could not those who clung to the ancient creed do as others had done? Loyalty to the old faith was construed into defiance, and patient suffering was treated as contumacy. One may take it as a general axiom that wherever justice is wrested the standard of popular morals sinks; and this rule was again to be verified. The undisguised hatred of the legislator unloosed all the lawless passions of the mob. What could a Jew's life be worth when the sacred head of the Church was persecuting them with a fiery zeal as if he was carrying out some holy work pleasing to God? What was to become of that small handful of poor Jews living in Cori, when one support after another was failing them; when their chances of gaining a livelihood were being continually curtailed; and exaction and extortion became rifer? At last, they were robbed of their last solace—if, indeed, they had cherished it—the confidence that their lives at least would be protected by the authorities. A respected member of the community, Abraham ben Bezaleel, had set out, in the course of his business, for the Roman Campagna, and, on the road, had been foully murdered by the landlord of an inn where he had lodged overnight. His co-religionists instituted a search for their missing brother, and found his remains. The murderer was apprehended, tried, and acquitted. And thus the Jewish citizens of the Papal States were practically outlawed. The murder of a Jew was, according to judicial ruling, no longer a punishable offence.

In this extreme peril, the small congregation of the Campagna heard a welcome voice, which roused them from their dull despair, promised them relief from their troubles, and

held out to them the hope of better times. While suffering all the birth-pangs of the Messianic Age, without the advent of a Messiah to console them, the report reached them of an unprecedented distinction conferred on a Jew at the Sultan Solyman's court, and of the love and pity with which this illustrious son of Israel remembered his unhappy brethren in the West. Juan Migues, the Marrano, or Don Joseph Nassi, to call him by his Hebrew title, had obtained the ruined City of Tiberias, and seven adjoining townships, as a mark of favour from his august lord. Three generations of Sultans—the original donor, his son Solyman and his grandson Murad—had confirmed the deed of gift with their seals,[1] and thus invested it with a character of permanency. Orders had further been sent to the Pachas of Damascus and Safed, bidding them render Don Joseph every assistance in the rebuilding of Tiberias. They were to furnish him with competent masons and workmen. Don Joseph himself was too busy with diplomatic affairs at the Porte personally to superintend the restoration of the town. He, accordingly, sent an agent, Joseph ibn Adret,[2] to direct the building operations. In the Chanuca month, Kislev 5325, Tiberias rose, like a phœnix, from its ruins.

But what did Joseph intend by this work of town-founding? If we are to believe the French Ambassador[3] of his day, it was the first step of a large scheme which was ultimately to seat him on Judea's throne. Even Graetz[4] has adopted this view, and connects the restoration of Tiberias with a supposed plan, on Joseph's part, of founding a Jewish State, with himself as the head. But nothing in Joseph's character or career justifies us in regarding him as a dreamer who would allow himself to be carried away by visionary ideas. From the beginning to the end of his life he always shows himself sober in his aims, a prudent calculator of consequences, ever keeping the end he has in view steadily before him, well versed in all the intricate arts of Court life, guided by practical aims, and eager for secular power. The fact has been alleged hitherto as an argument—and even Graetz has done it—that, while still at Venice, he petitioned the Senate to assign an island to the Jews, which request, by the way, was refused. But this negotiation does not prove that Don Joseph's supposed scheme of founding a kingdom had any real existence. Joseph's petition has been com-

[1] See Joseph ha-Cohen, *Emek Habaca*, ed. Letteris p. 127 ff., M. Wiener's German translation, p. 104 f.; M. A. Levy, *Don Joseph Nasi*, p. 20, n. 66.

[2] Isidore Loeb, *Revue des Études juives*, IV., 67.

[3] M. A. Levy, l. c.

[4] *Geschichte der Juden*, IX., 424, n. 1.

pletely misunderstood. About 1550, the Marranos were banished from Venice. Joseph himself was included in this edict. As long as he lived he preserved the senatorial order for his expulsion.[1] It was at this time, probably, that he entered into negotiations for the grant of one of the islands of the lagunas of Venice as a Ghetto or Jewish Quarter.

So far from connecting any romantic dreams with this enterprise, we may confidently declare that the considerations which influenced him were modest and practical. He evinced no desire to leave Constantinople and visit his new Tiberias, which he would certainly have done had he cherished a secret design of inaugurating a royal triumph throughout the Jewish world.

Don Joseph's contemporaries understood his intentions better. The small community of Cori has left us a valuable exposition of his real aims. Sultan Solyman did not hit upon the idea of bestowing this gift upon his favourite spontaneously. Don Joseph must have suggested to his august master the esteem in which he held these ruins, and the importance which he attached to their possession. In his intercourse with the Talmudists and Cabbalists of his Divan Don Joseph must certainly have heard the ancient tradition which connected the restoration of Palestine with the renovation of the ruined city on the shore of the sea of Tiberias. The opposition of the Arab population to this seemingly innocent undertaking; the fanatical sermons which the old *Scherif* preached on the event, taking, as his text, an old oracular saying that "the rise of Tiberias means the fall of Islam"; the coercive measures which the Pacha of Damascus was forced to adopt before he could obtain labourers, who only commenced work after the execution of two of their ring-leaders; all these facts are now quite intelligible. The Arabs had heard so much of the significance of Tiberias for the Jews that they felt a natural reluctance to labour at its restoration. Originally, therefore, it was a religious motive that prompted Don Joseph to ask Solyman for Tiberias, and secure the gift with every possible precaution. But what others looked upon as the confirmation of an idealist's hope, the experienced diplomatist regarded from a practical point of view. The believers in the literal fulfilment of prophecy hailed the event as an omen of the immediate advent of the Messiah.

---

[1] I believe that one must thus interpret Bonrizzo's words given by M. A. Levy, p. 45: "Venne in geroposito *del bando* chera da questo excellentissimo stato."

Don Joseph's intention, however, was more practical. He wished to found a Colony at one of the keys of Palestine—a place which tradition had hallowed, and which might serve as an asylum for fugitives. In this plan he may have had the welfare of his unhappy co-religionists in Italy especially in view. He had experienced, in his own person, all the terrors of intolerance, and, consequently, evinced the liveliest sympathy with the Marranos of Ancona. To quote a single instance. To punish Paul IV. and Ancona, which had rendered itself notorious by Auto-da-fés, Don Joseph exerted all his influence, though in vain, to obtain for the Port of Pesaro the privilege of exclusive commercial relations with Turkey.[1] Ever since his departure from Italy he had kept up an uninterrupted correspondence with the Jews of that country. The tale of their woes was poured into his ears. The report of their oppressions reached him through various channels. Their sufferings were ever present to his mind, and familiar to him in every detail. Accordingly, he took particular care that the news of the restoration of Tiberias should reach Italy. Ships for transporting the emigrants to their new home lay moored in the ports of Venice and Ancona. Money was provided to defray the expenses of the emigrants. Jewish artizans who could no longer make a living in the Peninsula were especially invited to colonize Tiberias. A new Jewish industry was to be reared in that colony. Silk and cloth manufactories, after the model of those at Venice, were to be built, and the industry of the Jewish colonists was to ensure their success. Mulberry trees were planted to provide silkworms with their proper food. Wool was, as Joseph ha-Cohen[2] tells us, imported direct from Spain to serve as raw material for the cloth factory.

Those Italian communities who did not languish under the yoke of the Papal Government, showed their sympathy with their unhappy brethren in the Papal States, by receiving the delegates cordially ; and resolving to aid the emigration. The movement continually assumed larger dimensions. Numerous Jewish families embarked for the Holy Land.

At this stage of affairs, the message reached the Jews of Cori, who did not hesitate an instant to obey the welcome and unexpected call. The whole congregation gathered into the synagogue, and, under the presidency of Maleachi Galliko, of Nepi, their Rabbi, resolved unanimously to emigrate *en masse* to Tiberias. Four of their most respected members—all heads

---

[1] See David Kaufmann, *Revue des Etudes juives* XVI., 61-72.
[2] *Emek Habaca*, p. 129 ; *Weiner*, p. 105.

of families,—were appointed to direct the emigration. Two of these, Michael ben Aaron and Joseph ben Menachem, were to proceed to Venice in advance of the rest. Their mission was to arouse public sympathy with the movement and obtain for their impoverished community funds to meet travelling expenses. They were furnished, for this purpose, with a copy of the resolution, sealed with the congregational seal, and an official subscription book, for entering donations. This latter book further contained a minute statistical account of the financial position of the Cori congregation, a glorification of Tiberias, and an exposition of its significance. To smooth the way of the messengers, and to inspire the public with confidence in their representative character, their Rabbi, Galliko, was deputed to accompany them.

We can follow these delegates but a little way on their thorny path. The three men, armed with letters of recommendation of several Italian communities, among which that of the Roman congregation figured prominently, arrived at Ancona. The Jews here, handicapped though they were by the heavy claims their own poor made upon them, came readily to the assistance of the delegates, two of whom were personally known to several of them. Beside the help they rendered individually and in their communal capacity, the Jews of Ancona furnished the messengers with a letter of recommendation to other congregations.

The discovery of fresh manuscripts will perhaps throw light on the subsequent fortunes of New Tiberias and its colony, whose history forms so considerable a portion in a sketch of Don Joseph. The student who investigates Jewish history often finds the thread tantalisingly break off at the most interesting point, where he would most wish it continued. My material only extends as far as my account has gone. If I were to attempt with my scant information to continue the story, I should be compelled to pass beyond the borders of sober history into the realms of the imagination.

The two letters to which I am indebted for the gist of this account deserve a passing mention. Remarkable as is Jewish history, its sources are still more curious. In a MS. of the 16th century in my possession, a letter writer intended to initiate learners into the elegancies of Hebrew epistolary style which the Italian Jews always cultivated with predilection. I found the two letters of the communities of Cori and Ancona under the numbers 167-168. Model letters form a valuable branch of Hebrew literature. In every collection of Hebrew MSS. of any pretension, such specimens of epistolary composition are to be found. But they

have not yet received the attention they deserve. Because, as a rule, names of persons and places are suppressed in them, historians have thought these letters unworthy of notice. But we meet in them not only with fictitious letters, purely and simply models of composition, but also with genuine epistles, recording dramas of real life. These owe their preservation to the accident of being hidden in a place where no one thought of looking for them. When opened up, these sources will reveal a treasure of information concerning the political no less than the religious life of the Italian Jews. Historians have already recognised the turbulent literature of the responses as a rich mine of historical knowledge. The gentler department of epistolary literature is a still unworked field, which promises an ample historical harvest.

The small Cori community which through these manuscript records steps out for the first time into the broad daylight of history, shows to advantage in an educational point of view. No Jewish community was so small and obscure as not to be illuminated by some rays of Hebrew and secular culture. Corrupted as the letter from Cori seems to have become in the course of its transmission, it sufficiently proves that even small communities maintained the tradition of an ornate Hebrew style and handed down the art of letter-writing from generation to generation. The Rabbi, Galliko, did not compose this letter. He must have had, at his elbow, a congregational scribe or private member who was a master of a rich and pointed Hebrew style.

II.

A Contribution to the History of the Venetian Jews.

The few details here collected are all taken from a bundle of original documents preserved in the State Archives of Modena. The first of these reports, which, though undated evidently belongs to the seventeenth century, throws a flood of light on the circumstances of the Jews in Venice. To that city we owe an idea and its expression that have, alas obtained but too wide a currency—the Ghetto.[1] Here, for once in a way, philology becomes history. The word, if we are to believe our report, is not older than 1516. In that year the Venetian senate resolved to isolate the Jews in a separate quarter, in the vicinity of the Cannon Foundry.

[1] For the history of the word Ghetto see *Güdemann Geschichte des Erziehungswesens*, II., 250, n. 1.

Improbable as the derivation of Ghetto from Gietto seems, the historical evidence for this origin of the word is clear and indisputable. The word, then, belongs to the Modern Epoch. The Middle Ages may have had the reality, but the expression is an acquisition of the sixteenth century. In 1516, a serious attempt was made, for the first time, to shut up the Jews in a separate quarter. This social degradation was accompanied by a few other legal restrictions. Jewish money-lenders had hitherto been permitted to charge a maximum rate of 20 per cent., Christians being allowed to take twice as much.[1] This trade was now absolutely forbidden them. They were obliged, nevertheless, to maintain, at their own expense, three public loan offices[2]—so-called Monte di Pietà—where anyone could obtain advances on pledges at 5 per cent. The Jews were also forbidden to keep open shops. They were restricted to dealing in old clothes, and were only allowed to hold business relations with brokers of foreign firms. The houses they occupied were the property of Christians. The rent was at once raised one-third. But as a set-off, this was made a fixed rate, and could never afterwards be raised. As once the Jews of Sicily, so now their co-religionists of Venice were charged with a large share of the cost of entertaining the guests of the Republic, Royal Highnesses and Ambassadors, to whom the State assigned palaces. The Jews had to furnish these palaces. For taxes, they were assessed not as Jews but as merchants. The Ghetto had, later on, to be repeatedly enlarged. The immigration of Jewish fugitives from Spain and of Marranos, all included under the generic term Ponentini (Western European Jews), made the Ghetto illusory. These arrivals, albeit they were Jews, were permitted to settle in all parts of Venice among the Christian population. The Ponentini and the Levantine Jews shared with their Christian fellow-citizens the privilege of commerce with the Levant and the Occident. A court, consisting of five Venetian nobles, and styled the *Magistrato de cinque Savi*[3] was specially instituted for the trial of their cases. The Jews generally had another court which ordinarily consisted of three patricians, and was called the Court of the Cataveri. It has a peculiar interest of its own. Its special *imprimatur* had often to be obtained for the publication of Hebrew books in Venice.[4] The increase in

---

[1] Comp. Antonio Ive in *Revue des Études juives*, II., 780, n. 1.

[2] S. Cassel in *Ersch und Gruber's Encyclopädie*, II., 27, p. 760.

[3] S. Cassel, loc. cit., p. 159, n. 73, mentions such a court of as early a date as the year 1298.

[4] אופיציו של קאטאווירי. M. Steinschneider, *Hebräische Bibliographie* V., 126, and G. Wolf, ib. VI., 64, n. 4.

the number of Jews in that town was thus, as we see, a direct result of the encouragement offered by the Republic to their settlement, and of the toleration with which it regarded their public return to Judaism.

This account, derived from official documents, can be supplemented from a Jewish source, viz., from a legal decision of R. Meir ben Isaac Katzenellenbogen, the renowned Rabbi of Padua and Venice. This decision he forwarded in his eightieth year (probably in 1562) to R. Moses Isserles at Cracow, and it may be found in Isserles' collected *Responsa* (No. 51). It appears that, subsequent to the establishment of the new Ghetto, the former Jewish quarter continued to exist under the name of *Ghetto vecchio*, and served as a residence for Jewish merchants from the Levant, who were wont to stay, without their families, for short periods in Venice to transact their business. The Christian owners of these houses might let them when empty to Christians, but Jews and Christians were not to reside together in the same house. Thus, if rooms were vacant in houses occupied in part by Levantine Jews, such rooms might only be let to Jewish Venetian families. But even this could not be done without the consent of the civic authorities. For, in order to protect the interests of the residents in the new Ghetto, and to prevent new comers from eluding the burdens of the community, the Senate had decreed that all Jewish families not from the Levant, should not be permitted to reside in the old Ghetto without the previous consent of the Jewish community. Two officers appointed by the community were entrusted with the duty of granting this license, as occasion demanded, and the Rabbinical Court of Venice would afterwards render the permission complete by formally ratifying it. This usage, to which not only the Jews but also the Christian house-owners submitted, was first broken by a Jewish physician named Joseph, who entered into a contract with his Christian landlord without previously procuring permission from the Jewish community. His example found imitators, and more and more Jewish families surreptitiously left the new for the old Ghetto. Empty houses began to grow numerous in the new Ghetto, and their Christian owners made complaints, which the Court inquired into, and, as a consequence, the Jewish families which had without leave settled in the old Ghetto were expelled from that quarter. But now it was the turn of the owners of the old Ghetto to complain. The landlord of the physician Joseph was one of the injured parties. After prolonged negotiations, the community agreed to rent the houses of the old Ghetto, upon the condition of obtaining

the exclusive right of sub-letting them. Messer Giaco, the Christian patron of Joseph, himself as *Gentilhuomo*, a member of the Council, consequently compelled his non-Levantine Jewish clients (including the doctor Joseph) to quit his house, the key of which he handed over to the Jewish communal officers. As Joseph refused to accede, and maintained his right in the Court of First Instance against the landlord, who was disinclined to continue the law suit, the Jewish community summoned the doctor to appear before the Court of the Five Rabbis of Venice. By a number of lengthy objections, Joseph denied the competency of this Court, and for his contumacy was subjected by R. Meir Katzenellenbogen to the first degree of excommunication. On the 12th of Elul, 1559, he solemnly abandoned his defiant attitude, and on the 27th of the same month submitted himself in a formal *Rinunzia* to the authority of the community, which then permitted him by contract to resume his dwelling in the old Ghetto. Later on, however, he changed his mind, and revoked his former submission. Upon this the authorities pronounced the edict of excommunication against him. He then again betook himself to the civil courts, through whom in March, 1561, he obtained the suspension of the excommunication. He was less successful in moving Meir Katzenellenbogen to withdraw the edict altogether, though he sought to compel him to do so through the Court of Padua. This continued recourse to Christian interference was in itself sufficient to stamp the doctor in the eyes of R. Moses Isserles as worthy of excommunication.

From the *Responsa* of R. Meir Katzenellenbogen it appears that the Venetian Jews felt themselves quite secure, and had no fear of expulsion by the Senate. They knew that at the renewal of their license, which was always granted for a limited period only, the worst they would suffer might be some fresh enactments in regard to the laws regulating interest and loans. The condition of the Levantine Jews was more precarious, because the commercial jealousy of the Viennese merchants was always, though silently, working against them. Expulsion, like a constantly threatening storm, was always before their eyes.[1]

---

[1] שו״ת רמ״א ed. Cracow, f. 112[d], וגם קביעת (ליוונטיני) הוא יותר מסופק משלנו כי הם בקוין בעיני רבים (מזינטילצא=gentilezza) אישר הם סוחרים בים לאשר אלה היהודים מזיקים להם ולזה עומדים עליהם לגרשם אמנם הקיומים שלנו לא נשמע מעולי שאמרו לגר שינו ת״ל ורק לפעמים באיזה קיום תרש כשנים איזה חק בהלואה :

Indeed, there loomed before all the great merchants the fear of banishment. There lie three official reports before us, all from the year 1550, in which the Duke of Ferrara's ambassador furnishes his liege with the reasons which, he supposes, induced the Senate to threaten the Marranos so suddenly with expulsion. These had argument on their side when they urged upon the Senate the benefits the State had gained through them. Such independent witnesses as the German traveller, Niclas Nicolai, and the Venetian Prince Soranzo,[1] concur that the Hebrew exiles from Spain were most skilful armourers and makers of military accoutrements. The representations of the Jews proved, however, futile. It was the fate of the unhappy descendants of the Spanish exiles once again to become wanderers. The storm gathered around them throughout Italy. The sulphur in the air and the rumbling underground were sufficient indications of the torrents of lava afterwards poured forth by the volcanic hatred of Paul IV. The Republic had long resisted the dark insinuations and suggestions of the spiritual authorities. Its commercial prosperity it placed above the fancied interests of the Catholic Church. But at last it, too, was forced to yield; a whole concourse of circumstances co-operated to seal the fate of the Marranos. The Jewish community itself seems to have regarded them with hostility, and thrown the weight of its influence in the scale against their stay in the city. They must have been most formidable competitors when trade jealousy caused Christians to look upon them as Jews, and Jews to see in them Christians. Just as the Roman Jewish community, according to Ibn Verga,[2] petitioned the Pope to refuse the Marranos admission into his city, by which they attained just the contrary, so the native Jewish families of Venice marshalled themselves on the side of the enemies of these unhappy exiles. No harm was apprehended from the Jews in the Ghetto. But these Judaizing Spaniards, baptised and yet so stiff-necked, were distributed among the Christians in all quarters of the city; and, from the Christian point of view, were a source of moral contagion to the souls of the Christian inhabitants of Venice. A similar physical danger was apprehended. The charge was brought against them of propagating contagious diseases. Their supposed filthy mode of life, aggravated the danger in the popular imagination. Whoever reads these aspersions will scarcely understand how the same people, whom inde-

[1] See M. A. Levy, *Don Joseph Nasi*, pp. 4, 5.
[2] *Schevet Jehuda*, § 57, ed. Wiener, p. 92, in his German translations, p. 188.

pendent and impartial Christian critics describe as model citizens in Turkey, should in Venice have been transformed into the incarnation of trickery and knavery. The worst of it, however, was that the Emperor Charles V. joined the ranks of their persecutors. We have it on the testimony of Messer Giovanni Francesco, Secretary to the Duke of Urbino's Ambassador, that the final resolve to expel the Marranos from Venice was due to the Emperor's influence. He thought it intolerable that this devil's brood, as he termed them, should be suffered to exist in Catholic lands. M. de Morvilliers, who, up to September, 1550, acted as the representative of France at Venice, and to whom we are indebted for so much information about Don Joseph, Duke of Naxos,[1] was too optimistic when he thought it probable that the harsh decree would be withdrawn, or, at least, mitigated. In November, 1549, this law, to which Don Joseph fell a victim, was put into execution. I believe I am not wrong in assuming the identity of the decree of expulsion which he recalled to the Venetian Ambassador, Bonrizzo,[2] at Constantinople, in 1565, and this edict for the banishment of the Marranos.

That the Ghetto could not destroy the intercourse between Christians and Jews, which attained so extensive a development at Venice, is proved by a law passed in 1671, forbidding Jews to wear arms and pointed knives.[3] So prevalent had the custom become among the Jews of going about armed with a poignard at least—a clear proof of their complete assimilation with their neighbours in undesirable as well as desirable qualities. Recourse was had to special legislation against this tendency. But in this as in other cases, it proved quite unavailing.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

I.

La natione hebrea è antichissima in Venetia. Era sparsa in quà in là per la Città habitando ciascuno d'essi dove più gli piaceva, e prestando danari con la solicita usura del vinti per cento.

Fu per certo accidente occorso pigliata parte di ristringerli tutti in un luogo e del 1516 furono ridutti in certa parte della Città dove si

---

[1] M. A. Levy, *loco cit.* p. 41. [2] *L.c.*, p. 45.

[3] On March 24th, 1668, the Senate excluded the Jews from access to the Fondaco of the German merchants in Venice. See Dr. Henry Simonsfeld, *Der Fondaco dei Tedeschi in Venedig* (Stuttgart, 1887), II., 286.

fondeva l'artiglieria chiamata gietto, che poi alterandosi il vocabolo s'è detta Ghetto.

E per cavar da essi pubblicamente più utile che si potesse e preservarse da ogni danno che potessero portare alla povertà degli artefici moltiplicando, e crescendo in numero fù loro prohibito il poter prestare con la solita usura del 20 per cento et furono obligati ad haver sempre tre banchi aperti i quali con la sola risposta di cinque per cento prestassero danari col pegno fin a certa soma come si usa per comodità de poveri ne monti eretti e chiamati di pietà da Christiani.

Aggiunsero che non potessero esercitare arte di sorte alcuna, ne comperar merci per rivenderle o farne botteghe per la Città lasciando simplicemente loro libero il trafficare per via di merci e rispondenti forestieri il loro danaro.

Le case del Ghetto furono a beneficio de Padroni Christiani cresciuto un terzo di più di quello, che prima pagavano d'affitto ma con conditione che non potessero ne tempi avvenire ricevere alcuna alteratione di prezzo.

Sono anche poi doppo qualche tempo stati obligati ad apparare e fornire a proprie spese tutti que palazzi che seccondo l'occorenze si pigliano dal Principe per alloggiare a spese publiche Principi, Ambasciatori e personaggi forestieri e questo per tutto il tempo solamente che detti forestieri si trattengono e sono alloggiati.

Nelle necessità della Republica contribuiscono ma in questo più come mercanti con la proportione degli altri mercanti che vengono tassati secondo le loro facoltà che come hebrei.

Il Ghetto è stato ampliato due volte del. . . . fu accresciuto di . . . . case et ultimamente l'anno passato vi si è pur fatta una nuova giunta di 20 case obligandosi all'incontro gli hebrei sotto pena di 2,000 ducati che per tutto un anno debbono esser venuti ad habitare in Venetia 20 famiglie forestiere.

Gli hebrei levantini e Ponentini hanno un privileggio particolare che essendo vietato dagli ordini della Republica il negotio di Levante e di Ponente a tutti i Mercanti Christiani che non sono Venetiani essi solamente traffichano liberamente nell'uno e nell'altro luogo et hanno un Magistrato di Nobili Venetiani detto de Cinque savi che solo e sommariamente giudica ne loro interessi, cose tutte che hanno servito e servono d'invito agli hebrei di quel paese di trasferirsi a Venetia.

Un altra cosa ancora ha servito a moltiplicare la natione, e questa è la sicurezza che trova qui tutta quella razza di spagnoli che battezzati tornano all'hebreismo perchè s'usa in questa parte una total conivenza ne si fa inquisitione come altrove per cercar se questa sorte di gente sia battezzata.

L'uffitio de Catauere che è un magistrato che consiste d'alcuni Nobili è giudice nel rimanente di tutta la natione et in tutte le Cause. E questo e quel più s'è creduto d'haver à comprendere in questa informatione non sapendosi particolarmente a che fine sia cercata da S. A^za^ Serenissima.
—*R. Archivio di Stato in Modena—Ebrei—Documenti.* (circa 1635).

II.

Di Venetia a XX. di *Luglio* L^ta^

Illustrissimo et Excell^mo^ Sig. Col^mo^

. . . . . .

La causa del bando contra li marani intendo principalmente procedere dal dubbio che questi signori havessino di malatia et qualche peste per

luoro et che li hebrei di questa città hanno fatto grandissima fortuna cum dire che detti marani sono homini maligni di pratiche et di mala conditione. Tuttavia intendo che da essi Marani et massime da huomini che sono ricchi et che ben viveno, è stato dimostrato a questi signori che per luoro vien dato grande utile alla Città in più modi et che si presume che in fine la cosa serà moderata et che sarà permesso ad alcuni principali d'essi che vi possano stare. . . . . .

De Vostra Ex^tia^,

Fidelis^mo^ et ben humil Servitore,

HIERONYMO FERUFFINO.

R. Archivio di Stato in Modena—Cancelleria Ducale—Dispacci degli Oratori Estensi a Venezia.

III.

Di Venetia 23 de *Luglio* del 50.

Illus^mo^ et Excel^mo^ Sig. Sig. mio Col^mo^

. . . . . .

Da Messer Giovan Francesco Secretario del predicto Sig. oratore di Urbino pagato da sva eccellentia ho inteso oltra il scritto per le precedenti circa le cause del bando mancato contra li Marani il che intesi da Monsignor de moruillier che dette cause sono diverse, et prima che a questi signori è stato raccordato che essi Marani sono peggio che li hebrei perchè non sono ne Christiani ne giudei li quali giudei tutti inscieme in Ghetto separati da Christiani se ne stanno et per conversare detti Marani cum Christiani et habitare in diverse parti, essere stata fatta conscienza alli predetti Signori dimostrandosseli che detta conversatione è causa di molti errori et massime di far prevaricare molte persone Christiane, et che danno in oltra denari a usura, et che vi posson per la detta conversatione indurre de li nostri a fare il medesimo. Apresso che è gente maligna infida et di mala pratica et che non solamente basteria ad infettare le anime de Christiani ma anche li corpi di qualche pestilentia soggiungendo il predetto Secretario havere di buon luoco che questi Signori habbian etiandio fatto esso bando ad eshortatione del Imperatore dal quale sia stato detto che questo Dominio Christiano et qual fa professione di Catholico come può tollerare che tal gente perversa et diabolica et piena di fezze habiti in Venetia et nelle terre Soe, et si li cose sono del modo inteso tenere por oppenione che la parte di detto bando sarà interamente osservata et non forse moderata come il predetto Signor Ambasciator de franza mi disse volere credere.

. . . . . .

De V^tra^ Ec^tia^,

Fidelissimo et ben humil Servitore,

HIERONYMO FERUFFINO.

R. Archivio di Stato in Modena—Cancelleria Ducale—Dispacci degli Oratori Estensi a Venezia.

IV.

Di Venetia a 24 di *Luglio* del 50.

Ill^mo et Ecc^mo S^r S^r mio Col^mo

. . . . . .

Circa la parte renovata contro li Marani la qual fù fatta nel 9^r havendone parlato al predicto Sig^re Ambasciatore ho inteso che veramente le principali cause d'essa parte e del bando sian l'essere stato mostrato a questi signori che conversando essi come conversavono cum Christiani corrompessino molti et che seminasseno una mala et pessima dottrina. E che per alloggiare in una casa in tre et quatro famiglie et stando sborcamente (*sic*) tenendo malissimo li luoro allogiamente era dubitato et temuto di malatia et de qualche pestilentia per causa di luoro procedere et vivere et che si ben li detti Marani hanno procurato che almeno puossin star fino a 300 d'essi cum mostrare che dano et darano utile alla città che nondimeno Egli crede per essere abboriti et in mal predicamento come sono non farano alcuno effetto anzi che questi Signori vorranno che la detta parte renovata sia interamente osservata. . . . . .

De V^ra Ecc^za,

Fideliss^mo et ben humil Servitore,

Hieronymo Feruffino.

R. Archivio di Stato in Modena—Cancelleria Ducale—Dispacci degli Oratori Estensi a Venezia.

V.

Venetia, 17 *Luglio*, 1671.

. . . . . .

Rigoroso proclama è stato pubblicato nel Ghetto col quale vien prohibito agli Hebrei il portar qualsisia sorte d'armi, come anco cortelli quando non siano senza punta.

R. Archivio di Stato in Modena—Cancelleria Ducale—Avvisi e Notizie dall'Estero.

קס"ז

אם התחלת מציאות האדם וסוף שלימותו מיד ה" יתברך המה ' ואי אפשר להגיע זולתו מה יעשה אדם לו לטובתו אולם היות התחלתו מאתו הנה הוא מבואר מעצמו מהתחלת הוייתו אם בפרטו ואם בכללו והדבר אלקי בלתי אפשרי להגיע בהשתדלות אם מצד מהותו ואם מצד רוחב גבולו ' וזה כי מלבד מה שישיגוהו בדרכו פגעים רעים מבקשת הצרכים ההכרחיים ורוע הבחירה הנה ידביקוהו בעתו המון המונעים והמע[י]קים מקוצר המשיג ולאות כו(מ)[ח]ותיו בכל מופתיו תולדותיו לבית אבותיו ' אמנם לשבר כל אלה המונעים הרעים רבים קמים עליו הוכרח לשום עליו

מלך להנהיג כלי כחותיו הוא שבחר בו ה״ למלוך על האדם כמו שאמר החכם[1] שכל איש יכלכל מחלתו כמו שנתבאר הדעות האלה בפרש(ו)[י] אשת חיל בשער שנים ועשרים ששם נתאמן אמון ההנהגה בדברים נסתרים הן מצד רוב פעלים הכוללים והחלקיים בהתחלת חסרי׳ ההכרחיים בקראתה אשת חיל כוללה בכל חמעלות קרוב מאוד למה שיאות למלאת השכל בעיוניו ולמודיו שבהם יפול עקר שבחו לעשות מהעיקר עיקר ולחגור בעוז מתניו לאמץ זרועות האיש להחנהג כהתנהג השכל היא תושיה והתורה׳ ולזה נתעוררה נשמתינו ושכלינו אנחנו צעירי הגולה ק״ק קו״רי אשר במדינת קאמפנ״ייה רחוקה מרומ״א מהלך יום עינינו תמיד אל ה״ אלהינו עד שיחננו׳ ומיום היותינו פה לא חסר מקהלינו פ״ת ב״ג המלך[2] מלכי (המלך) המלכים הקב״ה ויין משתיו לסעוד לבנו ולהשען תחת עין החיים בתורה תמימה משיבת נפש ובבית הכנסת להתפלל בו תפילת צבור הנשמעת תמיד וכמו שגלוי לכל העמים הגם כי כלנו דלים ורשים ויגיע כפינו כי נ(ו)[א]כל בזעת אפינו נביא לחמינו לא מנענו הטוב להעמיד תמיד בינינו חכם ורופא מבני עמינו ללמוד את בנינו ולדרוש לנו בכל שבת שבת דברי תלמוד ואגדא כפי מה שיאות׳ ויהי כי הקיפו ימי הצער והטירודים והמסיות והצרות והעולות עוד זה מדבר בזמן הפיפ״יור פאו״לו רביעי שאז מה מאד הקיפה הצעקה אל גבול[3] ישראל נאקה ומועקה שם במתנינו מן העבודה הקשה אשר עובד בינינו מהבו״לא שהוציא כנגדינו עד שלא השאיר לנו מחייה׳ והדוחקים עלו השתרגו על צואריגו ביציאת הקומים״אריו שהיו נוטלים את ממונינו ועונשים אותנו או לגלי״אה או למיתה באופן שמי לא היה בידו כח לסבול ולקדש את השם היו ממירים דתינו הקדושה עד שארכו כמו רבו הממירים בזמן ההוא והנשארי׳ לא נשאר להם בלתי אם גוייתם וצורתם׳ והדוחקי׳ ההם סבונו גם סבבונו כי כסלא לאונייא[4] כאלו ח״ו נבלע ישראל וכאלו יושב בין תנור לכירים כמי שיכפאו שד ורוח כביר ובפרט מלכות קמפנ״ייאה אשר עירנו בתוכו שכולו אם בוצרים באו לו אם שודדי לילה הלא יגנבו דיים במלחמת הפיפ״יור פאו״לו רביעי הנ״ל הלא ישאירו עוללות וכל שכן עניי עמינו הדרי׳ במדינה הזאת עד שנתנו עיניהם בנו ונעשנו גל של עצמות ואין לאל ידינו לחיות כי דלונו מאד ואפי׳ דיננו אין נדן בעסקנו וזה בא[5] הזמן המר והנמהר הזה כמו שגלוי ומפורסם לכל העמים גודל האנקה והצעקה בוקה ומבוקה ומבולקה ופיק ברכים וחלחלה בכל מתנים פני כלנו קבצו פרור מגודל סדרי הבו״לא קשה ועצומה שיצ(י)את עם כל דתי הנימוסים שיסדר עלינו הפיפ״יור פי״או חמישי יר״ה שלא די עצירתינו בכל מקום שאנחנו דרים בנו עלינו ויקיפו חומות סוגרים ומסוגרי׳ אין יוצא ואין בא לשאת ולתת עמם עד כי תפליא עצת הסדר ותגדיל תושית הנימום שאין אנו יכולים לעשות שום סחורה שבעולם לא מדבר הנזון ולא מבגדים חדשים ואפי׳ מלאכתינו אין אנו יוכלין לעשות׳ הגם שהעמים נהפכו כלם ממתוק למר באמרם שאסור להם לתת לנו שום סיוע והנאה ולהשתדל עמנו בשום

---

[1] Prov. xviii. 14. [2] Dan. i. 13. [3] Isaiah xv. 8.
[4] Berach. 6*a*. [5] Job i. 16.

צד ומה מאד תמיד מיום אל יום מעת אל עת באו עלינו הצרות הנ״ל דמעות נזלו עינינו ודמעתינו על לחיינו לא נתננו פוגת לנו עינינו אל ה״ אלקינו לבכות במר נפשנו באופן שקהלינו זה כלו ייליל יוריד מוריד כנחל דמעה יום ולילה. ויהי כי הקיפה הצעקה בראותינו הצרה הנ״ל אשר על זה דוה לבנו ועל אלה חשכו עינינו אמנם על זאת נספדה ונייליל נעשה מספד כתני׳ ואבל כבנות יענה כי כלנו כצאן תעינו איש לדרכו פנינו להמיר דת האל הקדושה שבכל יום ויום באים משפחות גדולים וקטנים חכמים ונבוני׳ דלים ועשירים וממירים דתם והם היו בעברינו מסיתים ומדיחים ופנים אנשי ישראל אל אמונתם מלבד שרודפין אותנו ועליהם ועל הסדרים הנזכרים הרגנו כל היום כל בתינו מעיר אל עיר הושמנו כצאן טבחה הורדפנו ולא הונח לנו ואין מידם מציל וחי נפשנו לאל חי שלימים מועטים חלפו למו זה כמו שני חדשים נסע מפה קור״י תוך קהלינו איש תם וישר וירא אלקים ללכת בארץ רומ״א אל עסקיו ושמו אברהם בכ״מ בצלאל ז״ל ויהי בדרך במלון ארבו לדמו והרגוהו עד שכאשר נודע הדבר נסעה החבורה מק״ק קור״י וקרוביו לבקשו. ומרוב ההוצאות שנעשו מצאו עצמותיו לבד ובעל מחנה שהרגו נתן ביד החצר והוציאו חפשי. ועל כן הלילו יושבי ישראל הרימי בכח קולך[1] בכל מקום שהם כשופר הרם קולך והגד לעמי׳ צרותינו ולבית יעקב דחקינו ואנחנו לא ידענו מה נעשה רק על היותינו תו״לע״ת יעקב מתי ישראל בעל פפיות סדרנו תמיד ביניינו תעניות צבור ותפלות על כל צרה עם תקיעות שופר לבש(ר)נו שקים ונשב על אפר ונזעק אל ה״ אלקינו בחזקה מקטנינו עד גדולינו. דבק לשון יונק אל חכו בצמא עוללים שואלים לחם פורס אין להם אולי יתעשת ה״ לנו ויצמיח לנו הכנת הצלה. וכה היתה תפילתינו מעינו מעינו נוחילה קרות לבנו הומה[2] ה״ שמעה ה״ סלחה ה״ הקשיבה ועשה ל[ה]תעורר לבנו ולהאיר שכלינו לאחוז בכנפות בחירת הטוב לנו ולנפשותינו להנצל עצמינו ונפשנו מפח יוקשי השמדות ושלא יהיה מקומינו קברינו ובצפייתינו צפינו עד ה״ למען רחמיו יערה עלינו רוח ממרום נצא השדה גלינה בכפרים[3] של ארצינו הקדושה ולא בכופרים הממירים הנ״ל וממרום ישלח לנו איזה סיוע וגואל יגל יעקב ישמח ישראל:

והנה צעקת ותפילת ק״ק קור״י וענויים כי רבה ובבייתם כי כבדה מאד והנה אלינו קול רגלי מבשר משמיע שלו׳ הבנות העניים והאביונים השואפים ומתאוים לצאת מן הגולה הזאת מבשר טוב חן וחסד הקהלות הקדושות. ועטרת תפארת חן וכבוד הנשיא השר והטפסר ראש הראשונים ומעוז האישים עמוד הגולה וגולה[4] ורוממות המלך ביפיו ובהלולו הוא הגבר הוקם ע״ל מן שמיא הדרבן המהימן צנצנת המן אסתרא די דהבא המרומם והמעולה חשבון ואלעלא אדונינו דון יוסף שמאת ה״ היתה לו היות נתונה בידו ארץ טבריא אשר בו בחר האל יתברך לעשות אות ומופת על גאולתינו ועל פדות נפשנו כמו שפסק הרמ״בם בספר סנהדרין סוף פרק ארבעה עשר[5] ול׳ ו(ב)[כ]שנת־

---

[1] Isaiah xl. 9. [2] Jer. iv. 19. [3] Cant. vii. 12.
[4] Zach. iv. 2. [5] H. Synhedrin xiv. 12.

קלקלה השו(מ)[ר]ה גלו ממקום למקום וכו׳ וסופן לטבריא וכו׳ וקבלה היא שבטבר״ייא עתידים לחזור תחלה ומשם נעתקים למקדש וכו׳ · שמענו מכנף הארץ זמירות צבי לצדיק הנשיא האדון הנ״ל הז״ל זהב מכים[1] וסדר בכמה מקומות כגון בויניצי״אה ובאנקו״נה אנייות וסיועים לפתח אנקת אסיר ובני תמותה להוציא ממסגר ומבית כלא יושבי חשך הגולה הזאת וכ״ש ליהודים אשר מטה ידם ואין לאל יכולתם ללכת ולהוליך בתיהם שם ונטבעו בטיט היון עד שבאו מים עד נפש · וגם שמענו כי רבים נסעו ועברו על סיוע הקהלות והנשיא הנ״ז · ובפרט כי הוא מבקש אנשים יהודים בעלי מלאכות כדי לישב ולתקן את הארץ בישובה כי מה רב טובו אשר צפן הנה שכרו אתו ופעולתו לפניו ה״ ישלים פעולו וירוממהו וינדלהו כרצונו וכרצון בני ביתו ואהביו לפני שמש ינון שמו אשר בשמענו שמח לבנו ויגל כבודינו אף בשרינו · ולשמועתו שמחה אחזתנו ואז לב טהור ברא לנו אלקים ורוח נכון חדש בקרבינו ונתעוררנו כלנו בלב אחד כאיש אחד והסכמנו ונסד[ר] בינינו וקראנו איש לכל בית והלכנו לבית הכנסת ושם אתנו כמהר״ר מלאכי ג״ליקו איש ניפי הוא שכור מקהלינו ללמוד את בנינו ולדרוש לנו בכל שבת ושבת ולר(אפ)[פא]ות חולי קהלינו ובחכמ(ה)[ת] הרפואה אשר עמו וסדרנו דברים בינינו לדבר כל אחד ואחד ממנו את כונתינו על עניין נסיעתנו מפה לבא לדור תחת צל כנפי השם לצוויי האדון והנשיא הנז״ בטבר״ייא · וכלנו בלב שלם ובנפש חפצה פצינו את פינו במאמר אחד לתת סדר למסעה הזאת · אם מה׳ היתה זאת שיזמין לנו עזר ו(י)סיוע כפי צורך עניות ק״ק קו״רי הנ״ז ובראשונה בחרנו לנו ארבעה אנשים מארבעה משפחות שיהיו לנו מנהיגי׳ ממסע למסע הם ילכו לפנינו לתת סדר והכנה למקום המלון לחם ומזון לפי הטף והאנשים והנשים לפי הצורך שיצטרך לקנות ולחלק לגו המזונות : ומהארבעה האנשים הברורים בחרנו לנו שניהם שיהיו שלוחים מאתנו עד ויניצ״יאה העירה קודם נסיעתינו לתור לנו את הסיוע מה הוא וללכת בכל פתחי הנדיבים עם אלקי אברהם אשר בכל מ(ת)[ד]ינות הגולה ירחמו על קהלינו זה · ושם השנים השלוחים הם כמ״ר מיכאל בכמ״ר אהרן נ״ע וכ״מ יוסף בכ״מ מנחם תושבי קהלינו אשר הם בחרנו לנו יען היותם משפחות הנזונות מיוחסי ישראל אנשים אשר צדק אזור מתנם והאמונה אזור חלצם תמיד רעי׳ עמם[2] פנות יקרות[3] אצלינו ועולה לא נמצא בשפ(ט)[ת]ם ואשר כח בהם לעמוד על העניין הזה · ואליהם כל קהלינו בקטון כגדול ישמעון וישליכו יהבם וביוצא מפיהם אנו מקיימין פיהם כפינו וידם כידינו ולסור לנדור ולגזור עלינו כרצונם וכחפצם לא נסור ימין ושמאל מן הדבר אשר יסכימו ויסדרו כי כן נדרנו כלנו בדעות נפשינו בדלא אתיניסנא · ולראיית אמת מסרנו בידם פנקס חתום בחותם קהלינו וארצינו עיר קו״רי כי לב העם נתאחד ונתאפק לעשות ככל התורה וההנהגה והסדר אשר יסדרו השנים השלוחים · אשר שם בפנקס הנ״ל יוכלו לכתוב כל הנדבות אשר ימין ה״ לנו מכל נדיב לב אשר ידבנו לבו מכתיבת ידם אחד לאחד למצוא חשבון · וגם כן כדי להתעורר וללבן רצון לבנו וכדי להודיע לכבודכם כל מנין קהלינו

[1] Isaiah xlvi. 6. [2] Jer. xxiii. 2. [3] Isaiah xxviii. 16.

האנשים וביתם הי[י]מטפם ונשיהם כדי להודיע די ספוק סיותינו ולהודיע עלוי ארץ טבר״ייא בביאתינו נספר ונכתוב כלם בפנקס הנ״ל כאשר כתבנו למעלה למען ירוץ קורא בו ובהיות כי התעררות כזה לעת כזאת מה מאד דבר גדול לחשוב מחשבת ימי קץ הימין על רוב הסימנים הקהילה הקדושה הזאת כדי לחזק ידים רפות וברכים כושלות ולאמץ לב השלוחים הנ״ל נתנו מאמת פניהם כל אנשי הקהל הנז״ לחלות פני דרבנא דעמנא נר המערבי גלוסקא יפפיה נ(רכ)[בר]שתא דדהבא מוסמך בר מוסמך יין בר יין החכם השלם כמהר״ר מלאכי נליקו בכמהר״ר יעקב בכמהר״ר שלמה זצ״ל אשלי רברבי טובי ילך עמם לשלחם להאיר לפני השלוחים או״ר לשבת נגדם ללכת יומם ולילה בכל מקום אשר ידרוך כף רגליהם ואחר דבורם אם יצטרך הנה מעלתו יוצא לקראת כבודכם כי דבר ידבר הוא מלאכי הנ״ל לפני בא יום ה״ הגדול והנורא להשיב לב אבות ובנים על עניין הנדבה והסיוע להתעוררות קבוץ הגליות · ויקרא לקהלינו ה״ יראה אשר יאמר היום בהר ה״ יראה נסיעה גדולה כזאת · אשר לא היתה כמוה בזמן הזה מאז היו הצרות :

ולכן נדיבי עמים תולעת יעקב בעל פפיות רחמנים בני רחמנים (ע)[ט]לי אורות גורי אריות הכינו לכם צדה העניק תעניקו קהל קדושה וגדולה מנורנכם ומיקבכם ודעו וראו וזכרו ההוא גברא דיהבא שרי להההוא ענייא מאה זוזי כל מעלי יומא דכפורי[1] בצנורא דדשא כי היכי דלא להתבייש כדאיתא התם[2] · הגם מצינו שקודם שישראל יכנסו לארץ אמר דוד לפני הקב״ה עמך ישראל צריכים פרנסה אמר לו התפרנסו זה מזה מיד יועצים באחיתופל ושואלים באורים ותומים וכו׳ וכ״ש ובנו של קל וחומר סיוע להדריך ענוים במשפט מגולה אל ארצינו ולאמת ישרים דרכם דרך הקבוץ הגם להרים מכשול השמדות והמיתות משונות מדרך עמינו ואין אזן יכולה לשמוע ולא פה לדבר גודל מעלת מצות המתנדבים שעולה עד כסא הכבוד ומתקן הצנורות מדין לרחמים כדאיתא במדרש נעלם האי צדיקא דעלמא אקרי בהאי צדק דהיא אומנותיה ואיהו קיומא דעלמא ותיקון כורסיה דקודשא בריך הוא בגין כך כתיב וצדיק יסוד עולם וכתיב צדק ומשפט מכון כסאך ועו״ כדאמר[3] כההוא גברא לאתתיה בראותו ענ״יי לפתחא קדים להו רפתא וכו׳ עד כי בגלל הדבר הזה גלגל הוא שחוזר וכו׳ והתורה אמרה כי בגלל הדבר הזה יברכך ה״ אלקיך בכל מעשה ידיך אמ״ר :

קס״ח

אנשי חסד יראה אלקים אדירי עולם · מוספים כח בגבורה · מחזיקי בדק בית ה״ · לשמוע אל הרנה ואל תחנת אחיכם העניים והאביונים · הנה לשמוע אזן שמענו · וגם עדות ברורה ראתה עינינו · מאנשי ק״ק קורי׳ ישר״ו · מכל התלאות אשר מצאתם · והגזרות אשר נגזרו עליהם כמשפטי״ כל יחדיו בהם · וע׳ הנה אחרי רחמי ה״ לא תמנו · כספם וזהבם היה להם למגן ועתה עלי שפיים נשמע בכי תמרורים · כי הראשונות הנה באו והחדשות רבו כמו רבו

[1] Kethub. 67*b*. [2] Berachoth, 3*b*. [3] Sabbath 151*b*.

ואין לאל ידם כי תם הכסף ולא נשאר להם בלתי מחנה רחמים · ויתנו אל לבם לשוב מאחרי התוהו כי לא יועילו שאם יחי״ו ימו״תו · וללכת אל מקום ה״ צבאות ושאם ימו״תו יחי״יו · הם ונשיהם וטפם סך מאתים נפשות · ודעו אחינו כי טובתם רבה להציל את נפש אחיכם מן הדלקה · מזולת כי מהנסיעה הזאת תעוררנה לבות אחיכם כל בית ישראל וישימו ל״ה כבוד · וגם הוא ב״ה יוסיף שנית ידו לקנות שאר עמו אשר ישאר · ולא יוסיפו בני עולה לענותו · כי מי פעל ועשה הלא ה״ זו קוינו לו · והוא נותן נשמה לעם עליה ורוח להולכים בה · קומו משכו מגן · חזקו ואמצו אותם מאשר חנן ה״ לכם · ואל תרפו את ידיכם כי יש שכר לפעולתכם · וגם אנחנו צעירי הגולה ק״ק אנקו״נה ישר״ו הגם כי רבו עלינו מבוכות וצרות כסידרן ושלא כסידרן וכבד עלינו המשא לפרנס את עניי ערינו מלבד שאר האביונים והדלים הבאים מסביבותינו · מ״מ לא העלמנו עינינו מהם רק עלה עלינו אל ה״ בכל מאמצי כחנו · והאל הוא יודע · והנה השלשה אנשים האלה הבאים לק[ר]את מעלתכם הם אנשים צדיקים יראי אלקים · לבושי מעיל צדק ואבנט החסדים · ובא[ו]מונה לצורך הם הולכים ולא לצורכם · כאשר תוכל דמות תפארתם מהכתבים אשר בידם מהקהילות איטל״יאה ורומ״א ועדותם אשר נושאי׳ אתם · שם האחד מהם נחל נובע מקור חכמה · ונתעשר בשמא דרבנותא · ויהב ליה גולתא דרבנן הנשגב כמהר״ר מלאכי יצ״ו · והשני האנשים אחרים כתר שם טוב עולה על גביהם · ופה בקהלתינו יש אנשים מכירים היותם גזע נכבדים ותמימים · ופליגו זכים ומזוקקים לכן אחינו שארית פלטת ישראל הענק תעניקו להם איש כמתנת ידו כברכת ה״ אלקיכם אשר נותן לכם · לבשו צדקה וחסד · ולאנקת האביונים האלה עתה תקומו והיתה זאת לכם לעזרה וה״ ישיב גמולכם הטוב להריק לכם ברכה עד בלי די ותזכו לראות כבוא לציון גואל ובנין בית אריאל ועל דרכם יגיה אור ושלו׳ אמ׳:

CRITICAL NOTICE.

KUENEN'S INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Vol. II. The Prophetical Literature. 2nd Edition (*Leiden*, 1889).[1]

THE appearance of the second part of Professor Kuenen's inquiry into the origin and collection of the Old Testament books in a revised and practically re-written second edition is an event of considerable importance in the history of Biblical criticism. The work was originally issued between the years 1861-1865, before Kuenen had become a convert to the theories of Reuss, George, Vatke, and Graf respecting the chronological order of the component parts of the Pentateuch. The more popular "Religion of Israel," issued in 1869 and 1870, with a series of elaborate articles in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, paved the way for the new edition of the Inquiry, which the progress of Biblical studies and the author's own changed point of view had rendered necessary. With exemplary patience, Kuenen set himself to rewrite a long and detailed work, which an interval of twenty years had sufficed to render in large portions unsatisfactory or out of date. His object had been, and still was, to provide students "with a complete exposition of the present condition of criticism, which should thus not merely advance upon the basis of foundations laid long ago, and generally recognised as stable, but in which the entire edifice should be built up before their eyes." How faithfully that object was fulfilled as regards the Hexateuch, English readers already know. Although the investigations into the historical books were published (in one volume with the Hexateuch) in 1886, they have unfortunately not yet been translated into English. Now after a three years' interval there has appeared the second part of the work, containing the Prophetical books. It is to be hoped that an English translation of this volume, which deals with a more interesting portion of Scripture, may before long be undertaken. It would be superfluous to indicate the importance of a right comprehension of the Prophets in the study of all Biblical questions. But we cannot use these writings correctly till we can assign each part of them with tolerable certainty to its own age. Criticism has not been satisfied with a separation of the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah from the first thirty-nine, or of the first eight chapters of Zechariah from the last six. The questions with which we have now to deal are still more delicate; they even include discussions into the authenticity of particular verses in otherwise genuine chapters, or into the differences between the spoken and the written form of the prophetical work. In the last ten years, Stade's investigations into supposed post-exilic interpretations and editings of pre-exilic authors would, if all

[1] The Dutch title is *Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds. Tweede, geheel omgewerkte Uitgave. Tweede Deel. De Profetische Boeken.*

accepted as correct, destroy many a feature hitherto pretty unanimously attributed to the picture of pre-exilic prophecy. In Kuenen's new work these latest criticisms are themselves subjected to a critical test.

The book opens with a short introduction into the general nature and range of Hebrew prophecy, both spoken and written, as well as into the subsidiary means (visions, symbolic actions, &c.) of which it occasionally makes use. Except in so far as these introductory pages contain references to and refutations of König's extraordinary literalism (in his *Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments*, 1882), they are chiefly a summary of what our author has already said in his former more dogmatic work upon the Prophets, which is accessible to English students.

Before passing to the investigation of each prophetic book in its order, Kuenen explains that the prophetic writings and poems "were collected and preserved from destruction by the post-exilic Jews, or more particularly by the scribes of Jerusalem." From this fact follow three important results, which I here transcribe in his own words :—

"1. The collection of prophetic books by no means contains everything which was ever spoken by the prophets of Yahveh and afterwards recorded in writing ; what the scribes, from their point of view, did not recognise as the word of Yahveh, they could not include in the sacred literature of their people. How much they excluded cannot now be ascertained. But it is probable that most prophecies, which would have seemed to them unsuited for a place in the Canon, had already perished before their time.

"2. Just as little as we can be assured of the completeness of the whole collection, so uncertain also is our guarantee for the integrity of each separate prophecy. The possibility exists that prophecies, parts of which were accepted, could not be included either in their entirety or without modification. Between the pre-exilic and post-exilic period there lies a deep gulf, and our study of the historic books has already shown to us that despite, or rather in consequence of, its veneration of the past, Judaism was much concerned to fill up this gulf by the modification of the old records.

"3. The existing collection and classification of the prophecies and their relegation under headings which indicate their author and sometimes also his epoch, must not be blindly followed. The scribes, doubtless, frequently left both classification and headings as they found them, which, in these cases, possess the value of an old authentic tradition, extending even to the age of the original authors themselves; but the possibility that the scribes have here interfered in one way or another of themselves is always present, and must never be lost sight of."

In accordance with the general plan, these results are further developed and substantiated in the notes in small print, which follow after each short section of the book. It is clear that the second of the three is the formula upon which Stade works, and between him and Kuenen there is a difference not in principle but only in degree. From these three results, three critical rules for the whole inquiry are then elicited. The prophecies must be treated by (1) the historic situation they presuppose, the age in which the writer's point of view, his ideas and expectations are rooted ; (2) the comparison of the prophecies with one other ; (3) their language and style. These are the rules by which investigations into interpolations and reproductive or second-hand prophecies, such as Stade's, must be carried on. Kuenen will not allow that Stade has ever consciously been false to these rules of critical method. "But in our judgment of his critical studies we must consider

with all the greater exactitude whether as a matter of fact he has always remained faithful to this method, or has not here and there fallen into an *à priori* way of arguing, which, from every point of view, merits disapprobation and most especially from his own" (p. 25).

After twenty-seven introductory pages such as these, the writings attributed to each of the fifteen prophets in the Canon are investigated separately. A final section is devoted to Daniel.

The method of the book is to give first a short sketch of the life and times of each prophet, so far as these are known. Then the inquiry passes on to the contents and order of his prophecies, their genuineness, the occasional interpolations, the historic circumstances, the unauthentic prophecies wrongly attributed to the writer with whose genuine productions they are now combined, the history of their collection, etc. Thus, the chapter upon Isaiah contains 10 sections; (1) his life and times; (2 and 3) the genuine prophecies in their order; (4) the prophecy against Moab, 'edited' by Isaiah; (5) the historical chapters, xxxvi.-xxxix.; (6) the unauthentic prophecies in i.-xxxv.; (7, 8, 9,) Chapters xl.-lxvi.; (10) origin of the whole collection. A concise bibliography precedes each chapter. Kuenen is notoriously well read in the English literature of his subject; we miss, however, a reference to Cheyne's article upon Isaiah in the *Encyc. Brit.*, to his *Commentary* upon Jeremiah, and to Kalisch's elaborate study of the book of Jonah.[1]

It is impossible within the limits of a review to give a full *résumé* of an exhaustive work of this kind. I shall confine myself to—(1) the dates and sequence of Isaiah's genuine prophecies; (2) Isaiah xl.-lxvi.; (3) the minor post-exilic interpolations in the pre-exilic prophets; (4) a few other critical results.

I. The order of Isaiah's authentic prophecies according to Kuenen is:—ii.-iv., v. (partly, *i.e.* 1-24), xvii. 1-11, vii., viii.-ix. 6, ix. 7-x. 4, v. 25-30 and re-editing of v. generally, xxiii., xxviii., xx., xxi. 11-17, x. 5-34, xi. 1-9, xiv. 28-32, xxix.-xxxi., xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-xviii. (xxxvii. 22-32), i., xxii. 1-14, 15-25, xix. When chapter vi. was written is obviously uncertain.

Little difference of opinion prevails as to ii.-iv. They fall early in the reign of Ahaz (735?) and before the outbreak of the Syrian War; xvii. must also have just preceded the invasion of Judah. The events recorded in vii. relate to the year 734, the Syrian War. The authenticity of its main contents is maintained; though not written by Isaiah, it was probably the work of a disciple (viii. 2-16). Following an article of Budde's, Kuenen not only omits as glosses 8*b*. and "king of Assyria" in 17 and 20, but also 22*a* and 16. This last omission is based upon his interpretation of the famous prophecy in v. 14. For Immanuel—"of whom it does not by any means appear that he is of Davidic descent or destined to rule, and who must not therefore be identified with the Davidic Messiah of ix. 5, xi. 1-5—is through his fortunes and training the type of Israel's future and vocation; he grows up in a desolate land, which has become unfitted for agriculture (15*a*), and through this life of privation he is fashioned into a man after Yahveh's heart." Thus in 15*b* לרעתו (against Cheyne, but as the Vulgate and Authorised Version) is taken causally, and 16, which, taking it temporally, gives the words another meaning, becomes a gloss.

viii.-ix. 6 comes somewhat later than vii., but during the Syrian War

---

[1] In the March number of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Kuenen alludes with regret to the omission of Cheyne's article among the literature on Isaiah.

(734): it was written down when the blow had fallen (viii. 23, 2 Kings xv. 29). As regards v. and ix. 7-x. 4, Kuenen's view is somewhat different from Ewald's and Cheyne's. He holds that ix. 7-x. 4 posit the issue of the Syrian War (ix. 10, where the correctness of the reading עֲרִי is of course assumed). The conflicting nature of v. is accounted for upon the hypothesis that v. 1-24 was originally composed about the same time as ii.-iv., while v. 25-30 were added on the same occasion as ix. 7-x. 4, when Judah had already been invaded. xxiii. 1-14 is assigned to the reign of Shalmanezer IV. (727-723). This is not Cheyne's view, but is now rendered probable by the new reading in Niese's edition of Josephus (Antiquities ix. 14 §2), where *πέμψας* is changed into *Σελάμψας* = Salmanezer. Shortly before the fall of Samaria (722) is placed chapter xxviii. To Sargon's reign (722-705) belong xx., xxi. 11-17, and also, according to Kuenen, x. 5-xi. 9. Our author takes up rather a peculiar attitude towards this last prophecy. For while assigning x. 5-xi. 9 to the reign of Sargon, he strongly controverts the hypothesis of an invasion of Judah and a capture of Jerusalem by Sargon, an hypothesis maintained in England by Sayce and Cheyne, and in Germany by Kleinert and once by Schrader. Though this view accounts satisfactorily for x. 9, I must confess I do not see how such language as x. 11, 28-32, if written during Sargon's reign, can be accounted for unless the Assyrian expedition of 711 (Driver's *Isaiah*, p. 45) or 709 (Cheyne, Introduction, chapter xx.) was directed not only against Ashdod, but also against Judah.

After the death of Sargon, and before the invasion of Sennacherib, come the prophecies xiv. 28-32, and xxix.-xxxi. (after Hezekiah's revolt). It seems somewhat strange that Kuenen should say that xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-xviii., are "nearly contemporaneous" with xxix.-xxxi. For surely they imply that the invader has already reached the soil of Judah (Driver, p. 75-76). Into the complicated questions raised by Isaiah xxxvi.-xxxix., I cannot enter. Kuenen's concise account in Part I. of the Inquiry of the corresponding and more original chapters in Kings should be compared. It is pleasant to read there that with Cheyne he accepts the Isianic authorship of xxxvii. 22-32 (against Stade, *Z. A. W.*, 1886, page 179). After Sennacherib's defeat are dated i., xxii. and xix. i. is a *résumé* of Isaiah's preaching against the sins of his people, drawn up by himself and perhaps intended to serve as an introduction to a collection of his prophecies. xxii. 1-14 raises many difficulties. If the invasion of Sargon be denied, Cheyne (Isaiah ii., page 185) holds that there is no choice but to follow Cornill (*Z. A. W.* 1884, page 96), who, on the ground of its inconsistently severe tone, expresses a grave doubt of its authenticity. Kuenen, with two German critics as his predecessors, thinks the difficulties may be explained upon the assumption that Isaiah looks back upon the Assyrian invasion, the siege of Jerusalem, and the measures of defence then taken by its citizens.[1] He reproaches the inhabitants in that they then showed no confidence in Yahveh, and that now, instead of humbling themselves and showing repentance for their sins, they give themselves up to gaiety and debauch. Therefore they are threatened with death.

To this date, xxii. 15-25, which there is no reason to put before 1-14, seems to raise objections. For its curious prediction is supposed to have been fulfilled (?) by the time of Sennacherib's invasion, when

---

[1] A siege of Jerusalem, or an attack upon it is not mentioned in 2 Kings, and even contradicted by 2 Kings xix. 32, but this is not determinative.

Eljakim is over the house, and Shebna is the scribe (2 Kings xviii. 18). Kuenen argues ingeniously that when officers of state are punished (and more especially in the East) they are not usually given another though lower office as a consolation prize. He is thus led to believe that the author of 2 Kings xviii. is in error, that Shebna was over the house and Eljakim the scribe at the time of the invasion, and that thus the prediction of xxii. 15-25 falls, like 1-14, after the Assyrian monarch's inglorious departure from Judæa. The list of genuine prophecies is then closed by xix., the authenticity of which in its entirety is maintained, the ideas in 16-25 not being inconceivable in Isaiah's mouth, if we imagine that they were written some time after the events of 701, in the prophet's last years. These verses would then form his *Schwanengesang;* as Cheyne has said, we can hardly imagine a nobler or more fitting end.

II. It is unnecessary, at the present time, to follow Kuenen in his exhaustive proof that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. could not have been written either by Isaiah himself or by any writer before the exile. Seeing that Delitzsch, in the new (4th) edition of his commentary, has announced his conversion to an exilic date, it would seem almost superfluous to have once more established so certain a conclusion. But Kuenen gives valid reasons (p. 102) for the course he pursues, and certainly no defender of the Isianic authorship would deny the patience and impartiality with which every possible argument upon the traditional side is weighed in the critical balance. In the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, however, I hope that the unauthenticity of Isaiah xl.-lxvi. may safely be assumed.

Like Cheyne in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Kuenen shows clearly why we have also to abandon the unity of those twenty-seven chapters among themselves. They could not all have been written before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus in 538; many chapters, on the contrary, assume the existence of a restored Jewish community in Palestine. This second division was written in Judæa, just as the first class was written in Babylon (p. 143, with notes 9, 10). These general conclusions are shared by Cheyne, but the two scholars differ as to some of the particular chapters which are to be assigned to either division. Cheyne relegates lvi.-lix., lxiii.-lxvi., to the Palestinian division; Kuenen includes in it also l., li., liv., lv., lx.-lxii. The reasons, *drawn from the subject matter of these chapters*, why they are (probably, p. 138) to be dated after 536 and from Palestine, it will interest the student to read in their entirety.

"In chapter l., we are, as it seems, transferred to other circumstances, and a new circle of thoughts. Israel complains of Yahveh, who has rejected and sold his people; but the misfortunes which have befallen it are the result of its sins; the power of Yahveh remains unlimited (1-3). The Prophet, in the fulfilment of his task, is exposed to abusive treatment, but declares that he will endure unflinchingly, in the assurance that Yahveh will help and justify him. He encourages his spiritual associates (4-11). The struggle which is here alluded to lies outside the great question which was the order of the day before 538 (*i.e.*, the deliverance from Babylon); it would rather seem to have been waged in an organised Jewish community, *i.e.*, after 536.—Chapter li. gives the impression of being a consolatory oration addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; the condition of the town is gloomy; the number of its citizens few; yet they must not despair; their lot shall be as that of Abraham and Sarah, the ancestors of a populous nation. The exiles, whose return is announced in ver. 11, are not the first home-comers, but will increase the existing population, which, according to verses

17-20, had suffered much from various calamities. Before 538, Jerusalem could hardly have been spoken of in such terms.—Chapter liv. also refers to the extension of Jerusalem and the increase of her population. Verses 14-17 allude to foes, who are now already her enemies, and are preparing plans against her which Yahveh will frustrate.

"Chapter lv. ends with the announcement of a glorious journey from the land of captivity to Jerusalem, but what precedes is addressed to an already existing Israelite community, which ought to become conscious of its noble destiny and of its vocation to the nations, and should trust in the fulfilment of God's promises. If the community is not yet in existence, the prophet is guilty of a strange ὕστερον πρότερον; but if verses 12, 13, refer to the return of the whole dispersion expected by pious Jews after 536 (compare Haggai and Zech. i.-viii.), his train of thought is perfectly natural . . . . . Chapter lx. describes the future glory of Jerusalem, the return of the moral regeneration of her inhabitants, the service of the nations. There is no sign that of all this the very foundations must still be laid, in other words, that Jerusalem is still wholly unpopulated. Chapter lxi. assumes a partial restoration of Jerusalem: 'They that mourn in Zion' (verse 3) are comforted by the prophet; the captive exiles, whose freedom and release is announced (verse 1), are thus those Israelites who are still dispersed in foreign lands; the 'waste cities,' whose repair is still future (verse 4), are the numerous cities of Judah, which had not been occupied by the small band of returning exiles. Much the same is true of chapter lxii.: the watchers upon Zion's walls (verse 6) look out for the coming of her still scattered sons (verses 10-12); over against her future glorification in the eyes of the heathen is set—not her present utterly forsaken condition, but—her smallness and the reproach thereto attached."

Although these chapters are thus to be regarded as Palestinian, it does not necessarily follow that they were not written, at least in part, by the same hand which composed xl.-xlix., lii. 1-12 (and ? lii. 13-liii., p. 143). Kuenen is less precise as to the date of such passages as lvi. 1-8 than Cheyne. But while we may, if we please, assume that the author of the Babylonian chapters returned to Palestine in 536 with Zerubbabel and Joshua, and might possibly have continued to compose up to about 500, there are both negative and positive reasons why at least some of the Palestinian chapters should have been written in the fifth rather than in the sixth century.

"The Palestinian chapters show great variety of historic background, of disposition and of tone, which is less easily to be explained if they were all written in the short period between 536-500. In that case we should have expected a reference, at least in some passages, to the building of the Temple, and to the disagreement with the Samaritans. The internal quarrels in the community, reflected in some places, seem to fit better in the fifth century than in the early years after the return" (p. 146, n. 11).

Again, while on the one hand the mutual agreements of the twenty-seven chapters are sufficiently accounted for by the fact that they were written comparatively near together and from the same circle of authors, the difference of ideas, style, and language (as well as the difference in contents), between some chapters and others, makes their unity of origin extremely doubtful, if not entirely impossible (p. 145 fin.).

The following characteristics of the Babylonian group are wanting in the Palestinian chapters:—

(1.) The peculiar *reductio ad absurdum* argument against image worship.

(2.) The stress and insistence upon Yahveh's absolute unity.

(3.) The appeal to the fulfilment of former prophecies in proof of Yahveh's foreknowledge.

(4.) The ideal conception of Israel as the servant (עבד in singular) of Yahveh, and of his mission to the heathen. (עבד in singular occurs in the Palestinian sections only 1. 4-11, but he is there more than elsewhere identified with the prophet himself, who in verses 4-9 speaks of his own experiences and feelings. Compare the parallel passage lxi. 1-3.)

On the other hand, in the Palestinian chapters, "the servants of Yahveh," who represent an antagonism within the community itself, are frequently mentioned ; never in the Babylonian.

The verbal differences which follow (pp. 148, 149), need not be specially quoted, as one can put them together, with the help of Naegelsbach's index, for oneself. (By-the-bye, should not this index, which Cheyne has called invaluable, have entitled Naegelsbach's commentary to a place in the Bibliography on page 29 ?) Thus the conclusion of the whole matter is that "a part of xl.-lxvi., in particular xl.-xlix., lii. 1-12 (lii. 13-liii. ?) was written down by its author in Babylon before 536, and in that year was brought either by himself or by contemporaries of the same spiritual kin to Judæa. Here it was preserved, and became the kernel of a gradually growing collection. The original author may himself have added something, but the largest number of additions came from others, who formed one circle with him, or, in so far as they lived afterwards, kept its traditions in honour, and transmitted them. At a date which cannot be exactly fixed, but was probably not later than the end of the fifth century (for there are no clear traces of a later age), all the prophecies were collected together, and at least, to some extent, arranged (page 136, note 3). The redactor of our present book of Isaiah found chapters xl.-lxvi. in much the same form as we now possess them, and in that condition included them in his book."

III. The arguments by which Stade attempts to invalidate the authenticity of pre-exilic passages where the conversion of "many nations" is foretold, as well as of those in which the uniqueness of Yahveh's creative majesty is dwelt upon, cannot be cited here. Stade is always worth reading, and no one can safely neglect to study his papers on this subject in his *Zeitschrift*. The plan and limits of Kuenen's book unfortunately do not allow him to deal in detail with Stade's theological arguments. He is compelled to merely indicate the reasons when his conclusions differ from those of the Giessen professor.

One of Stade's most interesting essays in his *Zeitschrift* dealt with Micah iv. and v. Cornill and Nowack replied to it, and Stade rejoined. These chapters of Micah include the celebrated prophecy of the conversion of the nations, and the cessation of war, which is also found in Isaiah ii. 2-4. Kuenen's view is that both Isaiah ii. 2-4, and Micah iv. 1-4 (5 ?) are to be regarded as more or less faithful copies of one pre-exilic original, which has no longer been preserved to us. "Neither its form nor its contents forbid us to believe that it was written by an older contemporary of Isaiah and Micah." The note in small print (note 8, page 40), then shortly deals with Stade's objections as follows :—

"Stade maintains that the prophets of the eighth century have always one or more *particular* nations in view, and that although they mention now and then the homage to be paid to Yahveh by one or more foreign

peoples (Isaiah xviii. 7, xix. 18 fol.), the idea of a conversion of 'many peoples' or of 'all the nations,' is unknown both to them and the pre-exilic prophets generally. But in order to maintain this assertion he has been compelled to withdraw a gradually growing number of pre-exilic texts from the authors among whose prophecies they stand, and to regard them as 'secondary' or interpolated, sometimes moreover upon very weak or even worthless grounds. In this way he has to renounce Isaiah viii. 9, xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14, xxix. 7 (how then about ver. 8 *b*?) as well as Jer. iii. 17, 18 (*Z. A. W.*, iii. 14 f., iv. 151-154, 260, n. 1).

"We shall have occasion to refer to some of these suppositions again. But it is already apparent that they over-step the line between criticism and hypercriticism. Moreover, they do not attain their goal. For besides the passages named above, one would also have to omit Jer. xii. 15-17, xvi. 19-21, xxxiii. 9, Zeph. iii. 9 and Isaiah xviii. 3.[1] For is it not very noticeable that the prophet here summons 'all the inhabitants of the world and dwellers on the earth' to give heed to the great work which Yahveh is preparing to do? Is this summons so very far from the prospect opened up in ii. 2-4? We may unhesitatingly allow that that prospect only became general and a part of the popular faith in and after the exile, but this is no valid reason for denying that a single mind could have risen to it already in the eighth century."

Whether Amos, the first of the literary prophets, had attained the conception of Yahveh as the creator and ruler of all things in heaven and upon earth, is clearly a very important question for the history of Old Testament theology. Duhm, Wellhausen and Stade have denied it. Kuenen follows Robertson Smith in maintaining the authenticity of the passages in Amos where these ideas are introduced. He shows that although these verses (iv. 13, v. 8, 9, ix. 5, 6) can be omitted without harm to the logical sequence of the thought, this is not a sufficient argument on the strength of which to reject them. They are as it were ejaculations, and need only a psychological justification. Amos clearly had an open eye for the wonders of nature. The language of the verses is rather favourable to his authorship than otherwise.

"They would only then have to be rejected if such praises of Yahveh as the ruler of nature were entirely wanting in the pre-exilic literature. . . . But in order to assert this we must not only omit Jer. v. 20-22, xxxii. 17-23 (with xxxi. 35-37, which indeed lie already under suspicion), but also, so far as I see, Micah i. 2-4, which passage rests upon a no less exalted conception of Yahveh's power; perhaps also some other texts quoted in *Religion of Israel*, I., p. 41-67. It is true that these doxologies only become frequent in Deutero-Isaiah and in the post-exilic poetry. But it seems to me too venturesome to expel them for that reason utterly out of the older literature" (page 62, note 6).

In these two notes Professor Kuenen deals generally, though cursorily, with two of the reasons for assuming interpolations. But I have already indicated that he by no means attempts to clear even the authentic prophecies from all post-exilic additions. I will here shortly give some of his results:—

(*a.*) Isaiah viii. 9-10, viii. 23-ix. 6 are authentic (against Stade, *Zeitschrift*, IV. 260, note 1, *Geschichte*, I. 596, note 2, and II. 209), page 45, note 17. Of Isaiah xiv. 24-27, xvii. 12-14, the authenticity is also

---

[1] Some of these passages have indeed been "obelised" by Stade already. For Jer. xii. 15-17 see *Geschichte*, Vol. I., page 676 *n.*; for xvi. 19-21, xxxiii. 9, *ibid.*, page 646 *n.*, and for Zeph. iii., page 644, note 3.

maintained against Stade (page 61, note 12). But xxiii. 15-18, is a late addition to xxiii. 1-14, influenced by Jer. xxv. 11, xxix. 10, and probably post-exilic (page 49 and note 24.)

(*b.*) Isaiah xi. 10-xii., in accordance with Stade, and some older critics, are regarded as an exilic expansion of x. 5-34, xi. 1-9 (page 55, and note 7, page 57[1]).

The "secondary" prophecies and passages in Jeremiah, according to Stade, make up a goodly quantity (see his *Geschichte*, vol. I. page 646, note 1, 676, note 1. *Z. A. W.*, iii. 14, iv. 151-154, v. 175, note 1).

According to Kuenen, the interpolated passages in i.-xxiv., xxvi.-xlv. are :—

(*a.*) ix. 22-25 probably, page 181 and note 11.

(*b.*) x. 1-16 are in the manner of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., page 180 and notes 8, 9, 10.

(*c.*) xvi. 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, xvii. 1-18 are fragments, some of which are of doubtful authenticity, page 188 and note 19 (xvi. 14, 15 are probably an early marginal note intended to soften verse 13 ; xvi. 19-21, on the other hand are guaranteed by iii. 17, xii. 14-17. xvii. 1-4, are certainly pre-exilic, if not by Jeremiah, etc.).

(*d.*) xvii. 19-27 belong to the period of Ezra (p. 174 and note 16).

(*e.*) xxx. 10-11, 22-24, xxxi. 35-37, xxxii. 17-23, xxxiii. 2-3, are probably, and xxxiii. 14-26 certainly, later exilic or post-exilic additions (page 204 and notes 20, 22, 23, 25). Of course the whole bulk of the remaining prophecies after these small passages have been removed was not written down as we now possess it by Jeremiah himself. Chapters xxvi., xxxvi., xlv. for instance cannot even be attributed to a contemporary, though their writer is in all essentials to be trusted. xviii.-xx. are also edited, and so too xxviii. and xxix., which are about, but not by, Jeremiah. Their author is, however, trustworthy (page 194 and note 7, and for xxxix.-xliv. page 210 f).

In the minor prophets, the authenticity of the references to Judah, both in Hosea and Amos, is maintained, except in Hosea i. 7 (p. 335, n. 8-10 ; p. 361, n. 6). Obadiah, and Jeremiah xlix. 7-22, have both excerpted an older prophet, perhaps a contemporary of Isaiah. Obadiah 1-9 are drawn from him ; 10-21 are probably post-exilic and of the fifth century. A minute investigation of Micah iv., v., leads to the conclusion that iv. 9, 10, 14, v. 1-8, 9-14 (in a more original form, because of v. 13) are Micah's ; while iv. 6-8, 11-13, and modifications in v. 9-14 belong to an exilic or post-exilic redactor. The discussion, though very condensed, is extremely interesting (§ 74, n. 5-9). Exilic are also ii. 12, 13. Chapters v.-vi. 16 belong to the age of Manasseh, while vii. 7-20, in agreement with Wellhausen, is relegated to the exile. As to Habakkuk, Kuenen concurs with Stade that ii. 9-20, is a later post-exilic addition (§76, n. 4-7 and §77, n. 9). Habakkuk iii. is not connected with ii. 9-20 (as Stade thinks, *Z.A.W.*, iv. 154-159), but is none the more the production of Habakkuk. It has been taken over from a collection of songs of probably post-exilic origin (p. 389). In Zephaniah, the whole of ii. including v. 1-3, 11, is not to be doubted, but iii. 14-20 is clearly not earlier than ii. Isaiah, and probably dates from the first years of the Second Temple. The conclusions as to Zech. ix.-xiv. will be summed up below.

IV. Space is wanting to give an analysis of Kuenen's chapters

[1] As to xi. 1-9 Stade's suspicions have gradually grown. In *Zeitschrift* III. 16, xi. 1-9 are regarded as authentic ; in *Geschichte*, Vol. I., page 586*n*, only v. 1-4 or 5 ; in *Geschichte*, Vol. II., page 210, not even these.

on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It should, however, be noted that he maintains the general authenticity of Jeremiah's prophecies against the heathen nations, although, of course, not that against Babylon (xxv., xlvi.-xlix., not l. li.). There is an intimation that Schwally's essay, which appeared too late to be considered in the Inquiry, will be replied to in another place. It is quite like the tried patience of our author that after he had just finished his analysis of these difficult and rather tedious chapters he should be willing, and even anxious, to begin a renewed study of the whole subject. If he does so, it is greatly to be hoped that the theological questions will be fully discussed. Schwally is clearly a disciple of Stade. No review of Stade's *Geschichte* has appeared in the *Tijdschrift*, and we are thus not yet fully aware of the impression made upon the great Dutch scholar's mind by Stade's more "advanced" views. That Kuenen is not prepared to follow Stade the whole way we have seen from his views upon Isaiah ii., and the suggested interpolations in Amos. It is clear that he lays greater stress upon the development between Isaiah and Jeremiah, and on the range of religious thought already attained at the end of the seventh century, than either Wellhausen or Stade. This we might infer from his *Religion of Israel*, and the treatment of Isaiah xxxii. and xxxiii. in the new edition of the *Inquiry* shows that the views expressed in 1870 are probably to a great extent retained. For although Kuenen is convinced by Stade's most able essay upon these chapters that they are not from Isaiah's hand (so that they will, in all probability, have to be added to the pretty considerable bulk of non-Isianic interpolations in the first thirty-five chapters of his book), he is, nevertheless, not inclined to relegate them to the growing mass of the post-exilic literature. He thinks they were written either under Josiah at the time of the Scythian invasion, or somewhat later (but before 586) with an eye to the Chaldæans (p. 87, n. 6). The doctrine of individual retribution, and that of the Divine Spirit as the needed cause of moral regeneration, must then be included among pre-exilic phases of religious thought.[1]

Whereas the tendency of advancing criticism has thus been to ascribe dates to writings or portions of writings later than those which tradition has attributed to them, there is one notable instance in the prophets in which criticism, up to within a short time ago, was pretty generally pursuing the opposite path. "Among the conclusions of Old Testament criticism, none has probably found so wide a circulation as the opinion that chapters ix.-xiv. of Zechariah were not composed by the contemporary and coadjutor of Zerubbabel and Joshua but are the work of one or two pre-exilic prophets."[2] In these chapters the tables were turned.

The apologists, who of course insisted upon the unity of the whole book of Zechariah, argued for the post-exilic, the critics for the pre-exilic date. Stade (though not without cursory predecessors, as he himself points out, one of whom was Geiger) was the first to subject these chapters to an elaborate examination, with the object of proving that they are not only entirely post-exilic, but also considerably later than Zechariah, Zerubbabel's contemporary, belonging in fact to the Grecian period, and that they were written by a single author. Kuenen, after a concise survey of the evidence (page 408-424), becomes partly, though only partly, a convert to Stade's view. The unity

---

[1] We shall learn more of Kuenen's present views when the second edition of the third part of the *Inquiry* is issued, and we see whether he still adheres to the pre-exilic date of Proverbs.

[2] The opening words of Stade's essay in the *Z. A. W.*, 1881.

of authorship he rejects; chapters xii.-xiv. are relegated in their entirety to the Second Temple, but the proximate date is fixed at 400. "There are no definite reasons to go down lower into the Grecian period" (page 417 and *n* 8). In ix.-xi., the question is far more intricate; for while there are passages which are certainly earlier than the fall of Samaria, there are others which imply its capture. The connection of the thought is very broken throughout. It is impossible to account satisfactorily for these differences upon the supposition that the post-exilic writer has every now and then purposely clothed his ideas in archaic forms. We are driven to the hypothesis that in ix.-xi. (together with xiii. 7-9, which following Ewald is rightly connected with them), "genuine pre-exilic fragments have been preserved for us, dating mostly from the eighth century B.C., strung together, not unfrequently, in an awkward manner, by a post-exilic redactor, and enriched with additions from his own hand." (page 411.)

Thus ix. 1-8 belongs to the eighth century, with the exception, perhaps, of verse 6 (and 7 ?), if allusion is there made to the mixed population of Ashdod in the fifth century (Neh. xiii. 23 f.). ix. 10, 13 point to a still existing kingdom of Israel. So do xi. 4-17, xiii. 7-10, which probably allude to the occurrences after 746 (*i.e.*, after Jeroboam the Second's death). ix. 9, 10 is more like Isaiah (ix. 5, xi. 1) and Micah (v. 1-5) than post-exilic writers; ix. 11, 12, on the other hand, appears to allude to a more than partial captivity of Ephraim. (Verse 13, if the text be correct, has been worked over by a very late redactor). As to chapter x., verses 10-12 may be compared with Hosea vii. 11, ix. 13, xi. 11, xii. 2 (where Egypt and Assyria are also joined together) v. 2, with its mention of teraphim and diviners, would be inapposite after the exile. v. 5-9 must be later than the fall of Samaria (but not necessarily post-exilic). If these conclusions, extracted from the notes 3-11 in § 81, are correct, the additions of the post-exilic redactor must be confined to very narrow limits (ix. 6, 7 ?, 13 ?, 14-17 ?, xi. 1-3 ?). Kuenen does not give any list himself of these additions, and only speaks of the post-exilic date of ix. 6, 7 ? and 13 in its present form, if the text be sound. It is the perplexing arrangement of the fragments which best proves that they have passed through a redactor's hands.[1]

A review of a work constructed upon the plan of Kuenen's Inquiry is almost bound to prove unsatisfactory reading. It will, however, have served a good purpose if it induce those students who can, to read the book at once, and those who cannot, to learn its language.[2] For while it would be impertinent on my part to sit in judgment upon its merits, I may at least quote the verdict of Professor Cheyne, which, given to the first edition, applies with greater force to the second; it is "a book unsurpassed among introductions to the Old Testament for completeness, accuracy, and sobriety of judgment."

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

---

[1] Kuenen's conclusions respecting Zech. ix.-xiv. are thus very similar to Prof. Cheyne's in JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. I., page 82, only that the latter is inclined to accept the unity of authorship of ix.-xi. (as regards its post-exilic amplifications) and xii.-xiv.

[2] Wer heutzutage etwas tiefer in die alttestamentlichen Studien eindringen will, muss schon um Kuenen's willen das Holländische selber lesen lernen. Kamphausen in his Review of Stade, Renan and Kittel. *Studien und Kritiken*, 1889, page 186.

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

Analecta I.—English Massorites.—I am not going to overthrow Mr. Jacobs's cleverly constructed mosaic on some pretended English grammarians or Massorites. What I propose to give here is a few facts and data concerning some of them, mentioned by Mr. Jacobs (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, I., pp. 182 and 183). I hope that they will be of some use for clearing up many doubtful points in Mr. Jacobs's notes, and I am sure that he will take my documents into consideration, correct my statements, and bring them into harmony with his own, if possible, or else withdraw his ingenious combinations altogether. I am prepared to learn from him in this matter, and to accept his combinations if the contradictory statement can be explained away by him.

Let us first see what the date of Berechiah the Naqdan can be. It is certain that the author of the Fox Fables, Berechiah ben Natronai, called Crespia, is identical with the translator of the *Quæstiones Naturales* of Adelard of Bath, and the *Lapidarium*. I can agree now with Dr. Steinschneider that he is also the author of the *Matsref*—although the identity of certain expressions is not always an infallible argument—but probably not of the paraphrase of Saadya Gaon's *Emunoth v' Deoth*. I regret also that I have imputed to him two Berechiahs, whilst he speaks of two Crespias, one of whom was also called Berechiah (*Isr. Letterbode*, viii., p. 25 *sqq.*). On the other hand, Dr. P. Bloch (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte des Judenthums*, xix., 1870, p. 451) states that the author of the *Matsref*, who made use of the writings of R. Nissim the elder, of Solomon ben Gabirol, of Bahya ben Joseph, and of Abraham ben David, the philosopher, borrows nothing from Maimonides' *Moreh Nebukhim*, the translation of which was certainly current in Provence and France towards 1204. Thus if Berechiah Naqdan were the author of the *Matsref*, which Dr. Bloch does not admit, he must have written it when young, since we shall see that at the date 1250-70 he was called by his son an old man. It might be said that Berechiah was a tacit antagonist of Maimonides, and therefore neglects him; but this can scarcely be the case with the enlightened translator of Adelard's book, and the author of the Fox Fables. We shall now give the two colophons of MSS. by which it is made clear that Berechiah the Naqdan is identical with the author of the Fox Fables and the *Lapidarium*, and that he was in 1250-70 an old man. The first is to be found in the MS. of the Vatican Library (Asseman, No. XIV.), according to my copy, revised by Prof. Ignazio Guidi.

אני אליה איש רב פעלים בן הקרא הרב רבי ברכיה התנא והנקדן והדייקן
אשר אזן וחקר תקן משלים הרבה וברוך מבנים אשר נדב לבו לעשות ספר
יפה כזה אמן ויזכהו השם להגות בו חזק: "I, Elijah, a man who has done many acts (2 Sam. xxiii. 20), son of the reader, R. Berechiah, the learned, the punctuator and grammarian, who gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs (Fables, Eccl. xii. 9). And blessed from sons (Deut. xxxvii. 24), whose heart made him willing (Exodus xxxv. 21) to produce such a beautiful book. May God help him to meditate in it. Amen."

This MS. contains a Pentateuch, with Megilloth and Haftaroth, and the copy was finished Tuesday, the 10th of Ab, 5049=10th of July, 1289.

From the absence of the formula for the dead, which a son would not have omitted, we have a right to conclude that Berechiah the Naqdan and author of the Fables was still alive in 1289. Consequently, if quoted by Moses ben Isaac about 1200, Berechiah must have reached the age of at least 120 years, and this age would not have passed without having been mentioned by chroniclers. But we shall see in the following colophon that Berechiah is named by his son in the year 1333 also without זיל.

In the MS. of Berlin, Or. Qu. 9 (Dr. Steinschneider's Catalogue, p. 22), we read the following: חזק ואתחזק הסופר לא יזק ׳ אני הסופר והנקדן אליהו בן ה···· ר׳ ברכיה הנקדן והקרא והתנא והדויקן והחכם גדול והיועץ אשר אזן וחקר תקן משׁ[לים] הרבה ׳ ודבר על העצים והאבנים אבני מחצב איש תם וישר ירא השם וסר מרע ׳ ואני בן זקוניו כתבתי ונקדתי ומסרתי זה הספר בזעת אפי ׳ וביגיע כפי ׳ וביושר עפעפי ׳ וסיימתי אותו יום ד׳ באחד ועשרים יום לירח מרחשון שנת צ״ד לפרט אלף הרביעי במדינת רדום כתבתי אותו ׳ וברוך.... "I the scribe and punctuator, Elijah, son of [the master ....] R. Berechiah the Naqdan, the reader, the learned man, the grammarian, the great, wise man, and the counsellor who gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs (fables), and he spoke of trees and stones (1 Kings v. 12, A.V., iv. 33), hewn stones, a man perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil (Job i. 1). And I, the son of his *old age*, wrote, pointed and provided with the Massorah this book, in the sweat of my face (Gen. iii. 19), with the labour of my hands (Gen. xxxi. 42), and with the straight look of my eyelids (Prov. iv. 25), and finished it on Wednesday, the 21st of the month Marheshwan, 5094=30th of October, 1333, in the town of Dreux. Blessed, etc."

This colophon is indeed carelessly written, notwithstanding its being Elijah's autograph. We find l. ואתחזק for the usual ונתחזק; l. והדויקן for והדייקן; l. הגדול for גדול; l. הרביעי for החמישי. In l. after . . . בן ה, Dr. Steinschneider says that there are only two words missing, which represent an epithet, but not a name, as stated by some bibliographers. The words "son of his age" might mean that Berechiah was an old man in 1333, and in that case he would be born about 1240. Usually "son of his age" means that the child was born in the old age of the father. But if so, why has not Elijah's colophon of 1289 these words? רדום, which is the correct reading according to Dr. Steinschneider's communication, is a riddle, unless we could read דרום, which represents Dreux in Normandy (Bacher, *Revue des Études Juives*, xvii., p. 300 *sqq.*). This would be of importance for Berechiah's native country; but were there Jews in Normandy in 1333? It is not impossible.

Certain it is that Berechiah of Lincoln is not identical with Berechiah Naqdan (see Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, ix. 1871, p. 231), and that there was only one Berechiah with the epithet of Naqdan. He, in the year 1200, when, according to Mr. Jacobs, the *Shoham* was composed, could not have been more than twenty years of age, but was more probably younger, and not yet important enough to be quoted by a ripe scholar as Moses ben Isaac was, according to Mr. Jacobs.

Let me now mention another date, that is of Samuel the Naqdan. The MS. A. 1 of St. John's College, Cambridge, which contains the Pentateuch, the Megilloth, the Psalms, Job, the Proverbs, and the Haftaroth, was pointed by Samuel Naqdan for his brother, R. Levi, and finished on Friday, Sedrâ תצא, 5020=August-September, 1260. The characters are Franco-German. Can this Samuel be identical with "Samuel le Pointeur"

in the list of Bristol Jews paying tallage in 1194? Even admitting that there were two Samuel Naqdans, it will always remain doubtful which is quoted by the author of the book *Shoham*; but in the case of two Naqdans with the same name there would be a distinction made by the name of the father, or some other word. Of course the Rabbenu Samuel, the author of the grammatical treatise in a MS. at Berlin (Dr. Steinschneider's Catalogue, p. 101), is most likely Samuel ben Meir of Ramerupt (Rashbam). The French words here given by Dr. Steinschneider, טובייגא דאנץ ought to be read נובנייא, Novaine dans [cent], a ninth of hundred. Perhaps Dr. Rosin, of Breslau, who is an authority on the Rashbam literature, will confirm our statement.

Next we have to mention another person in Mr. Jacobs's notice. It seems that Isaac of Russia, who may be the same person mentioned in the Pipe-roll of 27 Henry II., was a pupil of Judah the pious, and a contemporary or co-disciple of Eleazar of Worms; whilst Isaac of Tschernigoff, from whom Moses of England heard that יבם means in Russian "co-habitation" (not, as Mr. Jacobs says, "brother-in-law"), is different from Isaac of Russia (see *hak-Karmel*, 1875, pp. 33, 34). It is scarcely to be believed that the explanation of יבם would have been given to a boy of 12-15. Neither of these two must be confounded with Isaac, son of Dorbolo, who visited Russia, but whose father was an older contemporary of Rashi (see *Israelitische Letterbode*, viii., (1883), p. 130, extract from the *Agudah*).

There is no difficulty about the date of בלגנצי, quoted in the *Shoham*, who is no doubt Eliezer of Beaugency (see, however, Nutt, preface to Eleazar's commentary on Isaiah, London, 1879, p. xxix.), and who was a pupil of Rashbam (died about 1158). On the other hand, it is not proved that Moses, son of Yom Tob, was one of the masters of Moses of England; we should rather take the epithet זמורי than as ומרנו ומו'; but is it certain at all that this Moses is the same who is mentioned in the Berlin MS.? Is it even sure that הר"ם in the Berlin MS. is the abridged form of R. M[oses]? It might mean Meir, Menahem, Mordecai, and many other names. לוניטרש is scarcely a corruption of לונדריש. And, after all, the postscript which states that the book of Punctuation is by R. M., son of Yom Tob מלוניטרש is only to be found in the Berlin MS., which is, if we are not mistaken, of the sixteenth century, whilst the MSS. of Munich, p. 53, Parma, p. 396, 2 and 764, 4 of the Catalog De Rossi (Oxford, p. 25, 21, 4, is unfortunately incomplete), have not this name at all. I may be allowed to say a word or two concerning the ספר הנקוד.

In the *Sepher hash-Shoham* the chapters on the punctuation are much shorter than in that published by Frensdorff (which is not complete), and that in MSS. In the *Sepher hash-Shoham* (folio 129*b*) are the following chapters:—

1. וזה יהיה משפט הקוראים יש לכם לדעת כי הנקוד נתן בסיני ולא שננקדו הלוחות אך כאשר דבר הבורא י"ש בלשון הקודש הבינו השומעים כל התנועות.

2. Agreeing with Parma and Munich, וזה משפט שכונת הנגינות, fol. 124.

3. ומי יודע ישוב ויראה הלכות גדולות בכלל הנקוד' יש לך לדעת כי ראוי כל התורה להנקד תנועת אָה בקמץ, fol. 116. Agreeing (with great variation) with the edition and the MSS. at Parma, Oxford, and most likely Berlin and Munich, fol. 128. דברי משה וכלב' כל אדונות ואלהות מנהג

יהוא ' כל תיבה שסופה אות י הוא כמו אה, *ibidem*. Moses Roti, Samuel Naqdan and Rashi are not quoted in this treatise on punctuation, but they are to be found in the edition, and in the MSS. of Parma ; indeed, the first name is only to be found in the Parma MS. n. 396, where we read the following words : ומפי ר' משה רוטי נשמע הטעם כי כל משקל חזק פרושו רגיל אדם לעשות אותו דבר (compare the ed., p. 4, line 8) ; and for Samuel Naqdan (ed., p. 2, l. 3 from the bottom) we read in the Parma MS. the following words : אך שמעתי מפי הר' שמואל נקדן כי כן משפטו, which would imply that the author of the treatise of punctuation was a contemporary of Samuel Naqdan. The statement in the *Histoire littéraire de la France* (T. xxvii., p. 487), that the author of the printed treatise is identical with that of Moses of London, on the ground that in both compositions of the book of Punctuation Samuel Naqdan and Moses Roti are quoted, is not quite correct, as we have seen. The identification rests on the quotations of these authors in the book *Shoham* (in the Lexicographical part), which are the same as in book of Punctuation in the MS. of Parma. Before continuing, I may be permitted to state that the Berlin MS. (Catalogue of Steinschneider, p. 54, 2) agrees completely with the Parma MS. 396, except for the passage beginning ויקבץ, and the other beginning סליק (see above p. 323). Now, that the book of Punctuation published by Frensdorff, and that found in the MSS. mentioned above, are by an author called Moses is certain from the words ואמר משה, "Moses says," in the MS. Parma, p. 396, whilst, in the MS. of the Bodleian, we read משה הכהן, "Moses hak-Kohen ;" we suppose the MSS. at Berlin and Munich have no name at all, since none is given by Dr. Steinschneider. Which Moses is the author of the book of Punctuation becomes doubtful from the quotations we have just given. Perhaps the name in the Berlin MS., ר"ם בהר' יום טוב is a corruption of ר' משה רוטי (ריט for רוט & ר"ט), made by the copyist of the sixteenth century ; or it is possible that Moses ben Yom Tob enlarged the treatise of Moses ben Isaac, his contemporary but not his pupil. For the author of the book *Shoham*, if he had abridged from his master's book, would have acknowledged it. Certain it is that the contents and the methods of the treating of punctuation in the *Sepher hash-Shoham* and in the edition of Frensdorff are similar to such a degree that the latter might be considered as a second composition of the former, as suggested in the *Histoire Littéraire*. Let me also mention here that it is scarcely David Qamhi who is quoted by the author of the *Shoham* by the words בן קמחי or הקמחי, as said in the *Histoire Littéraire*, but most likely Joseph Qamhi. It seems that the author of the book of the Onyx did not know the dictionary of David Qamhi, at least he does not mention it, though he had the opportunity of doing so when he complains about the incompleteness of S. Pirhon's dictionary. This would rather be an argument that Moses, son of Isaac, wrote before David Qamhi's dictionary became known, about 1210-1220. But neither does he mention the grammar and lexicon of R. Jonah, both translated by Judah ibn Tibbon, nor the refutations of Jacob Tam, which he must have known from Joseph Qamhi's ספר הגלוי (ably edited by Mr. H. J. Mathews, of Exeter College, Oxford), which he quotes.

Mr. Jacobs has found an Isaac, the son of Comitisse, married before 1168, and making him the father of Moses, the author of the *Shoham*, says that he was born in that year. Mr. Jacobs further proceeds to find the tombstone of Moses, who died before 1215, and on which we read the simple inscription, מצב[ת] ר' משה בן הרב יצחק היני. If Mr. Jacobs is right in his conclusions, Moses died at the com-

paratively early age of forty-five, being then already a celebrated grammarian; we should expect, in that case, some higher title than the simple ר׳. It seems, moreover, that Moses ben Isaac did not live in England at all, but only sprang from an English family, for he calls himself "Moses, son of Isaac, who is known as the son of the Comitissa who comes from the land England" (הידוע בן הנשיאה אש׳ ממדיני׳ אינלטירא); had Moses, or even his father Isaac, been living in England, Moses would have said Comitissa of London, or Lincoln, or Cambridge, according to her residence. "Of England" is analogous to the expressions ספרד, צרפת, ממדינת אשכנז which point to the origin of the family, but not the actual dwelling-place of the writer.

To resume my statements. Berechiah Naqdan seems to have composed his Fables before 1299, but not yet the *Quæstiones* and the *Lapidarium* which his son does not mention at that date. Berechiah, Moses son of Isaac, Samuel Naqdan, Isaac of Tschernigoff, seem to have been contemporaries, most likely in the middle of the fourteenth century. Consequently Benedict Crispi in 1193 cannot be identical with our Berechiah. Identifications which are based on the similarity of names are not justified at all if there is no other reliable ground for them. Ibn Ezra, in his introduction to the *Yesod Morâ*, written in 1158, could not have alluded to an English massoretic school, for the simple reason that there was none, at that time at least. Moses ben Isaac and ben Yom Tob were in that year not yet born, and Moses ben Isaac, if he had composed his work in England, would not have omitted to mention English Massorites before and during his own time. He quotes French authorities mostly, and Ibn Ezra alluded, most likely, to the same school, where we find Rabbenu Gershom, Jacob of Ramerupt, and others who copied Bibles according to the Massorah, and even a Massorah (Dr. Graetz thinks, that R. Gershom was the author of one Massorah, see *Monatsschrift*, etc., 1887, p. 30). Besides, Ibn Ezra wrote his book on his arrival in London after a lengthened sojourn at Dreux. Perhaps the commentary on Job (MS. Cambridge, No. 28 of the first volume of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's catalogue, 1876, see also p. 245 of the same work), which is considered to be by a R. Berechiah, and perhaps by our Naqdan, may give some clue to our questions. It was stated in 1876 that the MS. had been transcribed, and was being prepared for publication by Mr. W. Aldis Wright, of Trinity College, Cambridge. We are now at the end of 1889, and there is no trace yet of this publication. I think it, therefore, right to give the following extracts, which may possibly lead to the discovery of the author of this commentary. There are many extracts from Eliezer of Beaugency (see the above-mentioned catalogue, p. 41; the name of the locality is written מְבָאְיֶצי, folio 2 *a.*, שיטת ר׳ אליעזר מבלגייצי, folio 14*b*, and מבגאייצי), and Ibn Ezra. The quotations from the author's father are the following: Job x. 7 (folio 6*b*) והנכון כמו שפי׳ אבי ז׳צ׳ל עם דעתך כי לא רשעתי—xii. 4 (fol. 7*b*), ואבי ז׳צ׳ל פי׳ פִּיד הרגיל יָגל יְבוּל׳ והא נגלל ומוצא לאחרים בזה בספר שהוא — xx. 28 (fol. 11*b*), ענין יגון—וא״א בתרגומו לקושש קש שהוא גילו כי כל יבולו יהיה קש וכא״ע׳ אמ׳ אבי ז״ל בצאתי שער שהוא מקום רק מיציאתי לבדה׳ ליד השער ורק מושבי כאשר ראוני שהנערים נחבאו. xxix. 7. (fol. 15*b*), There is another quotation which may help us to recognise the author of the commentary, viz. from his uncle Binjamin. He says, fol. 8*b* (xiii. 27 על שרשי רגלי) the following: ודודי ר׳ בנימן או׳ אל שרשרות ששמת ברגלי תעשה חותם וזהו תתחקה

והוא העלה וקש היבש. Who this Binjamin was cannot be said off-hand; he was possibly identical with the Binjamin who made annotations to Joseph Qamhi's ס' הגלוי (see Mr. Mathews' preface), in defence of R. Jacob Tam, of Ramerupt, against whom J. Qamhi's book is directed; Binjamin, as Mr. Mathews rightly says, was probably a French Jew. It is possible that our Binjamin is Benjamin of Canterbury, who is quoted by the glossators. This was suggested to Mr. Mathews (communication of the 17th December, 1889) by Herr Emanuel Blüth, cand. Philos. at Tübingen; Mr. Mathews rightly adds, "as Benjamin of Canterbury was a pupil of Rab Tam, I think it quite possible."

POSTSCRIPT.—The preceding article was already in type when I received Mr. Jacobs' admirable preface to his edition of the "Fables of Æsop" (see JEWISH QUARTERLY, Vol. II., p. 182), in which he naturally has to speak of one Berechiah as the author or translator of the fables "about the fox." After having ingeniously identified the King Alfred of Marie de France with Alfred the Englishman, who, according to Roger Bacon, translated from the Arabic, Mr. Jacobs says he "can show that Berechiah assisted Alfred as the Jew Andreas assisted Michael Scott." Of course Bacon does not say expressly that Alfred had Jewish help for his translations from the Arabic, but the following sentences may possibly imply it. Bacon says (*Compendium Studii*, ed. Brewer, p. 471) as follows: "Unde cum per Gerardum Cremonensem, et Michaelem Scotum, et Aluredum Anglicum, et Heremannum Alemannum, et Willielmum Flemingum, data sit notis copia translationum de omni scientia, accidit tanta falsitas in eorum operibus, quod nullus sufficit admirari. Nam ad hoc quod translatio fiat vera, oportet quod translator sciat linguam a qua transfert, et linguam in quam transfert, et scientiam quam vult transferre. Sed quis est hic, et laudabimus eum? . . . Similiter Michael Scotus ascripsit sibi translationes multas. Sed certum est quod Andreas quidam Judæus, plus laboravit in his. Unde Michaelus, sicut Heremannus retulit, nec scivit scientias neque linguas. Et sic de aliis. (For Andreas, see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii., page 583.)

If so, Berechiah was at work as Dragoman to Alfred about 1200, and consequently he knew Arabic. Where he acquired the knowledge of this language to such a perfection as is necessary for translating a text written in rhymed prose (for Mr. Jacobs presumes that Berechiah imitated his Hebrew in rhymed prose from an Arabic original), Mr. Jacobs does not say. Alfred and Michael Scott had opportunities of learning Arabic in Spain and Sicily, or in convents, where monks from all countries were to be found. Berechiah had no such opportunity, for nothing is known about his visiting Arabic speaking countries; from Ibn Ezra he could not have learned it as early as 1158—besides, Ibn Ezra was not a great Arabic scholar—and much less from monks. In Champagne, in Paris, and in Normandy, the Rabbis did not know Arabic. It is true that Moses fils Isaac of England shows in his grammatical work some knowledge of Arabic grammar, the terms of which he uses in his *hash-Shoham*, but according to our opinion he acquired it in Provence, where he was most likely educated. If Moses was a contemporary of Berechiah, as Mr

Jacobs believes, he will have to tell us whence Moses derived his knowledge of Arabic. The style in rhymed prose is not a direct imitation or a translation from the Arabic, as far as the east of France and Normandy are concerned, but an imitation of Kalir and other liturgists, as well as of the school of Menahem-Dunash, Joseph Qamhi and others. Jacob of Ramrupt employs the same style in his *Hakharoth* without any knowledge of Arabic.

Mr. Jacobs now gives up the identification of Berechiah with Benedict Crispi of Canterbury (see above, p. 326), and this weakens his supposed Massoretic school of this town; he identifies him with "Benedictus the puncteur of Oxford," who paid a contribution to Richard I. on his return to (*sic*) captivity, as found in an unpublished document in the Record Office. Thus Mr. Jacobs assumes "that Berechiah lived in England about 1190 A.D., and was known among Englishmen as Benedict the puncteur." "If so, we can," Mr. Jacobs says, "scarcely imagine the two men, Alfred and Benedict, translating from the Arabic independently, and it is but the slightest step further to assume that Benedict (Berechiah) the Jew was to Alfred the Englishman what Andrew the Jew was to Michael Scott." Before I proceed with my comments, I shall give the Latin text concerning Benedict and Samuel from the document marked Exchequer Q. R. Jews, $5\frac{3}{2}^{6}$, which I have obtained through the kindness of Mr. Black of the Record Office. The following is the heading of the document :—

"Recepta denariorum facta apud Westm' de promisso Judæorum totius Anglie facto apud Norttampton post reditum Domini Regis de Alemania (not when Richard returned *to* captivity, but *from* captivity) intermissa in termino pasche anni quinti ejusdem, etc., de m.m.m.m. mille marcis."

Under Oxonia there is mentioned amongst other names the following : "De Benedicto le pointur xxvi. s. et viii. d. pro eodem."

In another part of this document we find, according to Mr. C. Crump of the Record Office, the following mention "Bristow per manum de Buckingē Samuel le pointur, xxx. s. iiij.d." In the word "pointur," the letters *p*, *o*, *t*, *u*, and *r* are certain according to the authority of Mr. Crump, the *i* and *n* in "pointur" form in the document, according to Mr. Crump, "three minims" which may be *ui*, *ni*, *m*, and *in*, and only the last combination gives a sense. Consequently the reading of "pointur" may be taken as the right one. Mr. Jacob, who reads *punctr*, takes the word as a translation of *Naqdan*, "who puts the vowel points," and accordingly Benedict and Samuel the pointur are identical with Berechiah and Samuel the Naqdan. We have seen (above, page 323) that a Samuel Naqdan lived in the middle of the thirteenth century, and that two Samuel Naqdans would have been distinguished by late writers. Is it certain that "pointur" means what Mr. Jacobs assumes? This epithet "pointeur" means according to M. Godefroy (*Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue francaise*, etc., Paris, 1881, letter P, page 255a), "Officier publique, chargé d'imposer les taxes et les impots." And if I am right in my reading of the Shtar No. 136) in Mr. Davis' *Hebrew Deeds, etc.* (page 278), such a functionary existed amongst the Jews, of which the Hebrew name is נוקד. I read line 12 of this Shtar אם קבלת [נוקדים] הלבן והודיעני ע"י [נ משה] רק שלום שום דבר מן המס. And even if it could be admitted that "pointur" is a translation of Naqdan, it is doubtful whether in his youth Berechiah had already acquired the epithet of Naqdan. According to M. Godefroy (*op. cit.*, P. page 62*b*.) "pointeur" might also mean a painter; but the Jews scarcely exercised this profession, which is contrary to the Rabbinical law.

On no surer basis stands the argument concerning "a tradition that Oxford Jews helped towards the foundation of the University of this town." Mr. Jacobs does not give his source for this tradition; if it is derived from Anthony Wood, it has certainly no solid basis (see *Notes on Oxford Jews*, in the *Collectanea II.*, published by the Oxford Historical Society, p. 286 *sqq.*). I raise another question, viz., Is it really certain that Alfred made his translations in England? Michael Scott made his elsewhere. When Mr. Jacobs adduces as an argument for Berechiah's English nationality and his early date that his other translation is the work of an Englishman of the twelfth century, *The Quæstiones Naturales*, of Adelard of Bath, he forgets that he also translated the *Lapidarium* from the French, and that the translators of Avicenna, for instance, were not of the town of Rai, and not contemporaries of his. Kalonymos of Arles and Avignon was neither a countryman of Averroes nor his contemporary. Mr. Jacobs also adduces as an argument for his thesis that "the authorities Berachiah chiefly quotes, Abraham Ibn Ezra and Solomon Parchon (rather Pirhon), are those generally quoted by English Jews." Generally? There exists one work only, and that by the supposed Englishman, *i.e.*, the book of Moses, son of Isaac (see above, page 325), in his *Hash-Shoham*, where the author quotes many more authorities than the two mentioned. It is true that the translator of the *Image du Monde* also quotes Abraham Ibn Ezra, but Mr. Jacobs does not accept Hagin as the translator of it (see *Papers read at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 1888, p. 47). A further statement of Mr. Jacobs to the effect that England was the seat of a School of Punctuators of the twelfth century, I have tried to refute above (page 326). I am amazed at another argument of Mr. Jacobs, which is the following: he says, "Berachiah sometimes uses French, the ordinary language of the English Jews at this period and later, and London was the chief centre of the French-speaking world under the Angevin kings." What then was the language in Normandy, Paris, and the Champagne? Not French, with Rashi's 2,500 French glosses for the Bible and the Talmud, which glosses were continued in a modified form by the *Tosafists*, and finally put in the shape of vocabularies (see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii., pp. 488 *sqq*). The same language is used by Nathan, the Official of Chinon, in controversies with the clergy, whilst a number of French words are to be found in the works of Moses of Coucy and Isaac of Corbeil. But the next argument is certainly the weakest. Here Mr. Jacobs says that "because a MS. which is seemingly the oldest manuscript of the fables (this is not proved at all) once belonged to Cotton, it is probably one of the few Hebrew MSS. belonging to the early Jews of England which have never left England." Many a thing is probable, but for history we want well-founded arguments and not probabilities. To me it seems that Berechiah and Moses son of Isaac were contemporaries, and lived about 1240 in France, and perhaps for some time in Provence. Here Berechiah perhaps acquired the capacity for writing good and pure Hebrew in prose and in rhymed prose, and Moses his grammatical knowledge, based upon the principle of Arabic grammarians. Berechiah's free adaptation of *The Fox Fables* seems to me based upon Marie de France or else on a Provençal text. If, sooner or later, documents should be discovered in favour of Dr. Steinschneider's opinion, which I follow, Mr. Jacobs's preface will nevertheless remain one of the best expositions of the migration of Æsop's Fables.

Speaking of supposed Anglo-Jewish learned men, I may be allowed to give an extract from the Paris-Hebrew MS. No. 4543, which is described in the Catalogue of 1866 as follows: "*Fragments des Tosaphots et de*

divers Commentaires sur le Talmud." On the fly-leaf of this MS. we read: לקוטות מחדושין על קצת הלכות בבא מציעא ויבמות וחדושי גטין וגורניש משבועות מחולין וקנדריסים אחרים. Jacob Etlinger, in his *Novellae* on *Yebamoth* (Altona, 1850), entitled, ערוך לנר, refers to the Paris MS., according to a MS. note of the late Dr. Zunz, found by Mr. Schechter. Here we twice see the name of גורניש, and not נורניש, "Norwich," and I repeat that there were no Tosaphoth of Norwich, and that no wise men of this town are mentioned in *Commentaries on the Talmud*, except R. Elijah of England, who may be identical with the Poet of Norwich.

A. NEUBAUER.

By the kindness of the editors I have been enabled to see the foregoing reply of Dr. Neubauer to some suggestions of mine, and by a still further extension of their courtesy append my rejoinder to his demurrer without waiting for the lapse of three months. The facts in dispute are these: There is an important Hebrew grammar and dictionary named *The Onyx Book* (ס' השהם) written by "Moses ben Isaac known as the son of Hanassiah who is of the land England" (why does Dr. Neubauer insert "comes"?). The author quotes, among others, Joseph Kimchi, Solomon Parchon, Eliezer of Beaugency, Moses ben Yomtob, Isaac of Tchernigof, Samuel Nakdan, Berachyah Nakdan (I venture to use the old-fashioned spelling of these names). Now of these authorities we know for certain the dates of the first four, that they are all of the latter end of the twelfth century, nor does Moses quote any authority known to be of later date. That is by itself a presumption that the last three writers are also of the end of the twelfth century, and accordingly I was enabled to identify them with Jews mentioned in the English records just about that date, and also produced evidence of an Isaac son of Comitissa (which Dr. Neubauer has accepted as a suitable "Christian" name for Hanassiah) being married in Lincoln in the middle of the twelfth century: he would be the father of R. Moses ben Isaac. All this hangs together, and I cannot see anything in what Dr. Neubauer produces which shakes its consistency. In fact, much that he brings forward, with his usual thoroughness and fairness, is only confirmatory of my position. Thus he grants that it is strange that Moses does not know of David Kimchi's dictionary, known about 1210-20, which he would have naturally referred to when speaking of Solomon Parchon's. Again, he allows that it is strange Berachyah never uses the *Moreh* of Maimonides, known in N. Europe about 1204. And finally he adopts Mr. Mathews' suggestion that Berachyah was a nephew of R. Benjamin of Canterbury, whose *floruit* is 1170 A.D. All these facts agree with my dating, and conflict with Dr. Neubauer's curious view that Moses of England's book was written in Provence about 1240, a view for which he does not bring forward any evidence beyond the fact that Moses knew some Arabic.

There are really only two points in Dr. Neubauer's long excursus which seem to me to bear at all adversely on the suggestions I have made: (1.) Isaac of Tchernigof quoted by Moses ben Isaac is different from the Isaac of Russia, whom I discovered in England, mentioned in the Pipe Roll of 1180 (see my letter in the *Academy*, Jan. 12, 1889). So

says Dr. Neubauer, and refers us to the Hebrew journal *Carmel* for 1875. The said journal is not accessible to me, nor probably to anyone except a few librarians in Europe ; and until Dr. Neubauer tells us what is contained there, I for one shall doubt that two different Jews coming all the way from Russia to England bore the same name Isaac.

(2.) The two colophons written by Berachyah's son, Elijah, appear at first sight to date *Elijah* towards the latter end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century. I was, of course, acquainted with the substance of these as given by Dr. Steinschneider, *Heb. Bibl.*, xiii. 83, but all they implied was that Elijah in 1289 was a professional scribe, and was, therefore, at least thirty years old, and was born somewhere between 1230 and 1260, when his father was an old man. Berachyah was, therefore, born between 1160 and 1200 according to the colophon. This was somewhat later than I assumed, but the earlier date 1160 would suit well enough with all my other evidence. But the other colophon as given by Dr. Neubauer is evidently incorrect somewhere, for the year is given as 4094 (= 333 A.D.) Dr. Neubauer assumes that the thousand is given incorrectly : I think it much more likely that the hundred has simply been omitted, and that the correct date is 4994 (= 1233 A.D.). This simple explanation resolves all Dr. Neubauer's difficulties, and, besides, agrees with history. At that date there were Jews in Dreux in Normandy, where Elijah states he was writing, but not in 1333, as all Jews had been expelled from France in 1301.

There remains only Dr. Neubauer's point about the omission of the formula for the dead, ז"ל, in the colophons of 1289 and 1333, which would imply, according to him, that Berachyah was living in 1289, and was, therefore, at least 120 years old, if my identification of him was justified. But it would also imply the same for 1333, when Berachyah would also be above that age, even on Dr. Neubauer's hypothesis. For the earliest age which Elijah could have been in 1289 would be 25, and his father must have been at least 60 when Elijah was born as "the son of his old age," and, therefore, Berachyah was 85 in 1289 and 128 in 1333. Q. E. D. The truth is, that the formula is frequently omitted, as Dr. Neubauer must know better than most men. On the same grounds at any rate I can show that Berachyah wrote his מצרף before 1180 (as is indeed probable enough) ; for in it he quotes Abraham ben David, who was martyred in 1180 (see Steinschneider, *l.c.*), without adding the formula even in the case of a martyr. Besides, it is likely enough that Berachyah was still living in 1233, when one of the colophons was most probably composed, as we have seen.

(3.) Against these two points Dr. Neubauer fails to perceive the significance of the date of Moses ben Yomtob. There can be no doubt of his being an English Jew, as his son Elyas was the great Elyas Pontifex Judæorum (of whom I have spoken, *Papers Anglo-Jewish Exhibition*, pp. 49-51, *Revue des Études Juives*, 1889, p. 260), and he quotes a Response of his father Moses ben Yomtob of London (Berliner, *Heb. Ged. Meir aus Norwich*, p. 6). Now Elyas was appointed Episcopus in 1237, and must have been at least forty at that date. This would fix Moses ben Yomtob's birth about 1160-70. Moses ben Isaac Hanassiah, the author of the *Onyx Book*, quotes him as his teacher (p. 37, ed. Collins), and I leave Dr. Neubauer to explain how this could have been if Moses ben Isaac wrote his *Onyx Book* in Provence about 1240.

Now for some minor points which are introduced by Dr. Neubauer in such number that it is often difficult to see the bearing of them on the general question.

(*a.*) Dr. Neubauer wants to know where Moses ben Isaac and Berachyah learnt their Arabic from if they lived in England. Why not from Mosse de Hyspan, a Spanish Jew mentioned as being in London 1186-94 (see my *Was Sir Leon ever in London*? p. 2). In retort I could ask, Where did Berachyah get his fables from if not in England ? for Dr. Neubauer's suggestion that they are derived from Marie could easily be disproved, and there is no evidence for assuming, as he assumes, that there was a Provençal translation of Marie. The fact that Marie has some fables (about half) in common with Berachyah is easily to be understood if Alfred and Berachyah worked together. That Alfred's *Æsop* was known in England is proved by the Middle English translation. That Alfred himself was in England is proved by his dedicating one of his translations from the Arabic to Roger de Hereford.

(*b.*) I quoted quite correctly Samuel le P*oi*nteur in THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, p. 183, and I also quote quite correctly Benedictus le P*unct*r in my *Æsop*. Dr. Neubauer confuses the two. His "Benedicto le p*oi*ntur" is wrong. It should be "Bn̄dicto le p*unct*r," as in my *Æsop*, and in the MS., which I have again consulted. Dr. Neubauer scarcely appreciates the force of the circumstantial evidence on this point. Moses ben Isaac of England quotes two men as Nakdanim: Samuel and Berachyah. The list of all the most important Jews of England in 1194 (which I am about to publish in the *Revue des Études Juives*) gives only two men as "pointur" or "punctr," and these are Samuel and Benedictus. Permit me to add from my knowledge of the English records that there is absolutely no evidence of an official named "le pointur" in the English Jewry.

(*c.*) I fail to understand Dr. Neubauer's amazement about my argument from Berachyah's French words. They prove he was not a Spanish, Italian or German Jew, and, indeed, I should not be surprised if they proved he was not a Provençal Jew, as Dr. Neubauer assumes without the slightest attempt to find any such references in Provençal records or Jewish literature as I have given for my identifications. The French words in Berachyah do not prove he was not an English Jew, for there is plenty of evidence to show that the Jews of England habitually used French even down to the time of their expulsion.

(*d.*) As regards certain subsidiary points, I only gave them as confirmatory presumptions, and Dr. Neubauer ingeniously tries to leave the impression that these were my strongest points. Thus I stated that there was a tradition about Jews helping to found Oxford University by their learning : Benedict of Oxford (= Berachyah Nakdan) would be a case in point. Dr. Neubauer is, he tells us, going to perform that difficult logical feat of proving a negative, and will show that there is nothing in the tradition. I can quite understand Dr. Neubauer thinking slightly of traditions ; but I have found by experience that a tradition rarely arises without some foundation. Similarly Dr. Neubauer does not see much in my argument from Adelard of Bath. But surely there is some presumption that persons do not select for translation works written by a foreigner two hundred years old. To adopt Dr. Neubauer's tactics, I might ask him how he knows that Adelard of Bath's *Quæstiones Naturales* were known in Provence in 1240. However, these are minor points, some of the might-have-beens against which Dr. Neubauer protests so strongly, but of which he himself makes such large use. The Onyx book *might have been* written in Provence. R. M. ben Yomtob of Lontres *may be* R. Moses Roti. Isaac de Russie *may be* another R. Isaac from Russia. R. Moses ben Isaac of England *may be* R. Moses away from England ; his father Isaac fil Comitissa *may not be* Isaac ben

Hanassiah, and so on. All this might be, but there is nothing in what Dr. Neubauer brings forward that obliges us to make these forced assumptions instead of taking the straightforward facts of the case, as they come out in the records and in Jewish literature. Indeed I fail to see why Dr. Neubauer refuses to accept such simple and obvious identifications which chime in with all the facts of the case and do not require us to assume that documents are wrong—a very dangerous assumption which only Dr. Neubauer's long familiarity with Hebrew MSS. excuses him for making.

Altogether, in order to sustain his objections to my very obvious identifications, Dr. Neubauer has to assume an age of 130 for Berachyah in 1333, has to slice Isaac of Russia into two, has to deny the English domicile of Moses ben Isaac against all authorities, including himself in the *Histoire Litteraire*, has to assume that Elijah wrote *four* when he meant *five*, and that he was living in Normandy in 1333 when no Jews were in France, has to assume without any evidence that the *Æsop* of Alfred was known in Provence, has to attribute an utterly unknown work to the Rashbam, has to transform Moses of Lontres into Moses Roti, has to assume that a writer of the fourteenth century never quotes any authority who is known to have written later than 1210—and all for what? Simply, to leave us still more in the dark than before, with Jewish writers using French words when there were no French Jews, and with writings that find no natural place in the history of Jewish or of mediæval literature. I still, therefore, remain of the opinion that when we find an English Jew, who is ignorant of all Jewish literature after 1210, quoting Samuel the Punctuator, Isaac of Tchernigof and Berachyah the Punctuator, it is not too hazardous to identify these with Jews residing in England at the end of the twelfth century and known as "Samuel le Pointur," "Isaac de Russie," and "Benedict le Puncteur."

JOSEPH JACOBS.

A New Volume of the Work entitled תורה תלמוד.—I published some years ago (*Revue des Études Juives*, t. xiii. page 229 *sqq.*) extracts from the Agadic collection of Jacob, son of Hananel et Sikeli (of Sicily), on Leviticus, concerning the Midrash *Yelamdenu* from the unique MS. in the library of Baron de Günzburg of St. Petersburg (Cod. 512). The Bodleian Library has recently acquired a MS. which contains the collection of the same author on Numbers and Deuteronomy, which, like that on Leviticus, consists of extracts from the *Agadah* in the Talmud and the *Midrashim*. This work is mentioned in a Yemen Midrash composed between the years 1484 and 1492. (See the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, No. 2493.) It is there said that Jacob went from Damascus to Aden; indeed, we find in the colophon of our MS. that he finished his work Thursday, the sixth of the month Tishri, 5093 = 1332.

Our MS. may, therefore, prove of interest for the edition of the great Midrash of Yemen, which Mr. Schechter is preparing for publication. I abstain, therefore, from giving Agadic extracts from it, leaving this to Mr. Schechter, who is more experienced in this matter than I am. I

shall only give the original of part of Jacob's preface, where he enumerates his sources. They are the following :—

ששה סדרי משנה ששים ואחת מסכתות : ששה סדרי תוספתא ששים ואחת מסכתות ; ארבעה סדרי תלמוד בבלי חמש ושלשים מסכתות : ארבעה סדרי תלמוד ירושלמי חמש ושלשים מסכתות : תשע מסכתות חצוניות ׳ מסכת שמחות ׳ מסכת כלה ׳ מסכת ספר תורה ׳ מסכת מזוזה ׳ מסכת תפלין ׳ מסכת ציצית ׳ מסכת כותיים ׳ מסכת עבדים ׳ מסכת גרים ובריתא דנדה : גמר (so) דרך ארץ ׳ דרך ארץ רבה ׳ דרך ארץ זוטא : סדר אליהו רבה ׳ סדר אליהו זוטא : חופת אליהו : בראשית רבה ׳ אלה שמות רבה ׳ ויקרא רבה ״ במדבר סיני רבה ׳ אלה הדברים רבה : מכילתא דר׳ ישמעאל : מכילתא דר׳ שמעון בן יוחי : ספרא : ספרי : פסיקתא דרב כהנא : פסיקתא דרב הונא : סדר עולם : פרקי דר׳ אליעזר : פרקי ר׳ מאיר : מדרש תלים : מדרש רות : מדרש קהלת : מדרש שיר השירים : מדרש איכה : מדרש אסתר : מדות של ר׳ אליעזר בנו של ר׳ יוסי הגלילי : מגלת תענית : ילמדנו : משנת המשכן : אבות דר׳ נתן ׳ הבהיר :

Jacob, who visited many Talmud schools in various countries, did not find the missing fifth part of the Palestinian Talmud, neither does he mention the *Midrash Rabbathi*, attributed to Moses had-Darshan of Narbonne, nor the *Yalkut Shimeoni*. But what is more astonishing is that he ignores entirely the *Zohar*, although he mentions the *Bahir* His omission of the *Tanhuma* would prove that this Midrash is identical with the Yelamdenu, except in the arrangement of the two.

A. Neubauer.

MAIMUN'S LETTER OF CONSOLATION.

TEXT.

THE MS. from which the text of Maimun's celebrated letter to his co-religionists in Fez is edited is one of the treasures of the Bodleian (Neubauer's Catalogue, 1315, 2). It is unique, and written in Arabic, in the Syriac Rabbinic character. The scribe was a certain Immanuel haq-Qatan ben R. Y'hiel. Nothing is known of the scribe, but I am informed by Dr. Neubauer that, judging from palæographic evidence, he would have flourished during the fourteenth century.

The ordinary system of the transliteration of Arabic into Hebrew is adopted by the author, in which the following points are to be noted: ת stands for Ṯa; ג for Ǵim; ג for "Ġain"; ח for Ḥa; כ for Ḫa; ס for Sin; ש for Śin; ר for Ra; ז for Zay; ד for Ḏal; צ for Ḍad; and ט for Ẓa. In the MS. the diacritical points are often omitted, and I have not held it to be necessary to place them in the edited text unless it was likely that misunderstanding might arise. I do not think that any difficulty will be felt by Arabic scholars in placing mentally such diacritical points as are omitted.

In the margin of the MS. there are Hebrew notes, containing, as it were, a *précis* of the Arabic text. These I have put in the margin in small characters. Over the Arabic words there are occasionally Hebrew translations. These translations I have appended as foot notes. They are not valuable, and do not seem to have been made upon any principle. They are probably from the hand of a later scribe.

The author or the scribe is guilty of the usual provincialisms. We find, for instance, that he writes, instead of יִרְטַ, to be awake, יקץ; לִפְטַ he writes as לִפְץ Such provincialisms will not be disturbing, nor will the use of the particle Lam without the Jussive.

I have made as few emendations in the text as possible. The emendations are placed in the margin, and will easily be distinguished from the marginal Hebrew notes already referred to. As instances of the emendations I have made, I may point out דִּפק for דִּעק; דִּעַן (humility) for צִּעַן. Where the same root occurs several times in different forms, and each time it has been advisable to emend, I have not considered it necessary to make the emendation expressly. Some of the Biblical quotations are printed with the curious punctuation of the MS., but I have not thought it necessary to do this consistently.

The MS. from which the Appendix is edited is marked 276 in Neubauer's Catalogue. It is also unique. It contains the Commentary on Genesis and Exodus by Abraham, the son of Maimonides. The extracts were pointed out to me by Dr. Neubauer. They are quotations either literal, as the comment on the Middot, which, on account of its length, I have placed first, or merely from memory from the Commentary on the Pentateuch by the grandfather of the writer, Maimon ben Joseph. The MS. is also written in the Syriac Rabbinical character, and was finished at Aleppo in the year 1375.

CORRIGENDA.

Proposed emendations have not been distinguished in type from the Marginal Notes of the original MS., as intended. I trust that this will cause no great inconvenience, as the former are in Arabic, the latter in Hebrew.

Page 2, line 26, omit first א in ואתתבוא.

Page 2, line 34, probably read הולה for הו לה.

Page 3, line 9, for אלו read אלא.

Page 3, line 21, for אלקיאם perhaps read אלקיאם, and translate "analogy" for "restoration."

Page 4, line 4, for ה read ח in ושרהוא.

Page 6, line 15, for ארתכר read ארתכב.

Page 6, line 20, leave out the נ in פהמונה, ועלמונה, and ותוקונה.

Page 7, line 15, leave out ה in אלתלאתה.

Page 8, line 2, for כ read ס in אכתחקות.

Page 9, line 28, for ח read ה in חאמנתי.

Page 18, line 8, for מדינהקד read מדינה קד (two words).

Page 18, line 17, margin, for לסטה read לפטה

Page 19, line 11, for שרחד read שרחה.

Page 19, line 29, for ה read א in ואדה.

Page 20, line 5, for אלעדדולא read אלעדד ולא (two words).

Page 20, lines 9 and 10, אגלנא should stand in margin as emendation. In text of MS. there is אגנא.

Page 23, line 32, for אנא read אנה.

Page 24, line 8, עמל should stand in margin as emendation. In text there is אמל.

APPENDIX.

Page 2, last line, for אלאכם read אלאסם.

Page 3, last line but one, for מסתחסו read מסתחסן.

Page 4, line 8, place מ before ת in ואלתמוליין.

ADDENDUM.

Mr. Schechter has lately been good enough to call my attention to a remarkable reference to Maimun quoted in Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, vi. 18. The passage which refers to the fabulous Sambatyon river is probably not genuine.

L. M. SIMMONS.

Exodus XXVIII. 28. Pag. 93a.

וירכסו במעני ירבטו קאל אבי אבא ז״ל אן מעאה אלאעוגאג מתל מעני והרכסים לבקעה לאן אלרבט לא יתם אלא בתעקף אלפתיל ודוראנה באלאעוגאג ואלצורה אן ינעמל זנארין מן תכלת טרפי אלזנארין פי חלקתי אלחשן אלתי פי חלקתי כתפות האפוד אלתי פי אספלהמא פרק מן חשב האפוד וטרפיהא פי חלקתי אלחשן אלתי פי נהאיתה ענד תדיי אלכהן יותק רבאט אלחשן באלאפוד בהדין אלזנארין מן אלנהתין באלד חלק פי אלחשן אלספליה וחלתקין פי כתפת האפוד ספליה איתאקא קויא לא יסהל תפריקה ולא יזה לא יתפרק.

Cap. XXX. 7. Pag. 97a.

והקטיר עליו אהרן בין אלנקל אן הקטרת הקטרת כשרה בכהן הדיוט וקו׳ אהרן תקדירה או אחד מבניו ויעצד הדא אלמנקול כון אלנקד עלי נדב ואביהו תקריבהם אש זרה לא תערצהם ללקטרת בין דלך אבי אבא ז״ל.

Exodus XIV. 8. Pag. 58b.

יוצאים ביד רמה וג׳ אלמתרגם נפקו ואלמעני פי יוצאים כארגין אי כמא נרגו אול ביד רמה כדלך בקיו סאירין ביד רמה ועלל דלך אבי אבא ז״ל אן פרעה כאן יחת אלסיר לתבעהם כמא נץ וירדף והם באקין עלי סירהם במהל והו שרח מסתחסן.

Exodus XIX. 24. Pag. 70a.

והנא יקול והכהנים והעם אל יהרסו אלדי ידל אנהם מסאויין פי אלמנע לגמלה אלעם ואלדי יטהר פי מא שרח אבי אבא ז״ל ען אלחכמ׳ ז״ל אן קו׳ הנגשים מענאה אלמכתצין באלקרב אלמעני ודלך מסלם לכן אן כאן לאקרב מוצע ואצלא פיכון יתקדשו בבואטנהם פי האל תקדמהם אלמעני.

Exodus XX. 24. Pag. 72b.

בכל מקום אשר אזכיר וג׳ קאל אבי אבא ז״ל אשארה לשילה ונוב וגבעון ובית עולמים.

Exodus XXI. 28. Pag. 75b.

סקיל יסקל לעל ינפהם מן סר דלך אן פיה קנס למאלכה באעדאמה איאה ואן פיה תאדיב ללנאס פי עטמה דנב אלקתל חתי אן יקאציץ עליה ולו אלחיואן אלגיר נאטק ולעל אלי דלך אשאר תע׳ בקו׳ מיד כל חיה אדרשנו כמא בין אבי אבא ז״ל מצאף אלי מא יקתציה שרחה אלדי תקדם לך ביאנה פי מוצעה.

Exodus XXII. 14. Pag. 77b.

אם שכיר הוא בא בשכרו שרח אבי אבא מורי ז״ל אן כאן אלשואל שכיר לצאחב אלבהמה ועריץ פיהא הדא אלעאריץ כרגת אלבהמה פי אגרתה ולם יגרם וכאצה אן תכון עוארץ לא יקדר ינגיהא מתל נשבה או מת.

Exodus XXIV. 14. Pag. 85a.

והנה אהרן וחור וג׳ לאבי אבא ז״ל אנה ע״ה אסתכלף אהרן נאיבא ענה וחור נאיבא ען יהושע והו קול יקבלה אלדהן.

Exodns XXVIII. 13. Pag. 92a.

ועשית משבצות וג׳ קאל אבי אבא ז״ל אן הדה אלמשבצות הי אלמקדם דכרהא פי קו׳ מוסבות משבצות וג׳ אעאדהא הנא אן אלשרשרות תדכל פיהא ותתרכב עליהא ואלדי יפהם עמא בינה אבא מרי ז״ל אן פי אעלא כתפות האפוד הלקתין תתעלק פיהא אלשרשרות פתכון משבצות מתל טבעות.

Genesis XLIX. 15. Pag. 45a.

וירא מנוחה אשארה לאיתארה אלראחה [נ״א אלריאסה] חתי אנה בסבב דלך יהון עליה חמל אלאתקאל דון אלאספאר וירגה אלדעה עלי עז נצרה אלחרב ודלך פיה שבה מתאל מבאלנה לאיתארה אלראחה באלצד מן חאל זבולון וקד קאל אלרסול ע״ה פיהמא הדא אלגרץ איצא שמה זבולון בצאתך וישששכר באהליך דן ידין קיל אנה תנבי בחאל דגל דן מצאף אלי כונה תנבי בחאל שמשון אלקאים מן נסל דן ודלך אן אלתקדם כאן פי אלדגלים לראובן ויהודה ואפרים ודן ראובן באנה בכור יעקב ולאה ויהודה לתקדמתה באלריאסה אסתעדאדה ללמלך ואפרים לאן יוסף בכור דחל ושני בניו שני שבטים ואפרים קדמה יעקב עלי מנשה ודן בכור בלהה פקדם עלי בקיה בני בלהה וזלפה ולם יקדם גד מע כונה בכור זלפה פקו דן ידין עמו עלי הדא אלתוגיה יעני בה יתקדם עלי עסכרה אלמצאף אליה אלדין הם עמו כמא יתקדם ואחד מן ראובן ויהודה ואפרים אלדי הם שבטי ישראל ולא ינקץ ען מרתבתהם פי אלתקדם בכונה בן בלהה אלתי הי שפחה הדא תלגיץ מא שרח אבי אבא ז״ל.

Genesis L. 4. Pag. 46b.

בית פרעה אנלא מנזלה וכאצתה ומן אדאב אלמלוך אן לא יטלב אלטאלב מנהם מא יכצה אלא עלי יד חאגב ולו אכץ כציץ ועלל דלך אבי אבא ז״ל בכונה אעני יוסף כאן אבל ולא ינאסב אדב אלמלוך אלדכול אליהם בזי אביליות.

Exodus VI. 10. Pag. 53b.

וידבר יוי וג׳ שרחה אן ביום דבר יוי אל משה בארץ מצרים כאן אלדבור הכדא וידבר יוי אל משה אני יוי דבר וג׳ ויאמר יוי וג׳ הדא גואב אעתדארה ע״ה בכונה ערל שפתים יעני מסתגני אן כטאבך לה באהרן אלנאיב ענך פי דלך וקו׳ אלהים תרגמה אנקלום רב ואנקל אן אבא מרי ז״ל מן לפטה ואן אבי אבא ז״ל מן שרחה ואן ר׳ סעדיה ז״ל איצא חסב מא הו מסטור פי שרחה אלמתסע מא מענאה אן אלהים אסם משתרך ללמלאיכה וגירהם ואלקצד בה הנא מלאך אי אנני אנמא אוחי לאהרן וגירה מן אלנביין עלי לסאן מלאך ביני וביניה ואסטה ואנת כטאבי לך דון ואסטה פה אל פה פאלמלאך ביני ובין אהרן אנת והוא נביאך אי תנביה עני במא יקולה והדה מן נדר אלתפאסיר.

ואכתר אלחכמ׳ ז״ל וגירהם מן אלמתקדמין ירון אן אלרסול ע״ה ארתפע תוקף לסאנה ור׳ סעדיה ז״ל ירי אן דלך כאן מן מצר בדליל כטאבה עדה כטאבאת דון תעביר אהרן ויקיל אן דלך מן גמלה אלאיאת ואלמעגזאת אלתי טהר בהא עטמתה ענד אלמצריין ויישר׳ ופרעה ואבי אבא ז״ל יבין פי שרחה אן בעץ אלחכמ׳ ז״ל ילום עץ קולה לה אשתהר בהא אן ארתפע תקל לסאה ע״ה וקת כרוגהם מן מצר ובעצהם ירי אן דלך וקת מעמד הר סיני ובן עזרא ז״ל יטהר מן קו׳ דואם דלך בה ואן אהרן כאן אלמעבר ענה פי כל קו׳ חית נין דלך.

מעהם מכתלטין וכדלך כל מן זיה כזיהם או האלה כהאלהם וסמיו איצא ישמעאלים ואלשאהד קו׳ פי בני מדין אלדין קתלהם גדעון ואכד סלבהם כי נזמי זהב להם כי ישמעלים הם ומדנים מנסובין למדן ומדינים למדין ואלכל בני קטורה ואלתופקה פי מא יגד מן מכאלפה אלניץ פי הדא אלתסמיאת אן כאן אלקפל מגתמע מן מדנים ומדינים ולעל כאן פיה מן בני ישמעאל איצא וכאן אלגמיע משתרכין פי שראה וביעה ואלמתולין אלשרא מנהם אלמדינים ויעברו אנשים מדינים סוח׳ וג׳ והם אלמסמאיין מע בקיה אלקפל ישמעלים לזיהם והאלהם כמא תקדם ולדלך קאל וימכרו את יוסף לישמעלים ואלתמולין אלביע איצא המאלמדנים ולדלך קאל והמדנים מכרו וג׳ הדא הו אלשרח אלדי ינבגי אן ישרח פי פשטיה דקרא ומא סואה תאויל.

Genesis XLI. 25. Pag. 35b.

ולאבי אבא ז״ל תעליל פי תכרה ללמשורה מע כונה לם יסתשר והדא מנתקד ולא סימא פי מקאמאת אלמלוך לא סימא עלי שכין מעתבר.

Genesis XLI. 34. Pag. 36a.

ותאניה מא קאל אבי אבא ז״ל אנה משתק מן אלכמס ומענאה אן יסתכרג מן גלאל דיאר מצר אלכמס קאל ז״ל ודלך אמא אן יכון סנה קדימה להם אן אלמלך יאכד אלכמס מן אלגלאל ואמא סנה אחדתהא ואסתגאז אחדאתהא למא פי דלך מן אלסהולה עלי אהל אלבלאד לכתרה אלאנאבה לגלה אלארץ ורכצהא פי שבע שני השבע.

Genesis XLII. 13. Pag. 37a.

ויאמרו שנים עשר הדא לים פיה תנצל מן כונהם מרגלים בל גואב סואלה אלדי קאלו ענה שאול שאל האיש לנו וג׳ ואכתצר אלניץ דכר דלך וענדסואלה ען דלך אגאבוה קאילין שנים עשר הדא נכתה בינהא אבי אבא ז״ל.

Genesis XLII. 22. Pag. 37b.

ולאבי אבא ז״ל אן קו׳ נדרש באלעבארה אלמתנאקלה ענדהם סלף ען כלף כעבארה קו׳ תע׳ לנח מיד איש אחיו אדרוש את נפש האדם.

Genesis XLVIII. 16. Pag. 42a.

ויקרא בהם שמי וג׳ קאל אבי אבא ז״ל מא מענאה אנה דעא להם באן יכונו עלי האל מן אלטאעה יסתחקון בהא לאן ינסבון לאסלאפהם לאנהם פי זמאן כרוגהם ען אלטאעה לם ינסבו לאסלאפהם בל נסבו למן שאבההם פי צפאתהם שמעו דבר יוי קציני סדום וג׳ והדא תוגיה גיד ויטהר לי אנא אן קצדה פי קו׳ ויקרא דעא להם באן יטהר פיהם צפאתה וצפאת אברהם ויצחק ויכון שמי׳ הנא מעאני או אחואל וכדלך שם אבותי והדא כאנה מתמם לשרחה ז״ל או שארח לה.

Genesis XXIII. 2. Pag. 13a.

ויבא אברהם וג׳ אלקצד בויבא דכולה ללמוצע אלדי מאתת פיה הלעא לפקדהא ואספא עליהא וודאעא לשכצהא עלי מא יפעל אלאנסאן מע מית יעז עליה והו שדיד אלתעלק בה והכדא בין אבי אבא מרי ז״ל ודלך בדלך עלי אן נדב אלאמואת ואלבכא עליהם סירה אלאנביא קדימא.

Genesis XXVI. 3. Pag. 17a.

ויברכהו יוי וקאל אבי אבא ז״ל מא מענאה אן פי קו׳ תע׳ כי לך ולזרעך אתן את כל הארצות האל דליל לנא עלי אלנאולה אלמנתטרה לאן ישר׳ לם ימלכו ארץ פלשתים פי מא מצי והו קו׳ והקימותי את השבועה אשר נשבעתי וג׳ אשארה למא ועדה ועאהדה עליה לזרעך נתתי את הארץ הזאת מנהר מצרים עד הנהר הגדול נהר פרת וארץ פלשתים דאכלה פי הדא אלחד וקד קיל פי ספר יהושע מא יעצד דלך והו מן השיחור אשר על פני מצרים לכנעני תחשב חמשת סרני פלשתים.

Genesis XXXIII. 17. Pag. 26a.

ויעקב נסע סכות ולים הי סכות אלתי רחל ישר׳ מן מצר אליהא כמא טן אבי אבא ז״ל בל הדה סכות פי ארץ ישר׳ או קריב מנהא ותלך פי נטר מצר וחדודהא ואתפק אסם אלמוצועין באסם ואחד.

Genesis XXXIV. 7. Pag. 26b.

ויתעצבו לאבי אבא ז״ל אן פרק בין ויתעצבו ויחר להם לאן מעני ויתעצבו אנתמאם ואלאנתמאם לא יקתצי חרכה ללאנתקאם.

Genesis XXXV. 4. Pag. 27b.

ויתנו וג׳ ואת הנזמים וג׳ ותקדם בביאן הדא אבי אבא ז״ל וקו׳ והטהרו אמא אן יכון אשארה לתטהרהם מן נגאסה עבו׳ זר׳ אלמעטיה או אשארה ללתטהר מן אלנגאסאת אלתי כאנו יסתנגסונהא לעלהם כאנו יסתנגסון אלנדה ואלקרי ונחוהמא אלי אן יתטהרו ואבקת אלתורה דלך וקד בינת אלתורה נטיר דלך פי מעמד הר סיני פי קו׳ וכבסו שמלותם.

Genesis XXXVII. 8. Pag. 31a.

ויאמרו לו אחיו וג׳ מא ראית הדא אלמנאם אלא ופכרך נאיל פי יקטתך פי אלתקדם ואלתראס עלינא אין אדם רואה חלום אלא מדרהורי לבו. ולאבי אבא ז״ל פי דלך אנהם קלקו מן אעאדתה אלמנאם עליהם וקאלו לה מא מענאה אן מן עיאדתך הדא אלמנאם לנא והפלך בה יסתדל אנך מתרקב מענאה מומל שרחה והדא שרח צחיח מסתחסי והו אלדי יפהם מן תעביר אלמתרגם פי קו׳ המלכו את מדמה לממלך עלינא.

Genesis XXXVII. 28. Pag. 31b.

ויעברו אנשים וג׳ קאל אבי אבא ז״ל אן סמיו בני מדין ישמעאלים לאנהם

ולא יעשה וג׳ פלמא קדם הדה אלמקדמה אלתי ילזם ענהא צרורה אסעאף טלבתהא אדראך נתיגתהא פאכד אן יטלב אולא מא כאן קד קצד אליה אולא מן תחצילה אלעלם במדותיו של הקב״ה פקאל ועתה אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך וג׳ יריד כמא קלת לי הודיעני נא את דרכיך אי מדותיו אלתי מקאבלהא פי אלנאס אלרחמה ואלקצאוה ואלרצא ואלסכט ואלמהל ואלמעאנלה ומא אשבה דלך ואדעך למען אמצא חן בעיניך יעני חתי אעלם חדוד הדה אלמדות ענדך ומא אנת עליה פאשפע אליך בהא ליכון דלך אקוי ואוגב פי אן אמצא חן בעיניך לתסעף טלבתי מתי אורדתהא בין ידיך הדא אלדי טהר פי קול הודיעני נא את דרכיך ולמא וגד תע׳ עלי ישר׳ פי קציה אלמרגלים וקאל תע׳ ללרסול ע״ה עד אנה ינאצוני וג׳ אכנו בדבר וג׳ ולם יתשפע אליה אלרסול ע״ה באלאבות בל תשפע במא עלמה מן מדותיו וקאל ועתה יגדל נא כח יוי כאשר דברת לאמר יוי ארך אפים ורב חסד נושא עון ופשע וג׳ פבשרה תע׳ באסעאף טלבתה בנין פציה קאל סלחתי כדבריך וג׳ תם רגע הנא ליטלב אלמטלב אלב׳ והו אסתדאמה חלול אלשכינה וקאל וראה כי עמך הגוי הזה ואלדי יגלב עליה טני אנה קד עין להדה אלפסוקים תקדים ותאכיר פיכון תרתיבהא הנא לינתטם אלמעני ויתגה אלנסק ולא יבקי תכלף פי מעני אכר יוגב אן יקול אלקאיל אד קאל לה פני ילכו והניחותי לך לם אחתאג אן יקול ובמה יודע אפוא וג׳ הלא בלכתך עמנו אן יכון תקדיר אלנסק הכדא בעד קו׳ ע״ה וראה כי עמך וג׳ וקו׳ ובמה יודע וג׳ פיכון נסק אלפסוקים ועתה אם נא מצאתי חן וג׳ ובמה יודע וג׳ ויאמר פני וג׳ ויאמר יוי אל משה גם את הדבר וג׳ יעני סואלך לי הודיעני נא וג׳ לאנני קלת לך מצאת חן וג׳ ואדעך בשם. והדה הי נתיגה תלך אלמקדמה פלמא חצל לה אלבשארה באסעאף מטלובה גמיעה חלול אלשכינה ותעריפה מדותיו טלב איצא מא הו אשרף מן דלך פקאל הראני נא את כבודיך וג׳ פכאן חקיקה יכון גואבה אולא לא תוכל לראות את פני וג׳ ניר אנה למא מצא חן בעיניו לם יבאדיה אולא בכיבתה ממא טלב בל לאטפה אולא בתטמיעה פי בעין מא טלב וקאל אני אעביר וג׳ פלמא דען ע״ה עלי אמתנאע דלך בתלטף חניד תבעה עלי סביל אלתדריג במא הו אקוי פי אלאמתנאע פקאל לא תוכל לראות וג׳ ואעלמה בבאקי אלקול כיף תכון אלרתבה פי חאל מא יחצל לה ממא סמח לה מן ראית אחוריו ליכון עדידא לדלך דרבא במבאשרתה.

תם כלאם ר׳ מימון ז״ל.

Genesis XXI. 16. Pag. 11b.

כמטחוי קשת מקדאר גר קיס ולאבי אבא ז״ל פיהא אלטית בדל אלתאו כאנה במעני כמתחוי משתק מן וימתחם:

Genesis XXI. 30. Pag. 12a.

ויאמר כי את שבע כבשות וג׳ קאל אבי אבא ז״ל פי שרחה קצד בשבע מנאסבה פי אסמהא לאסם אלבאר שבע לאנה לו כאן אלעדד אכתר או אקל מז׳ מא נאסב אלאסם ולו כאן אלמעדוד כבשים כאן אלעדד שבעה לא שבע.

Appendix.

חאשיה מן כלאם ר׳ מימון ז״ל.

Exodus XXXIII. Pag. 101a.

ויאמר משה אל י״י ראה אתה אומר אלי וגו׳ ועתה אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך יקול ז״ל טהר לי לפי עני דעתי אן מעני הדה אלפסוקים עלי מא אצף ודלך אנה למא אתפק מעשה עגל בעונות וקאל אלחק סבח׳ ללרסול ע״ה הניחה לי ויחר אפי ולם יכן תקדם חיניד מע אלרסול ע״ה עלם מדותיו של הקב״ה לישפע פיהם ענדה תע׳ בדכרהא ואיראדהא בין ידיה תע׳ פאצטר אלי אן שפע באלאבות ע״ה וקו׳ זכור לעבדיך לאברהם וג׳ תם שפע כמא קאל וינחם יוי על הרעה וג׳ גיר אנה לם יג׳ אלניץ אנה תע׳ אנבאה בצפה מעאנלה עקאבהם כמא קאל לה תע׳ פי קציה אלמרגלים סלחתי כדבריך פבקי מתוקע אלעקאב פיהם ואלדליל עלי אנה לם יעלם אן צפה להם דלך פהו קו׳ אכירא ועתה אעלה אל יוי אולי וג׳ תם קו׳ בין ידי אלחק סבח׳ ועתה אם תשא חטאתם וג׳ ובאלג וקאל ואם אין מחני נא וג׳ תם וקע גואבה מן אלחק סבח׳ מי אשר חטא לי וג׳ יריד עלי חאל אלמהל לא אן יעשה אותם כלה כמא כאן טאהר מן קו׳ תע׳ ואכלם גיר אנה לם יתבין ללרסול ע״ה אן קד צפה להם דלך פוקע לה אנה לם ישפע ואן אלדי אוגב דלך כונה לם יתשפע בגליל אוצאף אלחק סבח׳ אסתקלאלא באלנסבה אלי דלך לשפאעתה במכלוקאתה אעני אלאבות ע״ה תם אן אלחק סבח׳ זאדה עלי דלך מא אקלקה אכתר מן ארתפאע אלשכינה ענהם אד קאל לה תע׳ כי לא אעלה בקרבך וג׳ פתיקן בנמיע דלך אנה לם ישפע פנוע אלי תחציל מא ישפע בה מן אלעלם במדותיו של הקב״ה עסאה ימצא חן בעיניו אדא שפע בהא בין ידיה פתלטף ע״ה במקדמה קדמהא בין ידי אלחק סבח׳ תונב אסעאפה פי מא יטלבה לאנהא מן נהה אלחק סבח׳ לא מן נהה שפאעה במכלוקאתה ואשאר קבל אלמקדמה באכר מא יטלבה אעני חלול אלשכינה פקאל ראה אתה וג׳ תלניץ הדא אללפט כאנה קאל ע״ה קלת לי העל את העם הדא דליל אנך תעני בהם בעין אלענאיה תם אנך לם תעלמני חדהא ומקדארהא ואלטאהר אנהא קלילה נדא בחסב מא קלת לי ושלחתי לפניך מלאך וג׳ כי לא אעלה בקרבך וג׳ פלמא אשאר בהדה אלאשארה אמסי ולם יצרח בטלב חלול אלשכינה חתי יקדם אלמקדמה אלתי תונב אסעאף מטלובה ואלמקדמה קו׳ ע״ה ואתה אמרת ידעתיך בשם וגם מצאת חן בעיני מעני דלך אנך קלת לי הדא אלקול ואסתפאץ ענד אלאמה כמא אסתפאץ ענד אלאמם אן אמתך מצאה חן בעיניך ביציאתם ממצרים וועדהם בדכול ארץ כנען וינב תנפיד הדא אלקול מן חית לא איש אל ויכזב וג׳ ההוא אמר

אלי אללה עז וגל במא צלאה כיר מכלוקא ואגל מרסולא פלא אגל מנהא ולו עלמוא אלנאס מצמונהא ומא כן אללה פיהא מן אצול תאייד אלדין ותצחה אלאימאן לרסמוהא אלי נפוסהם רסמא מתל קרית שמע כל יומא וקד בינת לך אנראצהא עלי וגה אלאכתצאר לתהתדי במא אטהרתה ותקתדי במא בינתה ואללה תעאלי יהדינא אגמעין לפהם אנראצה ועלם מא אראדה ויגעל אלפרג פי איאמנא ויתבת מא ועד פי עהדנא ויניר טלמתנא כמא ועד וועדה אלצאדק ועליך יזרח י״י וכבודו עליך יראה :

וכן יהי רצון :

וכתב עמנואל הקטן בי״ר יחואל נבתוּיא.

סימן טוב. וסליחת טוב.

ינקלב מנהא אלי אלאכרי תם יעוד לבית אללה תעאלי פי תחית המתים יקעד פיה ויבכר אליה לאורך ימים י״י לאורך ימים. וחסידי ישראל פי ביתה לאורך ימים וכדלך ועד אללה גל וע אלקארי כתאבה כי אורך ימים ושנות חיים ושלום יוסיפו לך.

ומעשה ידינו כוננה עלינו. פי דאר אלדניא לאן אדא כאנת מעונה אללה ללצאלה אתקן עמלה פי אלטאעה ואנעמל לה אלכל לאן אדא מאל אלאנסאן ללטאעה כאן אללה מעאונא לה ומלאיכה אללה מעאונה ואדא מאל אלי אלשר פתח אללה אלשר ולם ימנע איאה פאדא רצי אללה ען אלעבד אעאנה עלי אלכיר ואן עמל חסנה נתג לה מנהא חסנאת כתירה לם יבני עליהא ואדא תנלב עליה יצר הרע מרה צעב עליה וגוה אלמעציה ועצמה מנהא ונגאה מתל אלסיד יוסף ובועז ופלטי בן ליש ואשבאהם פפי דלך דעא אלנבי להם וקאל ומעשה ידינו כוננה עלינו חתי נזכוא ללמואעיד ומעשה ידינו כוננהו. ענד אלרצא בעד אלפרקאן קד צמן אללה לנא צואב אלטריקה וקיאם אלדין ואסתקאמה עמל אלשרוע כקולה ואת רוחי אתן בקרבכם ועשיתי את אשר בחוקי תלכו ונו׳ וצמן פי אלעלם ונתתי את תורתי בקרבם ועל לבם אכתבנה ולא ילמדו עוד איש את רעהו.

שרח הדה אלפואסיק יקול אללה תעאלי אני אנזל תיראתי פי צדר כל ואחד מנהם ועלי קלובהם תנכתב חתי לא יעלם אחדא צאחבה כיף יעבד אללה בל כלהם יערפוני צגירהם וכבירהם והי מא דעא פיה אלנבי אלמכרם פינא קבל ופאתה. ופאה לים כופאה אלבשר בל גסמא מכרמא אכרם בהא מן נתה טאהרה לם תַּכְמֶד עינהא ולא גפת רטובאתהא בל כמן נאם אד תנלא עליה רבה עלי נארי אלעאדה פְּקַבל אלנור פמה אלטאהר אלמשאפה ללה אלדי נעל אללה אלפאטה אלטאהרה מנטרדה עליה וגעלה אלה לנורה לתויציל אלפאטה אלינא פאכתלצת אלרוח אלעאליה אכתלאצא קד עלמו חכמה לא מתל אכתלאין ארואח אלבשר מן אגסאדהם במארה אלמות ובל שי עלם כפי ואתצלת באלמלכותיה אלעאליה והו מגסדא בגסדא מלכותיא מתל מיכאל וגבריאל ותנאול חמדא ושכרא מתל תנאולהם ומא מן גדידא עליה והו מגסדא בנסם אלאדמי לה אלתצרף פי מא בינהם פכיף בעד דלך. הו קול אלרבניה אלדין פהמוא מקדארה ומא צה ענדהם מן עטים אמרה אד קאלוא ויש אומרים משה רבינו לא מת אלא עומד ומשמש במרום והו מא קלנא פלמא קדם שפאעתה תלא ברכאתה וזאת הברכה פלמא אכמלהא ודע ישראל וטלע וחגבה באריה אלי וקת ירצא ען אלדניא ויצרפה אליהא מעאונא ללמלך אלמאיד באללה ולי אללה אלמשהוד פיה בקולה בני אתה אני היום ילדתיך ובאקי מא קיל פיה פהדה אלשפאעה וטאת לנא טרק גמיע אלנלות אלואערה והי אלהצן אלמאנע אלדי נפר אליה ענד אלשדאיד אלי אנקצא אלאמר אלדי הדה אללה לפכאכנא ויפי בגמיע מא ועד בה תעאלי פתאמל רסאלתנא ואנראצהא יתם אימאנך ויצח יקינך וקד וצענא לך פיהא אצולא תעתמד עליהא לך פיהא אצולא כפיה תקף עלי מקתצהא פתצלה האלך מע באריך וינבני לך אן תכון הדה אלצלוה אלתי שרחתהא מחפוטה ענדך תקראהא קבל ברוך שאמר תברכא באלפאטהא אלטאהרה ותוצילא

אללה אשר יעשה אותם האדם וחי בהם ללמסתאנף ולדלך קצד צאחב
אלתרגום אלדי ערף סר כלאם אללה פקאל וְחַיִּי בְּהֵון בְּחַיֵּי עָלְמָא פענא
דוד אן אלמתמסכין באלתורה עין חיים היא להם לאן בהא יגדון חטא
ענד אללה ובהא יזכון לרויה אלמואעיד ובהא יסתחקון אכל עץ החיים
פיעישון אבדא ונצא גליא קד עמדוה דראסין אלנצוץ אלדין זעמוא
דרם אלמקרא ולא יפהמוא לכלאם אלנביא מעני קאל ומצדיקי הרבים
ככוכבים לעולם ועד. פהדה אלאנרץ כלהא אלמביינה אלגלילה
אלצאדקה נצהא כלהא אחכם לַפֶּתִי ומטלובה. שמחנו כימות עניתנו
שנות ראינו רעה. פאניבת דעותה וועדנא על ידי אלאנביא בתבותהא
כקולה יראה אל עבדיך פעליך והדרך על בניהם שרחה אללהם פישחר
פעלך עלאניה משהורא לעבידך וכדא ועד עין בעין יראו בשוב י״י ציון.
וקאל וראיתם וישש לבכם ועצמותיכם כדשא תפרחנא וקאל ועיניכם
תראינה ואתם תאמרו יגדל י״י וקאל וראו גוים צדקך וכל מלאכים כבודך
ואול ואעד הו תבארך ותעאלי קאל וראו כל עמי הארץ כי שם י״י
נקרא עליך ויראו ממך ואמא קולה והדרך על בניהם יריד בדלך ויכון
בהגתך עלי וגה בניהם ודלך אן אלגיל אלמפכוך אלדי יגי אלפרקאן
פי איאמהם לא יתבדל האלהם מן מא כאנת סוי פי אלדולה פקט
ואמא צורהם כאלדי כאנת ואגסאדהם פי אלאול כמא כאנוא כקולה
אז ידלג כאיל פסח ותרון לשון אלם *ואמא אלגיל אלנאשי בעד
אלפרג ישד אללה פי קאמתהם ואולך אתכם קיממיות. ושרחה אלרבאניה
קאמתין מן קאמת אדם אלדי כאן בעד טרדה מן גן עדן והי מאיה דראע
פתכון מאיתין דראע וישד פי צורתהם אן יכון עז אללה טאהרא
באדיא עלי וגוההם כקולה ונודע בנוים זרעם פהו אלדי טלב אלנבי
בקולה והדרך על בניהם ויהי נועם י״י אלהינו עלינו. ויכון אללה ונעמה
עלינא והדא אדא כאן אלמטלוב אלדי כאן דוד סאעיא פיה מדה עמרה
אן יזכיה אללה לרויה אלכיר אלתיר אלדי תתרוא בה נפום אלצאלחין
ויסרי עלם אלתורה פיהם פקאל אחת שאלתי מאת י״י אותה אבקש
שבתי בבית י כל ימי חיי לחזות בנועם י״י ולבקר בהיכלו. נקרא ונצלי
לנזכא בדלך לנרי נור אללה ואן נכון נבכר להיכלה בלגדוה כקולה לחזות
בנועם י״י ולבקר בהיכלו לבקר הנא אלתבכיר משתק מן בוקר לא מן
אלבחת מתלא לא יבקר בין טוב לרע ואנמא הו מן מעני אלתבכיר
פאמנה אללה ובשרה אנא יזכא אלי דלך וסיחיא ויעוד אלי בית אללה
מואצבא דהורא מדידה כמא קלנא פקאל סארא אך טוב וחסד ירדפוני
כל ימי חיי טול חיותי לא אעדמהא וסאעוד קאעדא פי בית אללה למדד
טול אלאיאם טולא לא ינחצר לעדד ושבתי ואעוד פי בית אללה והו
פי אלמקרא אתנין ושבתי בשלום ושבתי בבית י״י והי מן אלאעאדה
אנה יעמר פי אלדניא מדה עמרה בגוד אללה תעאלי ואחסאנה תם

* היתרונות והמעלות שיהיו לדור שיולד אחר הגאולה.

לם ירצי במיכאל ימשי וחדה קדאמנא בל קאל לה אד קאל לה הנה מלאכי ילך לפניך. קאל אם אין פניך הולכים אל תעלינו מזה. פיטלב מן רבה אלמעאוצה מן הדה אלנחום אלטואל במדה חדהא ויכון בעד דלך אי שיא נרגע ללנחום קד חלף אללה וקאל כימי נח זאת לי אשר נשבעתי מעבור מי נח עוד על הארץ כן נשבעתי מקצוף עליך ומגער בך. וקאל נשבע י״י בימינו ובזרוע עוזו וכו׳ פאי שי טלב.

*שאלה כיצד שאל מרע״ה ואמר שמחנו כימות עניתנו שירא׳ שאח״כ יש גלות כמו שאירע בד׳ גליות שעברו, שעברו צרה בתחלה זמן מה ואח״כ רווחה זמן מה והלא נשבע הקב״ה לשלא יביאנו עוד בגלות אחר, אחר זה הגלות כ״ש כימי נח וכו׳כנשבעתי וכו׳ ועוד הרי מצינו שימי הגלות קראם הכתוב רגע כ״ש ברגע קטנכו׳ ורועה יבקש שמחנו כימות עניתנו.

*תשובה לזה.

*תם אן גלות מצרים מאיתין ועשר סנין מנהא כדמה וֵדל ועדאב מאיה וניף שיא כאנת אלמעאוצה תמן מאיה ותסעין סנה וגלות בבל סבעין סנה ואלסעוד ארבע מאיה ועשרין פאן אלחסאב פי גלות מן אלף סנה ומאיה וניף או רבמא תכון מיאין פכיף יטלב משה שמחנו כימות עניתנו אנמא טלב מן אללֵה איאם באזא איאם אלישקא עלי חסאב אן נעלהא אללה ואללה קד געל מדהּ אלגלות רגע ענדה ברגע קטן עזבתיך וגו׳ הסתרתי פני רגע ממך וקאל חבי כמעט רגע עד יעבור זעם. כי רגע באפו חיים ברצונו *הדה כלהא שואהד אן מֵדהּ אלגלות רגע ואלרגע גֵזא מן אלמיאין מן אלסאעה פטלב מן אללֵה אן יעטינא סאעת ואיאם ושהור וסנין עלי עדהּ אלגלות עלי אן נֵעטא עלי כל רגע אלף סנה וניף ויגמע לנא מנהא הו אלדי יחוט עלמה תעאלי בחסאבהא אלאפא ורבואת לא תחצא הו יעטיהא לנא והו קאל עאמא יסע פיה אלאף אלאלאף בקולה וברחמים גדולים אקבצך ובחסד עולם ריחמתיך קאל עד עלמא ועד עלם עלמיא והו אן יעיש אלעאיש אלאפא ויבני אלמבני ותפנא והו באקיא בקולה ומעשה ידיהם יבלו בחירי. *ואנא אעתקד אנה פי קולה כי כימי העץ ימי עמי יריד בה עץ החיים אשר בתוך הגן אן אללה קד שהד אן מן אכל מנהא פיעיש דאימא ולים יכלק שיא עבתא פמנד נפי אדם ולם יאכלה פבלא מחאלה אנה סיוכל ואנמא למא שא אללה אן לא ינצלה אלאדמי אלא פי אואכר אלמֶדד כמא ועד בקולה כי מלאה הארץ דעה את י״י כמים לים מכסים וקאל לקרוא כולם בשם י״י לעבדו שכם אחד. אד עלם אן כל מן יכלק מנה עאדה לים ינצלה פאדא כלק שמים חדשים וארץ חדשה לם תותר תאתיראת אלסמא מא כאנת תותר ולא יועי טבאע אלארץ מא כאנת עליה בל נורא ֲבמד שמסא וקמרא ונצבהּ אלארץ עלי גיר נצבתהא צארת שמים חדשים וארץ חדשה ויאכלוא ישראל אלזאכיין עץ החיים כקולה ואכל וחי לעולם *והו גרץ דוד עליה אלסלאם פי קולה עץ אלתורה עץ חיים היא למחזיקים בה ולם יקול גזאפא לים כלאם אללה אלא תחקיק פלו ראינא מן קרא אלתורה יעיש אבדא לכאן תרי אלכלאם חקיקי פֶמד ראינא משה רבן שלכל הנביאים מאת והנביאים הלעולם יחיו פאין עץ החיים הנא אנמא ענא בדלך ללמסתאנף כקול

*שאלה כתיב עץ חיים היא למחזיקים בה וכו׳. והלא העוסקים בתורה מתים כמי שאינם עוסקים ומי לנו שעסק בתורה כמשה ומת אלא ח״ס על החיים הנצחיים.

*פי׳ פסוק כי כימי העץ ימי עמי.

*שאלה כיצד שאל מרע״ה ואמר שמחנו כימות עניתנו שירא׳ שאח״כ יש גלות כמו שאירע בד׳ גליות שעברו, שעברו צרה בתחלה זמן מה ואח״כ רווחה זמן מה והלא נשבע הקב״ה לשלא יביאנו עוד בגלות אחר, אחר זה הגלות כ״ש כימי נח וכו׳כנשבעתי וכו׳ ועוד הרי מצינו שימי הגלות קראם הכתוב רגע כ״ש ברגע קטנכו׳ ורועה יבקש שמחנו כימות עניתנו.

*תשובה לזה.

*פי׳ פסוק כי כימי העץ ימי עמי.

*שאלה כתיב עץ חיים היא למחזיקים בה וכו׳. והלא העוסקים בתורה מתים כמי שאינם עוסקים ומי לנו שעסק בתורה כמשה ומת אלא ח״ס על החיים הנצחיים.

עד מתי רשעים יעלוזו. יביעו ידברו עתק יתאמרו כל פועלי און. שרחה קאל מסתגיתא עלי לסאן ישראל פי הדא אלגלות אל מתי אלרשעים יסרון ולא מא ינכדהם יבדעוא ויתכלמוא פאעלי אלנור קצא אללה עלינא אן נכון נסתגית ונקול עד מתי עקובהּ לילהּ תמרדנא עלי אללה לילהּ אלמְרַגְלִים לילהּ תִשְׁעָה בְאָב אד אנהּ אללה מנא וקאל עד מתי לעדה הרעה הזאת נפד עלינא ליורטנא פי נהוסא שאמלא. פי גנם הדה אללילה פי לילהּ תשעה באב ונחצל פי מצאיק נסתגית מנהא ונקול עד מתי י״י וכמא בַּין דוד אן אללה נפד עלינא תבדיד שמלנא פי אלגלות ועאקבא לקולה תעאלי עד אנא מאנתם לשמור מצותי ותורתי ועד אנא ינאצוני ועד אנא לא יאמינו בי, ועד מתי לעדה פלדלך אורטנא ארבע ורטאת פי ארבע מלכיות ונקול עד מתי הו קול דוד עד אנא י״י תשכחני נצח עד אנא תסתיר את פניך ממני עד אנא אשית עצות בנפשי יגון בלבבי יומם עד אנא ירום אויבי עלי. פלמא עטם טול אלמדה עלי אלנבי שובה י״י עד מתי והנחם על עבדיך. אצרף נצבך כאנה אנסאן נדם עלי מא נרי עלי מחבובה אד סכט עליה והו ועד אללה לנא עלי ידי אלרסול כי ידין י״י עמו ועל עבדיו יתנחם דעי אלנבי פי תתבית דלך וקאל והנחם על עבדיך שבעינו בבוקר חסדך ונרננה ונשמחה בכל ימינו. שרחה אללהם אשבענא ענד גד צו פרגנא ואנעם עלינא מן פצלך אנה תעאלי רב חסד פינעם בה עלינא כמא ועד ובחסד עולם ריחמתיך וקאל מה יקר חסדך אלהים וקאל וחסד יי מעולם ועד עולם על יריאיו וקאל ען אלמשיח וחסדי לא יסור ממנו וקאל חסדי דוד הנאמנים בפיה דעא שבעינו בבוקר חסדך ונרננה ונשמחה בכל ימינו. וקאל רננו צדיקים ביי. וקאל אז ימלא שחוק פינו ולשוננו רנה. וקאל ישעיה פצחו רננו יחדיו. וקאל רנו ליעקב שמחה. וקאל שמחנו כימות עניתנו שרחה. אללהם פאנך תפרחנא מן חסאב אי׳אם עדאבנא הדה טלב אלנבי מן רבה ונהללוא אלנאם כאפה אעני אהל עצרנא ואעצאר סבקתנא איצא ולם יפהמון מטלובה ומן אלמַאל יטלב משה רבינו אן יכון סרורנא בעדד כל מא גרי עדד איאם נכדנא לם נגד פי אלגליות אלסאבקה הדה אלמַעאוצה אליסירה ולא סבק אללה פי אלאתאר מכאפאה עלי הדא אלמקדאר *אִיוב עליה אלסלאם לם יִנאח גיר פי גסמה ומאלה ואלאולאד ולם ידלה אחד ולא אֶחתקר ולא ביע ולא אֶסתעבד ולם יכון עדאבה סוי אתני עשר שהרא ועוץ בעד דלך בתתניה אלכסב ואלאולאד ועאש מאיה וארבעין עאם כאן קד בלי אבן סבעין סנה פלמא זיד באלתתניה זיד עמרין מן עמרה מאיה וארבעין עאם צארת אלגמלה מאיתין ועשרה פנחן אלדין קתלנא ואבדנא ולי עלינא עבידנא ונכד עישנא ובענא וביע אולאדנא ואסתעבדנא אלף סנה ומאיהּ סנה וניף ולם נדרי כם. יטלב נבינא אלמשפק עלינא אלדאל עלי אלמתחכם עליה אלדי

*נחמה לבני הגלות מאיוב ומה איוב שלא לקה אלא בגופו ובבניו ובממונו אבל לא נמבר ולא ג ש ת ע ב ד לעבו״ם מלא הש״י חסרונו למשנה אנו ש ל ק י נ ו בגופינו ובבנינו ובממוניגו ויתר עליו נשתעבדנו בעול גלות ושביה.

אלבחר או עלי ראם אלצארי פכיף יהנא נומה וַהוי אלבחר לא יְהַנִיה וכיף יתקרר ואלמא מחרך מא תחתה וכיף יסתקים עישא למן הו בראם אלצארי והוא מכאנא צ̈יקא וריאח עאצפה והולא תחתה ומניה מראיה כדאך עישנא פי אלגלות קאל שלמה עליה אלסלאם והיית כשוכב בלב ים וכשוכב בראש תבל והו אלצארי פנחן כדלך פלו כאן גלותנא מקטוע אלעדדולא נדרי מן מתי הו אלחסאב כאן פיה פרגה תרי גלות מצרים ארבע מאיה סנה הדת אלשך פיה מן מתי תְחסב הל הו מן מעמד בין הבתרים או מן מכלק יצחק או מן סאעה דכול מצר חסבהא אללה מן מכלק יצחק נאת ארבע מאיה ומן וקת מעמד בין הבתרים הו נחו ארבע מאיה ותלתין הו אלדי קאל שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה פלו אנגנא אללה פי גלותה אנגנא אלחסאב כאן יכון מן יום דכול מצר׳ פרפק אללה ולם יקטענא פי מצר מאיתין ועשר סנין אלא ורמז אללה דלך עלי לסאן אלסיד יעקב ולם יְעלם מא קאל רדו שמה עדד רדו מאיתין ועשרה וגלות בבל קאל שבעים שנה וקע אלשך פיה הלהו מן אול דולה בבל או מן אלגלות בינהמא אתני עשר סנה וקע אלגלט פיה סוי לדניאל עליה אלסלאם קאל להם קד בקי שיא תמאם דולה עילָם וילי מָדַי ויוני אלפרג פכאן דלך וכמל ללבראב סבעין סנה ואמא הדה אלגלות ימים רבים קאל לא נדרי מתי ואלאמראת אלתי אעטית לדניאל אנמאהא עליה פלמא טלב אלביאן קאל לה לך דניאל כי סתומים וחתומים הדברים מר יא דניאל אן אלאמור מכפיה מכתומה חתי יחין אלוקת חיניד בעד אלפרג תתפהמון כל מא קלת פי דניאל פלמא ראי אָסף עליה אלסלאם הדא אלאנעתאם אלעשים בכא וקאל אותותינו לא ראינו אין עוד נביא ולא אתנו יודע עד מה. שרחה איאתנא לם נראהא אלא מגצובין מכזין לא נצרה לנא ולים ענדנא נבי ולא מענא מן ידרי׳ אלי מתי פלמא ראי כיר אלבשר בוהיה אלבליג ונבאהה קותה פי פהם נור אלנור ונוץ אלגוץ ולם ינפהם לה הדא אלגלות קאל עליה אלסלאם מי יודע עוז אפיך וכיראתך עברתיך מן הו אלדי ידרי שדה נצבך כם יכון ועלי קדר מא יגב עלי אלמכלוק מן תקואך כאן נצבך מתעינא עליה מן היבתך ועשים נצבך פלמא [1]וחלנא [2]ונשבנא לא תקטע בנא פי כל וגה כפא עלם אלמערפה ללקץ כפא בהא מן גְצה פלא תְניב ענא נור תוראתך והַכמנא פיהא עוצא מן נבי יְנַבְיֵנא וארזקנא קלבא חכימא נפהם בה תוראתך ונתסלא בהא קאל נאמעא להדה אלאנראץ למנות ימינו כן הודע ונביא לבב חכמה פקצא אללה דלך וחסבך חכמה רבותינו ז״ל ומא וצל אליה כל ואחד מנהם ומוצעאתהם וכתבהם ותואליפהם מעאני לא יוצל לפהם שיא מנהא אלא במטאולה אלסנין וכפא בתאליף אלמשנה ושרח אלתלמוד להא ואלכתב אלדרשיה דואין לא יקרא מנהא דיואן אלא פי סנה או אכתר ובאלחרי יפהם ונחן מתקלבין פי בעץ אוראק מן כפיף כלאמהם באקי אלאעמאר קבולא לדעא נבינא משה ונביא לבב חכמה לם יכן יתחכם פי אלתורה פי איאם אלנביא באכתר ממא קרי ועלם פי איאם אלרבאניה פי אלגלות שובה י״י עד מתי. אללהם פאצרף רחמתך עלינא ויַכפי ואלי מתי בהדא אללפט בעינה אסתגאת דוד עליה אלסלאם עד מתי רשעים י״י

---

[1] טבענו בין מצולה. [2] נוקשנו.

וערפל לאומים והם יקאתלונא פיכון קתלא ללה פיהם מן נצף אלנהאר פיהלך אלגמלה
וענד קריב אלגרוב יצוי אלנהאר בקילה ועליך יורח י״י וענה קאל והיה לעת ערב יהיה
אור פלמא אמסא לם יבק מנהם די רוח כמא דעא אלנבי אלאול לערב ימולל ויבש.
פלמא וצף הדא אלגמל מא כאן ומא יכון מן אלאהואל ומא יאול אליה אלחאל
רגע מתנביא מתאספא עלי מא אל בנא פי אלגלות קאל כי כלינו באפיך ובחמתך נבהלנו.
אננא פנינא בנצבך כמא תואעד וקאל ונשארתם מתי מספר וקאל ואצפא כי נשארנו
מעט מהרבה ואוצאפא כתירה פפנינא בנצב אללה ואלבאקי מנא מבהותין מן נשבתנא
פי אלגלות כמא קד תרי פקאל ובחמתך נבהלנו. פוצף עליה אלסלאם מא אוגב דלך
אן דלך בדנובנא למא כתרת געלהא אללה הדאה פנטרהא פאוגב אלעקאב בקולה נכתם
עונך לפני ומא עמלנא כפיא או משהורא הדא נורה לם תכפא ענה כפיה בקולה אם
יסתר איש במסתרים ואני לא אראנו נאם י״י. שרחד אימכן אן יסתתר אנסאן פי אלכפאיא
פיעציני ולא אראה אליס נורי מלא סמאואתי וארצי יקול אללה הלא את השמים ואת
הארץ אני מלא נאם י״י פאנא מוגודא בכל מכאן ולא יכלו מני מכאן ולא גאב עני
מא יכון כמא לא יניב עני מא כאן פאין אלמפר מני פלמא עלם וראי חכם ואוגב
קצאצא פאכד הקא וצף דלך אלרסול וקאל שתה עונותינו לנגדך עלומנו למאור פניך
כי כל ימינו פנו בעברתך כלינו שנינו כמו הגה. שרחה אנה כל איאמנא פנית פי המיה
נצבך פרנת סנינא כלהגה לאהג מתל באלכלאם קיל כלמה פתמת פכדאך יקאל פי
אלגלות כלך לפלאן ולד או בנת פי אמלא מא יתרערע מאת פמא נסמע גיר .וליד
מאת כמא תואעד בעונות בנים ובנות תוליד ולא יהיו לך וקאל אם ינדלו את בניהם
ושכלתים מאדם קאל וחתי אדא כברוא בניהם אתכלהם מנהם כאנהם מא כאנוא מן
אלאדמייה פישד מנא שואד יעישוא ובדלך קל עדנא כל יום פי נקצאן פבכא אלנבי
דלך וקאל כי כלינו באפיך כי כל ימינו פנו בעברתיך נטמע עַמִי פי אעמארנא יאתי
פרג תפרג איאמנא פי אלחרג ואעמאר אלכל פאניה פי להגה ואן שדוא אלעאישין
אי שי יעישוא אלגאיה סבעין סנה ואלנהאיה תמאנין קאל עליה אלסלאם ימי שנותנו
בהם שבעים שנה ואם בגבורות שמונים שנה איאם סנין אעמארנא פיהא יעני איאם
אלגלות סבעין סנה או תמאנין אלגאיה אן נכד אלקלב מע קלה אלחילה ועדם אלמכנה
ואנקטאע אלאמאל ימין אלקלב ויצף אלטאקה ויקצר אלעמר ויקרב אלמניה ונחן
כלנא כדלך ואלשאד מנא מתסע אלחאל לא יכסב שיא אלא בעד שקה ואדה הצל
ענדה תסבב אלי אכדה מנה גורא ועדואנא קאל עליה אלסלאם ואצפא דלך גמלה ורחבם
עמל ואון ואתסאעהא אן אתסעת אנמא תאתיהם בשקוה לאן לים מאלך נפסה בכסב
ממלוכא. ואדא הצל נזל אלגור אסבאבא ללגרם וכמא חתם פי אלאול תעאלי.
והסתרתי פני מהם והיה לאכול קאל כי גז חיש ונעופה. כי גז אן בסרעה יקטע בנא
קטעא פיטיר מא באידינא פנחן טאירין מן כל וגה לא קראר לנא ולא תבות.

תם רגע עליה אלסלאם האירא מתעגבא מן אנעתאם אלגלות
*סאנחה אלשדיד אלחדיד אלכפי לא בארקה פיה לישראל ולא *צאנחה ולא עלם
למתי ולא קיאסא נאפדא ולא חסאבא צאדקא ולא דלילא ואצחא ולא
תבאשרא בשי ולא מטמעא קריבא אלא חאירין כאנסאן ראקד פי מוסטה

אורך וקאל גירה וזרחה לכם יראי שמי שמש צדקה ומרפא בכנפיה ויצאתם
ופשתם כעגלי מַרְבֵּק. פאדא אנבלג צונא טמעת אלמלל וגאת אלינא בחסב
מא וצף ואספתי את כל הגוים אל ירושלים למלחמה והי מלחמת גוג ומגוג
ותואבעהם אלתי וצפוהא גמיע אלאנביא מא מן נבי אלא ואנדר בהא פענד
מא יטמעו בנא *ותצנח להם צאנהה פי צונא ונפוץ מן הדה אלדעקאת יְלַאשי *ותסנח
אללה אמרהם וכאנהם מא כאנוא. שבה אללה דלך כמן יחלם פי אלנום
והו גאיע אנה אכל ושבע או ירי אנה שארבא וקד רקד עאטשא יסתיקץ
והו גאיע עאטשא כדלך יכונוא גמיע אלמלל ירו מדינהקד האטת בהא
גמיע אלמלל וישתהון כלהם בלענא ונהן האצלין וקד פתחת אלמדינה
וסבי נצפהא פדלך אלחין יגצב אללה עלי אלגְמלה וַיַסְבֵּט כקולה תעלה
חמתי באפי ויזלזל זלאזל תַנַחֵל אלגבאל מנהא ותסקט אלמבאני ואלאסואר
ותמות אלוחוש פוצע וחתי אלסמך פי אלמיאה תתזלזל ותנפר וינאדי צותא
מן ענדה תעאלי סיופכם נאפדה פיכם פירד כל ואחד סיפה אלי צאחבה
ותתסאקט אלרווס. ותקע אלגת ותתלאשא אלדואב ורכאבהא יתמאסא
אלראכב ותדוב עיניה ויהתבם לסאנה פי פמה ויורא ולא ירא ואוצאפא
גליה מֻבינה עלי ידי כל נבי פהם כעשב טהר נוארה תם יבם לחינה
וסקט גמע הדה אלאגראץ כלהא פי *לפטה ואחדה בבוקר כחציר יחלוף. *לפטה
בלפטה בעינה אללה וקאל סיכונוא אלמלל כעשבא ולים כעשב אלארץ
אלדי לה אצולא ופרועא וארצא ורטובה ומואדא ועלי אנה ניר תאבת
פלה מאדה ואצול ואנמא יכונוא כעשב אלסטוח אלדי לא אצלא ימדה
ולא ארצא תֻנמיה אלא *ילסח לחינה וייבם לחינה לא ינמו ולא יתמר קאל *ילפח
יהיו כחציר גגות שקדמת שלף יבש. קבל אן ינסל מן אלגלאף ייבם תם
נבי אללה תעאלי ישעיה בעד דלך בהדא אללפט בעינה קאל. קול אומר
קרא ואמר מה אקרא כל הבשר חציר. יבש הציר נבל ציץ ודבר אלהים
יקום לעולם. שרח דלך צות עלי תקול נאדי פקלת מא אנאדי קאל קל פאנה
כל בשריא ענדי כאלעשב ופצלהם ואעמאלהם אלחַסַן בזעמהם כנואר
אלפחיץ אלדי לא יעקד מנה טעאמא ולא זרועא תראה גמילא לחינה ולא
יַחְבֹּת ייבם עשבהם ויסקט נוארהם וכלאם אללה ומואעידה תאבתה אבדא.
על הר גבוה עלי לך מבשרת ציון הרימי בכח קולך מבשרת ירושלם הרימי
אל תיראי אמרי לערי יהודה הנה אלהיכם. יא איהא אלנבוה אלתי בשרת
ציון עלי גבל עאליא ארפעי באלקֻוַה צותך יא נבות בשרת ירושלם ארפעי
ולא תפזעי קולי למדן יהודה קד אקבל אלאהכם פקאל הדה אלאגראץ
דאעיא בבוקר יציץ וחלף לערב ימולל ויבש. פי גד יומה דאך יָנוּר וַיָכֵלף
נבאתא וענד אלגרוב יתלאשא וייבם וכדלך יכון יצבחון לקתאלנא גדוה
יטלם אללה אלנהאר בקולה יום חשך ואפילה יום ענן וערפל וקאל יכון
לא יומא הו ולא לילא כקולה והיה יום אחד הוא יודע ליי לא יום ולא
לילה ויגטי אלארץ אלטלאם ואלגבם בקולה כי הנה החשך יכסה ארץ

אלאנאבה ואלדי אוגב טול בקאינא פי אלגלות אן אלף סנה עגדך יסירה
והי לנא עטימה פטאלת עלינא ואן כאנת עגדך קצירה כי אלף שנים
בעיניך כיום אתמול כי יעבור ואשמורה בלילה שרחה. אן אלף עאם
עגדך כיום אמס אלדי גאז או נובה מן אלליל אלתי הי תלתה פאננא פי
טול אלגלות אדא תם מדתה כמן נאם נובה מן נובאת אלליל ואסתיקץ
פמע טולהא אדא סילת סיולהא ותמת כאנהא מא כאנת קאל זרמתם
שינה יהיו זרמתם משתק מן זרם והו אלסיל וכדא שבחת אלאמם באלסיל
כקולה כזרם ברד כזרם מים כבירים שוטפים וקאל לאומים כשאון מים
כבירים ישאון שרחה אלמלל אדא אנתמעת עלי ישראל *ידעקון עליהם *ידפקון
כדעקה אלמא אלעטים אדא יקבל סילא לכנה מן עטים אלסיל יתכלץ
מנה מואצע מע חואשיה ויבקא מכאנא לטיפא פי אלבנא או אצעף שיא
באקי ויהדם אלאסואר ויחמל אלחגארה ותרי אצעף שיא באקיא כדלך
אלגלות יהדם ויַהַמֵּם ותמלך ארכאנא כבארא ואחואלא עטימה וינגי
אללה קומא צעאפא לטאפא לם יחמלהם אלסיל פאדא האנת אמואג
בחאר אלגלות יְהדיהֵא אללה או פכאנת תגטינא ותַנְמְרֵנא חתי לא יטהר
מנא אתר הו אלדי יְהַדֵּי אמואג בחאר אלגלות אלי תרי אמואנא מתכאתפה
מן מיאה קד אסוד לונהא ועלא שאנהא ועטם אדעאקהא ותתכיל כאנהא
אן בלגת אלי אלמרכב גטתה ועטב או אן כרגת ללבר אקפרתה תם
תראהא קד אנכסרת ואכרי מתראדפה להא מתכאתפה אבדא והו תעאלי
יגלבהא אמרה אלמטאע ולא תעדא הדודהא אלדי חד להא כדלך תקום
אמואג אלשדאיד פי אלגלות תקול אלאן לא יבקא מנגא לאחד חתי
תראהא קד פתרהא אללה והדאהא ונגאנא מנהא קאל דוד עליה אלסלאם
פי דלך משביח שאון ימים שאון גליהם והמון לאומים: שרחה יא מן יהדי
דעקה אלבחאר ואמואנהא ודעקת אלאמם אד ידעקוא עלי ישראל פאדא
תמת מדה אלגלות עלי טולהא וסאלת סיולהא ואנקטעת כאנהא נום נאימא
כקול אלרסול זרמתם שינה יהיו בבוקר כחציר יחלוף. שרחה וענד גד
אלפרג אד גאנא בעד טלמה ליל אלגלות וכדא שבה טלמתה בטלאם
אללילֵ וצבאח אלישועה כמא ינבלג שיא שיא ותרתאח אלנפס אלכאיבה
בנמה אללילֵ מתל רגלא קד נשב פי פלא כאלאעמא ואטלם אללילֵ
עליה וימשי פאזעא מן כל אפה אן סלמת רגליה אתא אלטלאם אתקא
איאך כנאדק תחתה וחואפי יטוף ולא ידרי חית יקע ואן סלם מן אלמשי
פלא יאמן מן אדא וחושא תכלב עליה או כאמנא ראצדא עלי אלטריק פמא
אכרב נפסה ומא אנם צדרה ואללילֵ יטול אלי אן יטלע אלפגר ויטהר
אלצו פאמנת אלנפס שיא אלי אן ינבלג אלצו פיטלע קרן אלשמס ויצוי
אלעאלם וזאל וחאשת עינה באלפחוץ וראי כיף אלמשי ואלי אין יסיר
פקאל דוד משבחא בערב ילין בכי ולבוקר רנה וקאל וכאור בוקר יזרח שמש
וענד צו נהאר פרגנא ישרק שמם דולתנא וכדא ועדנא ישעיה. וזרח בחשך

פי ספרי פי אכר שרה אלתורה קאלוא בפציה אן יום מות אלסיד משה עליו השלום צלא הדא אלצלוה ובעדהא בארך ישראל ולדלך קאל וזאת הברכה בואו אלעטף אי אן קד סבק קבלהא שי אכר ואנמא הו קולה תפלה למשה פסרת עטימא אלדי הדית לקיאסא צחיחא מוגוד לרבותינו ז״ל מנקול מן גמלה נקלהם וסרת איצא בוגד אלאנראין כלהא מתאע הדה אלתפלה פי נצוץ אלאנביא וקד שרחתהא לתכון נזהה ללנפס אלתי קד תוחשת פי וחשה אלגלות והי איצא סלוה ללקלוב אלחזאן אלדי אדאבהא שדיד אלכוף מן אלאמם ואצלאה יקינא ותאיד אימאנא ללצאלחין אלמתמסכין אלתאיבין אלואתקין אלדין אמתסכוא בחבאל אלותאק ואלעורוה אלותקא אימאנא ברסולנא אלמכרם אלמצטפי מן גמיע אלבשר. *והדה שרוח אלפאטה אלמחכמה פי צלותה עליה אלסלאם ועלי אלרבאניה אלנאקלין ען אלאנביא ען סידהם וסיד אלבשר עליו השלום. קאל אכרם בה מן קאיל אד וקף צלא דאעיא פינא. תפלה למשה איש האלהים אלרגל אלמכתין באללה תעאלי לים ללה פי עאלמה איש גירה וכל נביא קאם בעדה וכאן פרידא פי עצרה פי משאבהתה פי כצלה מן כצאלה סמי איש האלהים והם עשרה אולהם סיד אלבשר ואכרהם אליהו ז״ל ואלו הן משה אלקנה שמואל דוד שמעיה עדוא אלישע מיכה אמוץ אליהו. קאל יי מעון אתה היית לנו בדור ודור. שרחה יא אלאהנא יא אללה אנת מאואנא אלדי נאוי אליה פי כל גיל וגיל לאנה אדא נשבנא מגלובין בין אעדאינא ותחדת עלינא האדתה ולא מלכא ידברנא ולא ראשדא ירשדנא ולא חצנא נתחצן פיה ולא מפר נפר עליה ולא עסכרא נחתמי בה ולא מונה ולא קדרה ולו עלי אלכלאם אלא מקטועין אלחילה קד אבכמתנא אלגלבה מע מא לא נטיק נגאוב עליה ונסכת כאננא בכם לא נקדר נתכלם וכמא וצף דוד עליה אלסלאם ואני כחרש לא אשמע וכאלם לא יפתה פיו. ואהי כאיש אשר לא שומע פאדא אנקטעת אלחייל וכאבת אלמטאמע לא מפרן אלא אליך נדעוא פתנית ונציה פתוגיב ואנת אלמאוא כקולה מעון אתה היית פבדא יצף אלסבב אלמוגב לקבול אלדעא ואלאגאבה פהי אלתובה *ואלצען ואלאעתראף ללה גל ועז פיגית פלמא עלם אללה אנא סנכטי ויגלבנא יצר הרע אלדי סיכלל פי אלבשר קצא בקבול אלתובה קבל כלקה אלאדמי מע סבעה אשיא נפד קצאה פיהא קבל מכלק אלעאלם אד כלק אולהא אלתורה ואכרהא משיח בן דוד ופי אלגמלה אלתובה לאנהא מצלחה אלדניא פקצד רסולנא עליו השלום הדא אלגרץ וחיניד וצף האל אלגלות ורגב בנא פיהא פקאל בטרם הרים יולדו ותחולל ארץ ותבל ומעולם עד עולם אתה: תשב אנוש עד דכא ותאמר שובו בני אדם. שרה דלך קבל אן תחדת אלגבאל וכלקת ארצא ועאלמא אנת קבל ובעד מוגודא קבל אלכון ובעדהא חיניד קצית באלתובה ותאמר שובו בני אדם פאדא תבנא כאנת

*זהו פירוש המזמור של תפלה למשה.

וראת הדה אלשאה לא ראעיא להא יִפַּע מנה ולא קוה להא ללנהוץ
ולא סימא אדא לם תקדר תגרי פחדדת אדאנהא וברקת אעינהא אליהא
וטננת אניאבהא שהוה לאכלהא ותואמרת אלהגם עליהא כמא מתל אללה
וקאל שה פזורה ישראל אריות הדיחו פוקפת בין ידי אללֶה תלך אלשפאעה
אלתי שפע כיר מכלוקא פקידת ידיהא ושכלת ארגלהא וצרמת אפואהדהא
ומנעתהא אלהגם עליהא. ולקד קאל יומא אחד מלוך אלרום לְענת
גְמלתהם האשא אלפאצל אלמְנחאש מנהם והו אנטונינום אלדי כאן פי
עצר רבינו הקדוש עליו השלום קאל אלמלך והו קיסר אללעין לר׳ יהושע
בן חנניה עליו השלום מא אגרב שאתא תרא אלסבועה ותמשי בינהם
ולא תתקי והי דון ראעיא להא ולא נאצר פקאל לה דלך מן קְוַה אלראעי
אלגיר מראי אלדי קייד אידיהא וכסר אניאבהא ומנעהא אלהגם עליהא
אד דעא נבינא דוד עליו השלום וקאל אלהים הרם שנימו בפימו מלתעות
כפירים נתוץ י״י. שרחה אנך יא רב תרא סבועה ישראל אללהם אהדם
צפוף אצראסהם פי אפואהדהם ואניאב אלאסד אלגאמה אהדם יא רב.
וקאל אללה תעאלי. גואלם חזק י׳ צבאות שמו ולקד כנת מנד סנין עדה
רסמת עלי נפסי קראה הדא אלמזמור כל יומא בעד מאה ברכות קבל
ברוך שאמר והוא תפלה למשה איש האלהים תקְרבא אלי אללה באלפאטה
ותבְרכא בנטקה וצאלא מע אללה בצלוה כיר מולוד ׳ וכנת מפכרא לאי
מעני רְסַמת הדה אלצלוה פי כפר תלים ונקלתהא אלכאפה ען אלכאפה
אלי איאם דוד פרסמהא פי ספר חמדה מע מא נטם מן נבואת עשרה
אשיאך מנהם סאבקין לה ומנהם מעאצרין לה מתל בני קרח אלדין הם
פי איאם משה והם אסיר ואלקנה ואביאסף אלדי נקלוא רבותינו ז״ל אנהם
למא נאפרוא אלצאל אבוהם ותבעוא אלרסול אלצאדק אוחי אליהם
פאנטקו פקיל לבני קרח מזמור והימן וידותון ומשכיל ואסף ואיתן וגירהם
פכנת לא אדרי עלה לם אכתצרת *הדה אלצלוה מן גמלה צלואת אלרסול
ואתבתת פי תלים אלי עאמנא הדא פשרחת פרשת האזינו במא וגדת
לרבותינו ז״ל פלמא וצלת כי ידין י״י עמו ועל עבדיו יתנחם חניד צלא
הו תפלה למשה איש האלהים אלדי קאל פיהא שובה יי עד מתי והנחם
על עבדיך. פתאמלת אלמזמור כלה פאנכשף לי סרה אנה רַעאה פי
אלגלות ולדלך אתבתה דוד פי תלים ליכון תנזהא ואנסא ללמלה פשרחת
אלמזמור כלה במעונה אללה והדאיתה ללאגראץ ונטמתה פי טי
אלתאליף אלדי ולפת פי שרח האזינו אלדי בה תם תאליפנא פי אלתורה
וקלת פי אכר הדא אלמזמור ולא שך אן יום מותה צלאהא ותרכהא עדה
לישראל ולא אעלם דלך בתחקיק אלא קיאסא פלמא כאן בעד מדה
ושרחת וזאת הברכה וגדת הדא אלקיאם מנצוצא *לרבותינו ז״ל נצא גליא

*וזאת התפלה רמוזה בפרש׳ האזינו.

*ובספרי אמרו רז״ל שאמר זאת התפלה ביום מיתתו כשבא לברך ישראל וז״ש וזאת הברכה כלומר נוסף על התפלה שהתפלל ברכם ג״כ.

ברם בחיותה מן אגלהם וַסַהֶל עליה אכתצארה מן זמרה אלצאלחין בגנבהם
אד קאל אללהם יא רב ועלי אנהם קד אכטו כטיה עטימה פעפוך אעטם
פאן כאן גרמהם פי חאיז אלמגפרה פאנפרה ואן כאן לא תגפרה ותקטעהם
פאקטעני דניא ואכרי הל בלגתני הדה אלגאיה אלא מן אגלהם ואדא
זאלוא או לא יכונוא פאמחני מן דיואנך ספר חיים ולא אראדה לי פי
אלבקא בעדהם בקולה ואם אין מחני נא מִכספרך אשר כתבת. וכאן משפקא
ראופא רחומא עלי אלגמלה ואד *אֲבשר בקרב אלאגל לם יהילה דלך
ולא עטם ענדה ואנמא אשתגל בהם וקאל ללה לא תמיתני חתי תקדם
עליהם מן יקודהם פאני שאהא עליהם לאמות ומא אדרי מן הו אלואלי
עלי אלנטר פי מצאלחהם פקאל לה כד יהושע פקדמה פסר בדלך למא
קד עלם אכלאקה פאידה וקדמה וגעל יוציה עליהם *פלמא נזלת עליה
שירת האזינו וְאעלם פיהא בכל מא סיחל בישראל פי אלגלות אלמדיד
בקולה מזי רעב ולחומי רשף וכל מא תואעד מחוץ תשכל חרב עטם דלך
עליה וראי אן דלך אלוקת לא יכון פיה שפיעא ולא דאעיא ולא מן יַצֶלֶה
ללדעא ולא יבקא פיהם עאלמא ויתסאוא פי אלרדא פעז עליה דלך וכמא
וצף אללה האלהם וקאל וירא כי אין איש וישתומם כי אין מפגיע ותושע
לי זרועי וצדקתי היא סמכתני. שרהא למא ראי אן לים רגלא פיהם יַצֶלֶה
לישפע ואטרק פלם ירא דאעי חיניד רחם ואנאת וקאל אללה איצא וממא
ארא אן לא רגלא צאלחא פיהם ומן האולא אלאפאצל לא מעין להם
עדמוא גְמלה פחיניד יְגאתוא. פלמא פהם וחלתהם וקיל לה אד תלא
אלנבוה עלי ישראל קם ואטלע אלי גבל אלעֲבָרים ומת פיה קאם עליה
אלסלאם וצלא עץ ישראל כאפה אלדין סיורטוא פי אלגלות פלמא ראי
כי אין איש צאלח הו אלדי הו איש האלהים פקאל תפלה למשה איש
האלהים גמע פיהא דעא כל נאיבה נאבת ישראל מן אול גלות אלי אכרה
ורגב אלי אללה תעאלי אן ירפק בהם וינזל בלאה ברפקא לא בענפא
ולא יסתאצלנא ולא יפתח אליד בנא ואן יתוב עלינא וירגע כאלדי כאן
ויפרח קלובנא ויצברנא עלי אלמַחַן טול אלגלות וידפע ענא שר אלאמם
וכל מטאלב ויהדי אמואג אלבאחר אלתי קד אחאטת בנא ואהדקת עלינא
אלאמם אלדין נשבנא בינהם וגמע פי הדה אלצלוה כל מא כאן וכל מא
סיכון אלי אכר מדה אלעאלם בחתנא עלי אנראץ כל פסוק מנהא פוגדנא
גמיע אלמואעיד ואלנבואת מעלקה בהא ולמא קבל אללה שפאעתה פינא
נבא כל נבי גא בעדה במואעיד תדל אן אללה קבל רגבתה ובעת אלאנביא
בתלך אלאנראץ אלתי טלב וועד אנה סיפעלהא פאשתמלת הדה אלצלוה
עלי עטאים פכאנת לנא רפדא ווכאא ומאוא ורכנא נרכן אליה וסתרא
גמילא עלינא וחצנא מאנעא ננגו אליה פי אלמצאיק מן כוננא מתל שאה
ערגה קד צלת פי אלשעארי ונסית מוצע רעיהא ונשבת פי אלאועאר
ופי תלך אלשעארי סבועה ודייב ונמורה והי גאיעה משתהיה כרגת כלהא

* וכשנתבשר במיתה שאל מאת השי"ת שימנה עליהם רועה נאמן כמיהו כמ"ש יפקוד ה' אלהי הרוחות לכל בשר וכו'.

* וכשנתבאר בכל מה שעתיד להיות לישראל בגלות עד ימות המשיח וראה שאין מי שתקובל תפלתו עליהם התפלל עליה' ואמר תפלה למשה איש האלהים.

תכיל אנה מכן כדלך אמאל אלדניא ובלוג שהואתהא ענד אסתיקאץ
אלמות ענד אלמחאסבה לא תגד שיא מן כל מא עמלת פי אלדניא פאן
כאנת לדאתא תלאלא תלאשא אלכל ולא תגד שיא מן מא אועית לים
הי חסנאת פתגדהא ואן כאנת לדאתא חראמא פתחצל פי נחוסהא
מתצאעפא ואחדא לא תגד שיא ותאני אן ילחקך אלצרר אלאלים עלי
תלך אללדאת גסמא תלדד פי אלסתר במא לם ירידה אללה יוַרַּד נארא
אלימה פי טלאם אלגחים אלדי קד פָּון כיף שא וכמא שא ואנתבה קבל
אלפות ותנדם קבל אלמות ואגבר פי חאל אלצבא מא בקי מן עמר
אלשיכוכה וכיף תחב מן לא יחבך ותהמל דארא אנת באקיא פיה ותתמלך
דארא לים לך אנת תחב אלדניא והי באנצהּ פיהא תקרין עמרך באיאמא
וליאלי יתם אלנהאר ותסר במא היית לנפסך לילא ויתם אלליל ותסר
במא תמכנת גד יומך פי אלדניא. והי אלגמיע אכסארא אלתי פנית מן
אלעמר ונקצת מן אלמדה פלא עקלא תָּרַגַּה בה מא אנת פיה וָעמָּרא
אפנית שביהך פי אלדניא מתל מן ידעא לציאפה ועלם יקינא אנה לא
יבית בוגה בל מנד יתם אלנהאר יכרג מנה פאלעאקל פי אלנאס מן
אדא חצל ומכן מן מא ילתד בה מן מאכול ומשרוב וַהַמָּה פי אלמסיר
ועלי מנזלה תעוילא פירפה נפסה ולא ינהמך פי אלמוגוד ענד אלגרוב
יגד מן נפסה קוהּ ללנהוץ וחית יבית פיצל מעאפא ויתאה ואלסכיף
אלראי ינהמך פַּסכר ויפארק אלאעתדאל ויבקא לטיבה פאדא גא אלליל
אכרג צרורה עלי אשוה חאל ורמי בה ברא פי אדון מכאן לם יתרך חית
כאן ולא יצל ללוטן בוגה פמא אסכפה מן רא. פיגב אלפכר פי דאר
אלדניא אלי אין אלאנקלאב וחית אלמסיר ולא תגרה הדה אלגרה ולא
תכדעה אלכדאעה הדא כלה פי מטלובא חלאלא פי בלוג אלאמאל ומנע
אלאנהמאל פכיף מן יאמל בלוג אלאמאל בתרך אלטאעה ואלתלדד
באלתכלי פלא יגרך שיא ולא תפתנך פתנה. *ותאמל נביא קד בָּעת *ענין מעלת האומה הישראלית תדע אותה מהשליח ששלח אותו ל ה ם ו מ ה משלח יתי ויתי.
אליך ובמא בָּעת וכיף מנזלתה ואלי חית אנתהי כל דלך ליכון רסולא
ויחתך עלי אלטאעה פלו לם יעתקד אלשרע אלדי שרע בה ניר לגלאלתה
אלמוצופה לוגב אעתקאדהא כיף והי אומר אלבארי ושרועה פיגב
אלאנתבאט ואלארתבאט חָבא פי אלראסל ואלמרסול כפא בה מן פצילה
מן אלראסל ומן אלמרסול פמן קרבה אללה לא יבעד נפסה ומן הדא
רסולה לא יהמל נפסה ומן גלאלהּ אלרסול ינפהם לך קדר אלמרסול
ענה אדא כנת גלילא בעת אליך רסולא מן קרנך ועלי קדרך ענד אלדי
ירסל *ענך יכון *אלמרסול אליך ולא אגל מן ישראל ענד אללה תעאלי *ענה *מאהבתו לישראל שלח להם משה שהיה עניו מאד. *ומסר עצמו עליהם למיתה
פבעת אליהם רסולא לים כמתלה רסולא ומן עטים חָב אללה פי ישראל
געלה ואסטה בינה ובינהם פמע מָכנתה מן אללה וקרבה מנה כאן אחלם
אלבשר ואכשעהם כמא שהד פיה אלכתאב מן קול אללֹה תעאלי והאיש
משה עניו מאוד מכל האדם וכאן ישח עלי ישראל *אכתר מן נפסה וקד

אנה אן מאתוא האולאי כמות אלבשר ויחאסבהם אללה חסאב אלבשר אלדין ימותוא ויגיבוא פי אלתראב תם יבעתהם אללה ויחאסבהם ויורד אלנאר מסתחקיהא אן פעל בהאולאי כדלך וימותו ולא תרו פיהם אחדותה פמא זעמוא חק ולא יבעתני אללה בשיא ממא קלתה לכם ואנמא הי בדעה מני כמא קאלוא ואן אבדע אללה בדעה לם תכן קבל ולא תכון בעד ויחאסבוא האולאי קבל אלמות ואלאחיא ותנפתה אלארץ ותבלעהם ויהבטוא אחיא לנאר אלתרי אלמוצע אלמכנון ללה אלמעד ללעקאב פתעלמון צחה כלאמי ואן אלכאפר בי הו אלכאפר באללה תעאלי והאולאי אלדין כפרוא בי ליס אלכפר בי ואנמא הו באללה אלדי בעתני ושהד לי אנה אלדי בעתני וכלמני ואנתם סאמעין ואנתם אלדי קלתם לי נחן מומנין בך פי כל מא תגי בה אלינא ענה תעאלי פצמן הדה אלאנראץ פי קולה אם כמות כל האדם ימותון אלה ופקודת כל האדם יפקד עליהם לא י״י שלחני ואם בריאה יברא י״י ופצתה האדמה את פיה ובלעה אותם ואת כל אשר להם וירדו חיים שאולה וידעתם כי נאצו האנשים האלה את י״י. פלם יתם אלכלאם חתי אנה פתחת אלארץ אלתי תחת אלגמלה אלצאלה וכאנוא ישראל כלהם קד אקלעוא אכביתהם מן חואלי מא דאר בהם אד קאל להם אלרסול סורו נא מעל אהלי האנשים הרשעים האלה כמא קיל לה דבר אל העדה לאמר העלו מסביב למשכן קרח דתן ואבירם פפעלוא כדלך ויעלו מעל המשכן קרח דתן ואבירם מסביב ולמא ראוא ארואהם האצלין פי חלק אלארץ ובלעתהם שיא שיא צאחוא ולם יפיד ציאהם כמא לא יפיד יום אלחסאב אעתראף לעלה בל יורדהם נארא תתלטא ואנמא אלאעתראף קבל נזול אלבלא כקול שלמה עליה אלסלאם כל אשר תמצא ידך לעשות בכחך עשה כי לא מעשה וחשבון ודעת וחכמה בשאול אשר אתה הולך שמה.

*שרחה קאל ראשדא למן רשדה אללה כל מא אמכנת ידך לתצנע בטאקתך ונהדך מן טאעה אללה אצנעה ואנדם וקת אן יפיד אלנדם ואעמל חית יְמכן אלעמל ואעמל חסאבך פי אי שי אנת מֻרכח ופי אי שי אנת מכסר ואעלם מא תחתאג תעלמה ותתחכם חית ימכנך אלתחכם קבל חצולך מֻדנבא מֻעאקבא מנזולא פי שאול והנאך נאר עקאבך אד אסתחקית ורודהא אנך מנד תחצל הנאך לא תלחק שיא תדפע בה ען נפסך כי אין מעשה לא עמלא תקדר תעמל הנאך ולא חסאב תחסֻב ולא עלם תעלם ולא חכמה תתחכם פי אלתֻרי אדא ורדתהא והי שאול אלדי ורדוהא אלשכאכין ואלכֻפאר בכיר מכלוקא ואגל מולודא ואכרם מרסולא.

*פאנתבה יא איהא אלנאים פי גֻמראת אלשהואת אנך פי אלדניא כנאימא האלמא מעאני יגתבט בהא וימכנהא ויצנעהא פי מא יְכַיל אליה לכנה אדא אסתיקץ לם יגד שיא מן מא כאן ולא יְמַכַן במא

* ענין מה שאמרו רז״ל שהעה״ז הוא עולם המעשה והעוה״ב הוא עולם השכר שנאמר היום לעשותם וכו׳ וזהו פי׳ פסוק שהע״ה כל אשר תמצא ידך לעשות בכוחך עשה וכו׳.

*הער״ה לאדם בעה״ז.

צפּה אלתי וצף נפסה תעאלי בהא וצמנהא הדא אלפסוק פלמא ראי מא ראי כר סאגדא בין ידיה עז וגל פקאל וימהר משה ויקד ארצה וישתחו הדה צפאתה והדה גמליה אוצאפה לם תשרה ולם יבין מעאניה בל גְּמלא גְּמלא. *נביא שד אללה פיה כלקתה כל כלקא מן ארבע אדרע מן אדרעה והו מן עשרה כמא שהד לה ויפרוש את האוהל על המשכן וכאן עליה עשרה כקולה עשר אמות אורך הקרש.

* עוד תדע מעלתו שהיה ברייה גדולה יותר מכל בני דורו.

*נביא קוי עלי אלבקיא דון גדא מאיה ועשרין יומא ארבעין אואיל נזלת עליה אללוחין אלאולין וארבעין תואני שפע פי אלמלה אן לא תפנא ארבעין תואלת שפע פי אלבאקיין ליגפר אללה להם ולא יזיל נורה מן בינהם פקבל אללה שפאעתה.

* עוד תדע מעלתו שישב ק״כ יום בלא אכילה ושתי׳.

*נביא מן שַׁכך פי אשיא מן רסאלתה אהתרקת רוחה והלך ובקי גסמה צחיחא כמא גרי ללצאל קרח וישיעתה מאיתין וכמסין צאלי׳ ואש יצאה מאת י״י ותאכל את החמשים ומאתים איש.

* עוד תדע מעלתו מעניין קרח ועדתו.

נביא מן אכדבה חָרק והו עאיש וורד נאר גהנם והו עאיש והמא אללעינין אלכאפרין אלגאחדין דתן ואבירם ובניהם ונסאהם והאשיתהם וכל מן שך פיה ואנתהו אלי מאיתין וכמסין רגלא גרקוא כלהם ואחתרקוא ובקי פיהם ארבעה עשר אלפא וסבע מאיה כאנוא קד שככוא שיא לים כשך אולאיך מאתוא יום תאני מן אלגרק במגפה למא סמוא אלהאלכין עם י״י ולים הם עם י״י ואנמא עם י״י מן אמן במשה פוצף אלכתאב וקאל וילונו כל עדת בני ישראל ממחרת על משה ועל אהרן לאמר אתם המיתם את עם י״י פנזל אלגנף כקולה והנה החל הנגף בעם פתדארכהא משה וקאל לאהרן קד אנף אללה עלי אלגמאעה אסרע כד אלמגמרה ואגעל פיה מן נאר אלמזבח ואגעל אלבכור אלדי בה תבכר כל יום גדוה ועשיה בין ידי אללה אן אללה קד אעלמני אן אלבכור ירפע אלמגפה ואכברני מלאך המות בדלך וקאל לי מנד ינזל אלבכור ננדפע אנא פאסרע הארון ועמל מא קיל לה וקף בין אלאחיא ואלמותי ואלמלאך ואקף יהלך גמלא והם יתיאקעון פקאל הארון ללמלאך תנחא אלי ורא נגעל מבכרתי הנא קאל לה אן אללה אמרני קאל לה הארון ומשה אמרני אנא ואמר משה הו אמר אללה פתוקף אלמלאך ונזלת אלמבכרה ואנדפע אלובא וקאל לה אללה אמר רסולי הו אמרי פקיל ויעמוד בין המתים ובין החיים פאנתהת עדה אלהאלכין ארבעה עשר אלפא וסבע מאיה מלבד המתים על דבר קרח אמר דאך אליום פצחת אלרסאלה ותבת אלברהאן ען אמר משה אנמא הו ען אללה ואלשאך באללה הו אלדי ישך במשה וכאנוא אלגארקין יציחון והם האבטין פי עמק אלארץ משה אמת ותורתו אמת ומא אפאדהם ציאההם שיא פלו כאן דלך קבל אנפתאה אלארץ לנפעהם אד ועדהם משה ותואעדהם בטול עקאב אללה פתואקחוא עליה ואכדבוה פקאל עליה אלסלאם אעלמו יא בני ישראל

רויתה וגהא גוז עליה אללה נור כרמה בקולה אני אעביר כל טובי על פניך.

* עוד תדע מעלת מרע"ה שחזר גופו כגוף המלאכי מ י כ א ל וגבריאל.

*נביא טהר גסמה אלי אן צאר כגסם מיכאל וגבריאל בל אקוי לאן האולאיך מן נור לא להמא ולא דמא ולא עצב ולא מואד והדא בשריא דכל בין אלאפא ורבואת מן מלאיכה נאר ילהב ואחד מנהם אלארץ נאהיך ען אנתמאעהם ידכל בינהם כקולה רכב אלהים רבותים אלפי שנאן י"י בם סיני בקודש (סיני באלקדום) תעאלי מתגליא עליה מע האולאי כלהם ישק פי מא בינהם ויעלא פוקהם וינטר אלי נור אללה עלי וגוהא לו וצפת וקרב אלמעני פיהא ואוצהת למא וסעתהא אלעקול כמא שהד אללה לה ומשה נגש אל הערפל אשר שם האלהים.

* עוד תדע מעלת מרע"ה שאחז בכסא הכבוד מאחז פני כסא פרשז עליו ענגו וכו'

*ידין טאהרה אמסכת כרסי ערש כראמתה לים פי ממכן חיות הקודש אן אחתמלת אלערש אלי חתי געל אללה פאצלא בין ראוסהא ורגלין אלערש כמא שהד אללה תעאלי ודמות על ראשי החיה רקיע כעין חקרה הנורא נטוי על ראשיהם מלמעלה וממעל לרקיע אשר על ראשם כמראה אבן ספיר דמות כסא ועל דמות הכסא שרח דלך קאל יחזקאל אני למא אוחי אלי בסבאת אלמנאם ואוראני ערש כראמתה ראית חמלת אלערש אלתי הי האמלתה פי אלטאהר והי מחמולה בקדרה אללה הו יחמלהא לים הי תחמלה וראית פוק רוסהא שי כאנה סמא עלי צפה אלתלג אלצאפי מהובא מהולא ועלי דאך אלסמא צורה כרסי לון אלמהא נורא כלקה אללה תעאלי ועליה נור כראמתה תעאלי ען אלאוצאף פשיא לא יחתמלה חמלה אלערש אחתמלתה ידי משה אד שרפה אללה תעאלי

* עוד תדע מעלת מרע"ה לפי שיום ידיו על יהושע למד תורה בששה חדשים יותר מארבע' שנה וכו'.

עלי כל מכלוק מן אלמלאיכה נאהיך ען אלבשר *וחסבך אן יד וצעהא עלי ראס יהושע אסרא אללה פי דמאנה מן חינה מן קוה עלם אלתורה חתי פהם פי סתה אשהר מן אלוקת אלדי וצעת עליה אלי גיבה משה מן אלבשר סתה אשהר פהם פיהא מן משה אכתר מן כל מן קרא עליה מן מדה ארבעין עאם גיר תלך אלשהור שהד אללה וקאל ויהושע בן נון מלא רוח הכמה כי סמך משה את ידיו עליו וסרא פי וגהה נורא מן ידיה כמא כלפה אללה אד קאל לה ונתת מהודך עליו פטאעת לה גמאעה ישראל כקולה וישמעו אליו בני ישראל ושהד וקאל ויראו אתו כאשר יראו את משה כל ימי חייו. *רגלין טהרת חתי וטית נמאם אלנור אלמקדם אד שהד אללה בקולה ויבא משה בתוך הענן ויעל אל ההר.

* עוד תדע מעלתו ממה שהיה שוכן בין המלאכים מ' יום ומ' לילה וכו'.

*גסמא קוי עלי מסאכנה אלמלאיכה ונור אללה האיטא בה ארבעין יום וארבעין לילה ומתלהא ווקף איצא ארבעין בעדהא תואלת שאפעא פינא פי נור האיטא בה ואכרהא יום צום כפור הו וקת ויפסל ויעל וירד י"י בענן הוא אלמנטר אלאעטם ראי מא לים פי אללממכן אן יראה מלאך נאהיך ען בשר כמא שהד לה והסירותי את כפי וראית וקאל ויעבור י"י על פניו וגאז נור אללה עלי וגהה פנאדא אללה מעלמא לה אנה תעאלי לא אלאה סואה ואנה רחום וחנון וסאיר אלתלתה עשר

אלצראיר ען אתה הונן ותצלא ואקף או גאלם למן לה עדרא ואלמכתצרה
ללגרור כמא קלנא הדא נצהא לרבותינו ז״ל אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו צרכי
עמך בית ישראל מרובין ודעתם קצרה יהי רצון מלפניך י״י אלהינו שתתן
לכל אחד ואחד ממנו די מחסורו ולכל גויה וגויה די מחסורה ופרנסתה
ותשמע תפלתינו ברוך שומע תפלה. הדה לא תחתאג לא תלתה אולה ולא
לתלתה אכירה ומן לם יערפהא יצלי באללפט אלערבי ויגזיה לאן אלצלוה
בכל לגה גאיזה וכאצה אן תכון אלאנראין בעינהא מתאע רבותינו ז״ל
תקלב ערביה ואמא אן יצלי ערביה בניר אנראין רבותינו פלא מתלא אן
יקול אללהם ארחמני ואקצי לי אמרא כדא וכדא פלא אלא אדא קאלהא
עלי וגה אלדעא והו מאשי או ראקד או גאלם לא אן יקצי בהא פרץ
צלוה והדא גרץ הדא אלמכתצר אלדי דכרנא אלתי תגוז פי אלגרור ען
צלוה כמא בינת יקול אללהם יא אלאהנא ואלאה אבאינא אנך תעלם
אן מטלובנא כתיר ולסאננא קציר אללהם יכון רצא מן ענדך אן תעטי
לכל ואחד מנא קדר מא יחתאג ותרזק כל גתה קותהא ותקבל דעאנא
אנך קאבל אלדעא תבארך אסמך אלעטים הדה תכפי כל מן לא יערף
שיא ולא יבקי דון ארתבאט *בלא צלוה ליס מע אללה באעטם מן *תנאים ש... המתפלל.
אלצלוה ואדא כאנת אלניה צאפיה ואלקלב מכלין מומן באללה ורסולה
צה אימאנה וצלה יקינה וגאד ענד אללה וכפאה אללה עטאים ולקי מנה
רחמה וירגא אלהנא פי אכרתה ואלנגאה מן אלנאר ואלאסתחקאק ללאחיא
וניל אלמגאזאה ורויה אלנעים אלמועוד בה ולולם יכן קאריא או עאלמא
וללעלמא אלקאריין ללתורה אלמשתגלין בפהם מעאניהא מנאזל ומגאזאה
כיף מא זאד זיד אגרא אדא כאן מע אלעלם דינא וחקיקה אימאן באללה
לתדרי קדר מן בעת אליך ומא בעת בה פאנה לעטים פאדא ערפת בעץ
מן אלגלאלה אלתי והבה אללה ומא פצלה עלי אלבשר צח אימאנך
בה וותקת באללה באלאימאן בה. *נביא שד אללה פי כלקתה וכלקה *
עלי אחסן תצוירא כמא שהד פיה אלכתאב ותרא אותו כי טוב הוא ואסם מעלת מרע״ה מתחלת צאתו לאויר העולם.
אללה טוב כקולה טוב י״י לכל טוב י״י לקוו טוב וישר י״י טוב אתה
ומטיב ואסם נורא טוב כקולה אני אעביר כל טובי על פניך לולא חאמנתי
לראות בטוב י״י מה רב טובך אשר צפנת ליראיך.

פלמא כאן אחסן תצוירא ונור אללה באינא עלי וגהה מן אוליתה
כקולה כי טוב הוא פכל מא מצי תזאיד נורה אלי אן אקתבם נורא עטימא
מן וקת ויעבור י״י על פניו רגע וגהה אעטם מן נור אלשמס בל אבהר
מנה ולים פי אלאמכאן אן יכון נור אלשמס כנור וגהה לאן אלשמס
מכלוקה מן נורא כלקה אללה תעאלי ונור וגה אלסיד משה מן נור כבוד
י״י אלגיר מכלוק פהו אמרא מהולא לא יתגרא בשר אן ידנו אליה נאהיך
אן יקדר יבצרה חתי ברקע וגהה ולם יסהר מנה גיר המאלק עיניה אכרם
בהא מן עינין אבצרת נורא לא יקדר מיכאל וגבריאל ולא חיות הקודש

קדר עלי כלאצך מן אלאֶסד פאנאבה דניאל מן אלגֹב והוא מֻטבקא עליה אלאהי בעת מלאכא מן ענדה וצרם פם אלאֶסד פלם יהלכוני גזא למא אסתחקית ענדה חסנה ואנא ליס אנא מכאלפא לאמרך פלו כנת עאציא לך לם אגד חטא ענדך לאן אללה קד חד אלטאעה ללמלך וגאיה מא געל לך עלי אלנאס אלטאעה ואמא אלעבאדה פהי ללה סבחאנה לא לך פמן לם יודי לך טאעה כאלף עלי אללה ועליך ומן לם יעבדך טאע אללה ולם יגני עליך ובדלך כלֶצת.

פחצרת אלגמלה אללעינה מע מעשר אלבשר ואצעד מן אלגֹב פגֶרד נסמה וראי נסמה אלמטהר נקיא לא גֶרה פיה בל אִימֶאנה נגאה פקאל אלמלך יוכד כל מן תכלם אלי פיה פאהצרוא ונסאוהם ואולאדהם וכתפוא ורמיוא פי אלגֹב פמא מנהם וצל אלי אלארץ אלא ואלסבועה קד פתחת אפואהה ולקפתהם חתי קטעוא אראבהם ותהאגמוא עלי מן כאן עלי ראס אלגֹב. פלולא תאכיד אלצלוה לם ינֶרר דניאל בנפסה עליהא ולא אקנעה גלוכא ואצמאר אלצלוה פי קלבה רכוע וסגוד כאלעאדה בל אשהארא לטאעה אללה תעאלי.

פלמא כאנת אלצלוה בהדא אלתאכיד רתבוא לנא אלאואיל זכרם לברכה והם אלתלתה אנביא אלמתאכרין חני זכריה ומלאכי עליהם אלסלאם מע מאיה ועשרין שיך מן שיוך אלעלם צלוה יתסאוא פיהא אלעאלם ואלגאהל ולא יזיד אלעאלם פיהא ולא יכתצר אלגאהל מנהא והי שמונה עשרה גיר אן הדה פי אלאמאן ואמא מואצע אלסַפָּנה רתבוא לנא איצא צלוה מכתצרה לילא יבקי אלאנסאן דון צלוה אלבתה וגעלוא אלבון [1]בינהא ובין שמונה עשרה אן שמונה עשרה תצלא אלי אלקבלה ואקפא או גאלס אן כאן מעדורא והדה אלמכתצרה תצלא פי מואצע אלגרור כיף מא אתפק גאלס או ואקף או מאשי ולאי קבלה כאנת ותגוז ענה ען צלוה אלוקת לכנה אדא בלג ללאמאן פי אליום בעינה והוא קד צלאהא אלתלאתה כלהא אעני אלצלוה אלתי הי מכתצרה פיעיד צלוה מעריב פקט לא שחרית ולא מנחה ואן וצל בחין ללאמאן וקת מנחה יצלי מנחה קבל צלוה שחרית שמונה עשרה ומן לם יערף שיא גמלה יצלי אלצלוה אלמכתצרה פי אוקאת אלצלוה ולא יבקא בלא צלוה פיתכלא באלגמלה לאן כל מן לא ינצם למצמאר צלוה הו ואלמֻתכלי מן אלדין סוי ומן לא יערף שיא ויקף יצלי אי שיא ולא ידרי מא יקול ליסת צלוה אלא אלצלוה אלתי רתבוא אלאואיל והי שמונה עשרה למן יערף או מכתצרהא למן לא יערף או מכתצר אלמכתצר פמן ידרי ילפט באלעבראני ויצלי אלמכתצרה והי י״י שפתי תפתח כלהא אלי אכר אתה קדוש ופי אלאכר רצה ומודים ושים שלום ואלמכתצרה מוסטה עוצא מן אתה חונן והדא נצהא לרבותינו ז״ל יקול בעד אתה קדוש, הבינגו י״י אלהינו לדעת דרכיך ומול את לבבינו ליראתך לסלח היה לנו להיות גאולים רחקנו ממכאוב ודשננו בנאות ארצך ונפוצים מארבע תקבץ והתועים מדעתך ישפטו ועל הרשעים תניף ידיך וישמחו צדיקים בבנין עירך ובתיקון היכלך ובצמיחת קרן לדוד עבדך ועריכת נר לבן ישי משיחך ותשמע תפלתינו ברוך שומע תפלה תם יקול רצה ומודים ושים שלום הדה תגני פי

---

[1] הפרש.

עליו ה׳ יצחק ויעקב אנחם כאנוא יצלונהא פכאן אבינו אברהם עליו השלום
מֶחתפלא בצלוה אלצבה ירצד וקת כרוג אלשמס יקצי פיה בין ידי אללֶה
כמא וצף וישכם אברהם בבוקר אל המקום אשר עמד שם את פני יי
ואלסיד יצחק אחתפל בצלוה מנחה כאן ירצד אול אלסאבעה יצלי פיהא
כקולה ויצא יצחק לישוה בשדה לפנות ערב ואלסיד יעקב אחתפל בצלוה
מעריב מן טַהור אלכואכב כקולה ויפגע במקים וילן שם כי בא השמש
*וכלהם כאנוא יצלון אלתלת צלואת לכנה לא בד לכל פאצל מן
אמרא מן אואמר אללה יכון פיה מחתפלא כתיר ועלי אנה יעמלהא
כלהא פכמא כאן אברהם אול מומן אחתפל באלאולה לאן אנבעאת אלצו פי
אלדניא הו אברהם מצוי אלדניא ומהדי ואול ללבשר ויצחק תאני לה
אחתפל באלתאניה ויעקב אלתאלת אחתפל באלתאלתה פאלצאלחון מן
אלמלה מא אנפלוא אבדא תלתתהא ואלגיד פיהם מן יצליהא אלתלאת
או אלאתנתין או ואחדה מא מנהא אתפק לכנה מא כֶלי קט מְשַרע מנהא
פלמא עלם אלסיד דוד קדר פצלהא וצף נפסה ואלמחתפלין מתלה בקלה
אלפות להא אלתלאתה פקאל ערב ובוקר וצהרים אשיחה ואהמה *ווצף
דניאל עליה אלסלאם באלאחתפאל בהא קולה וזמנין תלתה ביומא הוה
ברך על ברכיהי ומצלא ומודא קדם אלהיה וגרר בנפסה פיהא אד קטעוא
אלפארסיין ואלמַדַיין כל צלוה לאנלה לעלה אן יקע פוקע ולם יעין אללה
עלי אדיתה פעאהד אלמלך לילא יצלי בשר תלאתין יומא ויכון אלמטלב
צַבחא ומסאא מן אלמלך לא מן אלאה ולא מן אללה עז וגל פנרר
בנפסה וגרי עלי עאדתה פי צלותה פַרצד עלי אלסטוח פכִשף עליה פַקבין
ושְפי אלי אלמלך ואנפהם אנה הדא כאן אלמקצד מטלבא לה לאנה
וירה מְרפעא עלי אלכל פלם יוגד אליה סביל למטאלבה בוגה גיר בגאנב
אללה תעאלי פעמם עלי אלמלך בלוג אלאמל ללמטאלב פיה פקהרוה
אלוזרא לְענת גמלתהם עלי רמיה פי גֵב ממלו אֶסד גאיעה כאן ללמלך
מעדא למן יריד ינתקם מנה במותה סו פַרמי פיה ואלמלך מְפתַריבַא עליה
ובאת פיה וגעלת חגרא עלי פם אלגב וטַמם עליה וגעל אלמלך טאבעה
עלי אלתמים קאלוא ללמלך איאך תזאל באללילְ ויכרג מנה או יחתאל
פיה׳ פלמא כאן וקת נזולה פיה אתי גבריאל עליה אלסלאם גלם מעה
וסר אפואהה ורבטהא פלם תתחרך מן מוצעהא ומרבצהא וקעד מעה
מואנסא לה לילא יפוז פלמא אצא אלנהאר קאם אלמלך וקד נפר נומה
תלך אללילה ומא אפטר עלי שי ולא דכלת ענדה נאריה ולא מחדתא
ואנטבק נמא פקאם אול אלצבה ומשא מלהופא ותבעה כל מן לקיה אלי
אלגב פלמא קרב מן אלגב [1]צאח [2]מתאספא וקאל יא דניאל ויא עאבד
אללה אלאלאה אלהי אלקיום אתרי אלאלאה אלדי אנת עאבדה דאימא

*שאלה באמרם ז״ל אברהם תקן תפלת שחריח וכי לא היה מתפלל מנחה וערבית עד שתקנו אותם יצחק ויעקב וי״ל.

*גודל מעלת התפלה שהרי דניאל ניצול בזכותה מגוב האריות ודוק ותשכח.

---

[1] זעק [2] בקול עצב.

שהוה אלנסא ואלתאני הב אלדניא ואמאלהא ואגראצהא באלשהוה
אלגאלבה עלי אלכל אלדי מנהא כְּלקנֵא והי אלתי *כאמרת אלכל פמא
עצם מנהא גיר אלאנביא ואלאוליא פאלדניא כאמראה גמילה מנטרהא
חסן וצפאתהא חַסַאן וזיהא חפילא ואטיאבהא פאיחה ומשיהא כאדעא
ללנאטרין להא פי אלעין חטוה וכלאמהא עדבא ולַהְוֵא תרק אלנפום
לסמאעהא ותסתמיל אלקלוב באכבארהא קד בסטת פי טרקהא שבאך
ואנשבת פי מחאגהא פכוכא תצטאד אלטאמע בהא ואלראגב פיהא
ותכאדעה אלי אן יקע ימשי אליהא טאמעא והי מנה הארבה יטמע וימשי
ולא יעלם מא תחתה כעצפורא האויא *מְצַרַחַא קד נְצַבַּת לה שבאך ובדר
לה חבא פוקהא פלמא נטר מנהא מאל אליהא ונזל ללקטהא פקאמת
אלשבכה עליה ווחל מציודא פיהא ירום **אלצראה ולא ימכנה אלטיראן
תמתיל שלמה עליה אלסלאם אלדניא כאמראה בקולה והנה אשה לקראתו
שית זונה ונצורת לב ווצף כדעהא ללמאיל אליהא אלי אן יוהק פי
פכוכהא פישבההא וקאל כמהר צפור אל פה פאיך מן כדאע אלדניא
וטלב אלמְנֵא *ואפתכר פי קואטע אלמות אלחאיל בין אלאראדה ואלאנסאן
וזואלה מן מוטנה ורמיה ברא מן מנזלה ומוצעא כאן יגב פי קעודה פיה
יתקלק בה חתי יכרג מנה [1]ותַבעד [2]אלקראבה מנה [3]ותתפרק [4]אלעצאבה
ויפרד וחדה מציקא פי לחדה ויתרך כל מא כסב ויחאסב עלי מא ארתכי
ויולא אליה באלחסאב ויגב עליה אלעדאב עדאב [5]נאב ען אלעיאן ולם
ינפהם ללאנסאן [6]פהמונה אלאנביא [7]ועלמונה אלאתקיא ותוקונה [8]אלאוליא
ולם יפכרון פיה אלארדיא *פמן [9]כאן מנה עלי חדר אגאד אלנטר ולם
יעבא באלדניא אן אקבלת [10]מא תסרה ואן אדברת מא תצרה פלא עקל
למן רגב פיהא רגבא תוגב פסאד האלה מע אללה עז וגל ואי צלאה
למן לם יצלה מע רבה ואי לדה למן לם ינתדר אלעדאב ואי ראחה למן
לא בְּקיֵא לה פי אלדניא וכיף יאמל אלאנסאן בלוגה שהותה פי שיא
פיה התפה ואמלא יבלגה באלחילולה בינה ובין רבה *פאלבאצר ינטר
לרבה ויעלג באלאתצאל באללה תעאלי ליכון מן אלמנתבטין אלמרתבטין
ויקנע מן אלדניא באליסיר אדא אעתאץ עליה אלכתיר ויקנע מן אלדניא
באקל שיא *פאדא טלב אלגאיה ואלאכתאר טלב דלך פי מא כלפה
אללה איאה ובלג אלגאיה פי אדאה פיגב אלפכר ואלתעב
אלאנסאן לנפסה ויסעא לנפסה לא לגירה *ומן אעטם אלצלה בין אלאנסאן
ובאריה אדא פרץ אלצלוה תלתה מראר פי כל יומא שכרא ללה תעאלי
עלי אנבעאת אלצו אול אלצְבה ופי אלאעתדאל וקת זואל אלשמם מן
אלשרק אלי אלגרב וענד גרוב אלנהאר וכדא וגדנא פי אלאתאר מנד
כאן אללייל ואלנהאר וקד נקלת אלרבאניה ען אלאבא אלאול אברהב

*העולם הזה נמשל לאשה יפה והולך אחר תאוות העולם כהולך אחר הזונה.

*מסרחא

**אלסיראח

מני גמע מניה ר״ל תאוות.
*יזכור האדם יום המיתה שהוא עתיד ליתן דין וחשבון.

*
השומר נפשו ירחק מהנאות העולם הזה.

* מי שעיניו פקוחות ידבק בדרך האל״ת ויחתפנו מן העולם הזה בדבר מ׳.

*
כי שרודפאחר היתרונות.
*דבר שידבק . . . ן האדם בבוראו . . .א התפלה לכן צריך אדם להיות נזהר בה ...פ בכל יום.

---

[1] ותתרחק [2] הקורבה [3] ותתפרד [4] החבורה [5] נעלם [6] הבינוהו [7] ידעוהו [8] הקדושים [9] נזהרו ממנו
[10] לא ישמחו בו.

אלליל ואלנהאר [1]נכשא באלנהאר אלנדר בנא ומא יחדת מן תדביר ראי
עלינא מע אכתלאף אלסאעאת פנתמנא אן נכון אליום עלי חאל [2]אלבארחה
אלדי רקדנא [3]מטמאנון ונקול מע טול אלנהאר יא ליתנא לו סלמנא
אליום מנהם כמא כנא אלבארחה לם תגרי עלינא גאריה ואדא נא אלליל
נקול מן ידרי הדה אללילה אי האדתה יחדת באללילֿ עלינא יא לית לו
כאנת אללילה מתל יומנא אלדי סלף והו אלדי תואעדנא נבינא בה
בבוקר תאמר מי יתן ערב ובערב תאמר מי יתן בוקר פינב אלפכר פי מא
ועד בה ומא נרגוא פתסכן אלנפוס אלכאיבה ויהתדי רועהא אד
לא בד מן קילולה ומן גברה בעד הדה אלנחוס ומן פרג בעד הדא אלהרג
*ויסעא אלאנסאן פי סרה וגהרה פי שי יעמלה מן אלשרע ואמתאל
אלמצות בקלבה וגסמה ויתמסך בחבל שריעתה ולא יחל ידה ענה פנחן
פי אלגלות מתל גריקא קד גרקנא אלי חד אלאנֵף לכנא בקינא מתמסכין
שיא מדלולין מדמומין מְקמְיִן קד חאטת בנא בחאר אלגלות ווחלנא פי
לגגהא וקד וצל אלמא אלי אנאפנא ובקינא פי אסוא חאל כמא וצף
חאלנא דוד עליה אלסלאם אד קאל הושיעני אלהים כי באו מים עד נפש
בלנת אלמיאה לחד אלנפס וחבלא מן שראיע אללה ותוראתה מעלקא מן
אלסמא אלי אלארץ פאי יד מסכת בה כאן להא רגא ומטמעא לאן
באלאמסאך יקוי אלקלב ויטמאן מן אלגרק ללקער וללהלאך ומן חל ידה
מן אלחבל ליס בינה ובין אללה וצאל וסְגְלב אללה עליה אלמיאה
אלגאמרה לה ויתגטא מוצע אלתנפס ויגרק פיהלך ובחסב אלתמסך באלחבל
תכון אלטמאניה מן אלגרק מן אמסך בידה כלהא פהו ארגא לא
מחאלה מן ממסכא בבעץ ידה ומן לם ימסך מנה סוי באטראף אלאצאבע
פהו ארגא בלא מחאלה ממן חל ידה מנה גמלה פמא יכלץ מן שבאך
אלגלות סוי אלאשתגאל באלתורה ושרוחאתהא ואמתאלהא ומלאזמתהא
ואללהג בהא דאימא [4]ומואטבתהא לילא ונהארא קאל דוד עליה אלסלאם
*לולי תורתך שעשועי אז אבדתי בעניי קאל לולא תוראתך קְרהֿ עיני
ומנא נפסי להלכת פי אִיאם דְלי תנבא עץ ישראל פי נשבתהם פי אלגלות
ווחלתהם פי שבאכה וכיף אן באשתגאלהם באלתורה ועמלהם בהא יתכלצוא
וינגוא מן שבאך אלאעאדי אלדין נשבוא בינהם *פינב עלי אלאנסאן אן
תכון אלניה סאלמה ואלקלב כאלץ מומן באללה אנה חק ומואעידה לנא
חק מומן באלרסול אלאול ומא בְעת בה מְקרא ללה פי אלרבוביה ולהדא
אלרסול בצדק אלרסאלה יקול בקלבא סאלמא ניר מגשושא וניר משכוכא
משה אמת ותורתו אמת *ולא יַתְבע בהימיתה וירוח טבעה עלי עקלה
פיתלף דינה ואכרתה פינתר באלדניא אלפאניה פאלאצל אלגאלב עלי
אלאנסאן אנמא הו חב אלדניא אלדי בלי אלאנסאן פיהא בבלאין אלואחד

*לכן צריך
ל ה ש ר ש ל
בתורה ובמצוי
כי הם כמו
ח ב ל ב י ד
הנטבעים בים
הגלות להציל'

*
הדבר שיצילנו
מהגלות הוא
העוסק בתורה
תמיד יומם
ולילה.

*הקדמה
לכן צריך אדם
שיהא לבו
שלם עם אלהי'
מאמין בדבריו
ולא ילך אחר
החומר ולא
כריע הטבע
על השכל.

[1]נפהד [2]אמש [3]בנוח ושאנן [4]שקידה.

קל ללרעיה אלמלך יצנע לכם צניעא ויכסיכם וימכנכם תם גאב אלרסו
פנאו ֶרסלא גירה פי אוקאת מכתלפה מע אלאיאם קאל כל ואחד מנה
מא אמר בה מן וצפה אלצניע אלמועוד בה וקאל ויכון בה מן אלאעדא
כדא וכדא פחנת נפוס אלסאמעין ללסמאע ושרהוא למא סמעוא פאנא
תאני קאל ויכון פי אלצניע מן אלבְסוה לכל מן חצר צפה כדא וכד
פכל מן נא ועד ווצף כיף כל הדה אלמקאלאת תחת אלמקאלה אלאו
דכלת ופי לפטהא אשתמל אלכל תם* אקסם אללה עלי כל דלך באסמ
אלמקדם אן יַתבת כל מא קאלוא אלואגדין מן ענדה באמרה פלו כא
מלכא מן כלק אללה וועד מואעיד ויקסם עליהא לאסרוא [1]אלמועוד
בדלך [2]גיר אנה סרורא [3]מרתאבא מנה מן [4]ונהין אלואחד מנ
[5]חכמה מצרופא [6]אלי גירה [7]ורוחה [8]איצא ביד [9]גירה [10]אן [11]עאש [12]רבמ
לא [13]יעאן עלי [14]שיא מן מא ַעד בה [15]לחואדת [16]תַחדת עליה [17]ומואנ
[18]תמנעה או [19]מותא קאטעא [20]באלואעד פלם ינתרך אן [21]יפי או באלמוע
לא [22]ישאהד דלך ואמא אלבארי גל גלאלה אלדי לא מאנע ימנעה ול
האדתא יחדת עליה ולא מעתאץ יעתאץ עליה ולא קאטעא יקטע בה ול
מותא ולא פותא פכיף לא יפי במא ועד דון ימין ולא סימא בימין לא
ימין אלמכלוק באסמה [23]כַּלַפה לְיַתבתה וקאל ככל היוצא מפיו יעש
פכיף הוא תעאלי דאתה ולו אקסם במכלוקאתה אלתי הי פאניה וכל אשי
הי ענדה לקיל לים בקסם ואנמא אקסם באסמה אלדי לא יזול ולא יח
והו אלדי יקול תעאלי בי נשבעתי נאם יי וקאל לה אלנבי אד [24]סכ
וארד [25]אפנאהם עלי מא פעלוא קאל לה זכור לאברהם ליצחק ולישרא
עבדיך אשר נשבעתי להם בך וקאל פי מואעדנא בי נשבעתי יצא מפ
צדקה *פהדה גמל בינה ואצול טאהרה וַאַדַלַה קאימה עלי אן אללה ל
יבנצנא ולם יזיל אסם אלבנוה ענא לא מרצין ולא מסכוטין לא מומני
ולא מנצרפין כקולה בנים אתם ליי אלהיכם בני בכורי ישראל בנים ל
אֵמן בם בנים משחיתים בנים סכלים וועד באלרצא בקולה יֵאָמר לה
בני אל חי כי היתי לישראל לאב ואפרים בכורי הוא וכם מן הדא פיג
אן נְתַק באללה [26]ונאמן בה ולא [27]נְשכך פי מואעידה כמא לא נשך כ
וגודה ולא נרתאב מן אבעאדנא אד קד ועדנא באלתקריב *ולא [28]יהילנ
[29]עִמַם שאן [30]אלאמם [31]וטול [32]מדדהם [33]וכתרה [34]אעדאדהם ומה זעמו
ומא יאמלוה לאן נחן באללה ואתקין ובמואעידה מומנין ומע [35]אלאסתיל
עלינא ואלענף בנא וקהרנא וגלבתנא ואכתלאף אלאפאת מע אכתלא

*ונשבע הקב"ה לקיים כל דברי הנביאים.

*כ כ ל ז ה למדנו שהקב"ה לא ימאס בנו ולא יסיר ממנו השם החבוי שקראנו ב נ י ם בין בשעת הכעס בין בשעת הרצון.

*ואע"פ שנרא' האומו' במעל' וישלוה לא נחוש.

---

[1]היו שמחים הנועדים [2]אלא שהיא שמחה [3]מסופק [4]שני פנים [5]גזרתי או מאמרו [6]זולו
[7]ונפשו [8]גם כן [9]זולתו [10]אם [11]יחיה [12]לפעמים [13]יעזר [14]דבר [15]לחדושים [16]יחודשו [17]ומונע
[18]ימנעוהו [19]מות [20]במועד [21]ישלים [22]יראה [23]יכריחהו [24]קצף [25]לכלותם [26]ונאמין [27]נסספק [28]יפח
[29]גודל יתרון [30]אומות [31]אורך [32]זמנם [33]ורוב [34]מספרם [35]שלטין :

ינזל עליה כבלא אלאדמי אלדי לים בבלא׳ פקאל אֲשֶׁר בְּהַעֲוֹתוֹ וְהוֹכַחְתִּיו
בְּשֵׁבֶט אֲנָשִׁים וּבְנִגְעֵי בְּנֵי אָדָם פאעלן אללה תעאלי בהדא אלצמיר
לרסולה אלאול וקאל וְאַף גַּם זֹאת בִּהְיוֹתָם בְּאֶרֶץ אוֹיְבֵיהֶם לֹא מְאַסְתִּים
וְלֹא גְעַלְתִּים לְכַלֹּתָם לְהָפֵר בְּרִיתִי אִתָּם כִּי אֲנִי יְיָ אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וקאל עלי
יד אלאתיין[1] בעד אלנבי אלאול כִּי אֶעֱשֶׂה כָלָה בְּכָל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר
הֲפַחְתִּיךְ שם אך אותך לא אעשה כלה ויסרתיך למשפט ונקה לא
אנקך פלו אראד אללה יבגצנא[2] אדא עצינאה[3] לאטרחנא[4] גמלה
ויותר פינא כמא זעמו אעאדינא[5] ולו כאן מא זעמוא חקא לאעטיו[6]
מא אעטינא ומכנוא מן מא מכנא *אלי תרי אן אלמלך אדא סכט אלי
אחד כאצתה עַיִן מנה בתאני ואפסאה כסותה ואחלאה בחליתה ומכנה
מן נפסה כמכנה אלזאיל ואדא בגין אלאנסאן זוגתה תעוין מנהא בתאניה
ומכנהא מנה מכנה אלאולי כמא קיל וַיָּשֶׂם פֶּתֶר מַלְכוּת בְּרֹאשָׁה
וַיַּמְלִיכֻהָ תַּחַת *וַשְׁתִּי פאין אלמלה אלתי קבב אללה עליהא בנמאמה[7]
ואסכן סכינתה[8] מראיה ללעיין[9] פי מא בינהם כקולה אולא וּכְבוֹד
יְיָ מָלֵא אֶת הַמִּשְׁכָּן ופי אלבלאד כִּי־מָלֵא כְּבוֹד יְיָ אֶת בֵּית יְיָ ואי נבי
מתל אלנבי אלמכרם ואיאת[10] בינאת[11] ועטאים ואעוגבאת וכרוך
אלעאדאת ואיצא אן לו קרב אללה גירנא ונזל עליהם שרענא לקיל
ימכן בדלהם בקומא טאיעין למא כאנוא עאציין ואנמא שרענא לים
כישרעהם יריד מא לם יְרִיד ויחב מן כרהה אמס כיף יְמכן הדא *ולו
תרכנא מְשאעא יועד ויתועד וינקטע אלכבר גדנַא[12] תבת אלועד[13]
רַדְיֵנָא[14] אתבת אלועיד[15] ולם יקע מנה ביאנא לכאן אלקיאם
מחתמל אן לה פינא גרין חית נרא אנה לם יְעוּן מנא בקומא גירנא
ולו אעטא אחדא מן תלך אלמואהב מתאענא פכיף אד מלא כתבה
וכתר מן אלמואעיד אלבינה בעד אלקוארע במעאני ואן לם תכון עאד
בלסתכון דכרהא כלהא בלפטא וגיזא מכתצרא שאמלא *אלנבי אלאול
קאל באחרית הימים ושבת עד יי אלהיך ושמעת בקולו ושב יי אלהיך
את שבותך ורחמך ושב וקבצך מכל העמים אשר הפיצך יי אלהיך שמה
אם יהיה נדחך בקצה השמים משם יקבצך יי אלהיך ומשם יקחך
והביאך יי אלהיך אל הארץ אשר ירשו אבותיך וירשתה והטיבך והרבך
מאבתיך כי ישוב יי לשוש עליך לטוב כאשר שש על אבותיך *הדה
גמלה תחתמל מן אלשרה מא קד שרחוה אלאנביא אלאתיין בעדה
מא קאל ישעיה וירמיה ויחזקאל ואלאתני עשר נבי פי תְּרֵי עָשָׂר ודניאל
אלכאתם להם וכל מא אשתמל עליה ספר תלים מן מואעיד כלהא ביאן
אלגמלה אלדי קאל אלנבי אלאול *ומתאל דלך כאנסאן קאל לוזירה

*ואם תאמר שהחליף אותנו באומה אחרת ה אי אפשר שהרי לא נהג עם שום אומה כמו שנהג עם ישראל אי זו שהגין עליה כ ע נ י ן זו השכין שכינתו בתוכה.

*אי זו אומה ש נ ת ן לה הקב״ה תורה כמו ש נ ת ן לישראל.

* ועוד זה הבטיחנו כמה הבטחות.

* ה ב ט ח ה ראשונה ע״י זשה ר׳ ע״ה.

ושאר נביאים ירשו מה שאמר מרע״ה

ה מ ש ל הבין הענין.

---

[1] באים. [2] מאס גועל. [3] מרה את פי. [4] משליך. [5] אויבינו. [6] נתן להם. [7] נתן לו. [8] ענן. [9] שכינה. לעינים. [11] אותות. [12] ברורות. [13] הטבנו. [14] יעוד טוב. [15] הרשענו.

ענין שהקב״ה בחר ישראל מכל האומות ולא ימירם באומה אחרת ואעפ״י שגזר עלינו גלות כאשר ייסר איש את בנו וכו׳.

יְרִיד שיא תָם יַחַדָת עליה מא לא יבני עליה פיבדא לה ואמא מן סבק עלמה בעלם כל אלאחואל וחיניד בַּיַנָהָא כמא שא כיף יְרִיד שיא ויבדא לה ויפצל קימא תם ירפצהם פהדא אמר לא יסוג פי גאנבה תעאלי וכקולה למן זעם דלך לא אִישׁ אֵל וִיכַזֵב וּבֶן אָדָם וְיִתְנֶחָם וקאל שמואל עליה אלסלאם וְגַם נֵצַח יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יְשַׁקֵר וְלֹא יִנָחֵם כִּי לֹא אָדָם הוּא לְהִנָחֵם פלמא ראינאה קד אכתאר קומא ופצלהם ומאל אליהם ואשתר גודה להם וקרב מנהם קרבא לם יכן לכלקא קבלהם ולא כאן לכלקא בעדהם עלמנא אן קד סבק עלמה בהם ועלם אנהם יצדקון ויקפון ענד אואמרה אולא ואכרא וכל אלמעאני אלגאריה בין אלחאלין אנמא הי ערציה לא תאבתה ולא באקיה כאנסאן צחיחא רְבִי והו צגירא וְדרג מן שיא לשיא פלמא אעתדל בְּקָא מדה עלי אחסן חאל תָם חַדָתַת עליה עללא ואסקאם אכתלת צחתה ותגירת סחנתה[1] וכאנה מא כאן קט צחיחא ויכאד אן לא תבקא שיא מן אַלַאשַׁכַאל אִלָא ותגירת עליה פבקא מָדַדַא מַאיוסַא מנה אִלַי אַן תדרגת חאלה פבדא אלבדן נאגחא טאהרא ינגבר שיא שיא פעאד לצחתה וכאנה מא אעתל[2] קט[3] כדלך סבק פי עלמה תעאלי תבות ישראל עלי אלטאעה ואעתדאלהם פיהא וקבולהם אואהא כקולה וַיַעַן כָּל הָעָם קוֹל אֶחָד וַיֹאמְרוּ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְיָ נַעֲשֶׂה וְנִשְׁמָע ועלם תעאלי אן כדלך יכונוא אלי נאבר אלדהור פחתם וקאל וְגַם בְּךָ יַאֲמִינוּ לְעוֹלָם פוצף אכתלאל אלחאל בין אלחַאלַיִן וְהָיָה אִם לֹא תִשְׁמַע בְּקוֹל יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ ותואעד בכל קַארַעָה[4] גרת וכל האלה חלת ומא נאב מן אלנואיב ואעלן[5] פי אַוַאכְרַהָא אן מע אכתלאל האלהם ואקתצאצה מנהם ליס בבאנצא פיהם ולא ראפצא להם ואנמא הי אדאבא ועקאבא עלי אלכלאף כמא סַמי אלנאזלאת[6] אדבא הו קולה וידעת עם לבבך כי כאשר ייסר איש את בנו אלהיך מיסרך קאל אלרסול אפהמוא ואתתבתוא ואעלמוא אן עקאבה לכם לִים כעַקאבה לְלמַלַל בל אלבון[7] אלדי בינכם ובינהם בינא[9] באן אלמכאלף אדא כאן בראני[8] עקאבה גיר עקאב אלוַלַד לאן מן כאַלפה גיר אבנה אנזל בה עקאבא שדידא האנקא[10] עליה מָרִיד אסתיצאלה[11] ואלולד אדא כאלף יְנזַל אלאב בה עקאבא[12] בתאדיב ולטף יולמה אלמא לא תבקא אדיתה[13] בְּשׂרַאף[14] יוגע ולא יותר לא בסוט[15] מותר *ולא בקציב[16] *אלא יַרְשֶׁם לחינה ויולם ולא ישק אללחם כמא ישק אלסוט וכקולה כי תַפֶּנוּ בַּשֶׁבֶט לא יָמוּת וקיל ען אלמחבוב ענדה מן כלקה אנה אדא כאלף יודבה בעקאבא הו לה לטיפא כצרב אלאנסאן באלקציב ובלא

---

[1]הוד פנים. [2]החלה. [3]כלל. [4]צרה. [5]והודיע בברור. [6]צרות רבות. [7]הפרש. [8]נכרי. [9]מבואר. [10]בקצף גדול. [11]לשרש. [12]מוסר. [13]צער או נזק. [14]שרוך נעל רצועה. [15]שוט. [16]שבט.

בשם י״י אל עולם.

רסאלה מרנו ורבנו מימון בר מרנו ורבנו יהוסף זכר צדיק לברכה אלפהא במדינה פאם שנת אתע״א לשטרות בעת בהא לבעין אכואנה לתכון לה [1]אנסא ונזהה[2] ללנפוס אלתי[3] כאבת[4] בחזן אלגלות והזנת לבעד[5] אלמואעיד[6] וטאל[7] אלאנתטאר[8] עלי צד אלאכתיאר[9] ותקלב[10] אללֵיל ואלנהאר עלי חאל אלאצטראר ואלתקתל[11] עלי טאעה[12] אללה ואמתאל[13] שראיעה[14] ואן כתרת אלמצאר רגא[15] למא מנחה ואנתטאר[16] למא ועד בה תעאלי מן ואעד וצדקת אקואלה כקולה תעאלי ען דאתה. בִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי יָצָא מִפִּי צְדָקָה דָּבָר וְלֹא יָשׁוּב כִּי לִי תִּכְרַע כָּל בֶּרֶךְ תִּשָּׁבַע כָּל לָשׁון שרה דלך: באסמי אקסמת אלדי לא קסמא אגל מן אסמי דכרי קצא באלפרקאן אפצאל מני והו כלאמא לא ירתגע פיה אד תעאלית ען אלארתגאע ואלבדא לאן לי רכעת רכבה כל מכלוק ובי אקסמת אלאלסן בארה ולא שי יחלף בי עליה אלא ויפעל פכיף אדא כנת אנא אלמקסם ואנא אלפאעל תעאלי דכרה ואסמה:

קאל ראסלהא זצ״ל.

אעלם הדאך אללה למא יריד ואבעדך ען מא כרה ואבעד ואסלכך מסלכא מסתקימא וגעל לך מלאיכה קומה עונא מעאונין עלי מא יַרְצֶיהָ ויוגבה אלשרע ויקתציה עלי מא ועד בה אוליאה עלי יד אנביאה טוב וְיָשָׁר יְיָ עַל כֵּן יוֹרֶה חַטָּאִים בַּדָּרֶךְ יַדְרֵךְ עֲנָוִים בַּמִּשְׁפָּט וילמד עֲנָוִים דַּרְכּוֹ:

אעלם אנה קד באן ואתצח במא צח מן אלכתב אלנבויה ושרוח אלרבאניה אן אללה גל ועז חקא ומא ארסל בה חקא ומא נקלתה אלכאפה ען אלכאפה צדקא לא ריב[17] פיה ולא אכתלאל[18] ולא כדבא[19] ולא כבאל אן אללה עאלמא במא כאן קבל כונה וקד סבק פי עלמה כל אלאחואל מא יריד שיא ויבדא לה ולא יַפְצֹל תם יַרְפִּין ואנמא אלאדמי אלדי נאב ענה עלם אלגיב הו אלדי

---

[1] שעשועים. [2] מרגוע. [3] לנפשות הנואשות. [4] יאוש. [5] לאחור. [6] מועדים. [7] אורך. [8] תוחלת ממושכה. [9] בחירה. [10] התחפבות. [11] נפול בחרב. [12] הכנע. [13] קיום. [14] תורתו. [15] תקוה. [16] תוחלת. [17] סבן. [18] הפסד. [19] כזב.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

JULY, 1890.

THE LATE CHIEF RABBI, DR. N. M. ADLER זצ"ל.

"PREPARE thyself for the study of the Law, for it will not come to thee by inheritance." These are the words of Rabbi Jose (Mishnah Aboth, ii. 17), and we are generally inclined to assent to his view, for without application and work we cannot expect to reap good fruit in the field of learning. And yet the remarkable, and not altogether rare, fact presents itself to our eyes when searching in the annals of history, that the same distinction has been gained by members of a family for many generations. The earlier history of the Jews presents a striking instance in the family of Hillel; throughout the period of the Tanaim and Amoraim, the descendants of Hillel were famous for their learning. In the Middle Ages the ancestors as well as the descendants of the great Maimonides distinguished themselves as earnest students of the Law; the house of Rashi likewise flourished through several generations as a house of learning, and an instance of successful study of the Law being transmitted from generation to generation is furnished in our own days by the family of Adler, which seems to have had its principal seat in Frankfort-on-the-Main. According to a tradition in the possession of one of its prominent members, the family is closely related to Rabbi Simeon ha-Darshan (the preacher), of Frankfort, the supposed author of the collection of Midrashim, called Yalkut Shimeoni, who lived in the 13th century. Family traditions of this kind are sometimes the result of vague rumours, or of fanciful combinations, but,

as a rule, they may be accepted as based on trustworthy communications, although no written record can be discovered.

There are two elements in Jewish life that favour the preservation of *Talmud-Torah*—the study of the Law—in the same family for a long period. First, genuine *Talmud-Torah* is not an occupation which engages the student a certain portion of the day, or a certain period in life, and is then put aside out of sight and out of mind; it is not a preparation for certain examinations to be discontinued immediately when the examinations are passed or abandoned. The *lamdan* ("scholar") considers every interruption of the "study of the Law" sinful, and the exhortation, "And thou shalt speak of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest on the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up," is obeyed literally. Whether in his study with his books, or in the dining-room at his meals; whether alone, or in company with juniors, equals, or seniors; whether at home, or in the synagogue, or the Beth ha-midrash, on days of work, or on days of rest: the words of the Torah never depart from the mind or the mouth of the lamdan. He lives in an atmosphere of *Torah;* here he has his field of labour, but also his garden for recreation; here he works hard to solve difficult problems of a literary, legal, theological, or philosophical character, and also amuses himself with beautiful proverbs, fables, parables, tales or fanciful descriptions of things in the heavens above, or of things beneath the earth; here he is exhorted to obedience and repentance, but also comforted with the blessings that await the pious in the world to come; here he learns the divine precepts which regulate his actions, and at the same time imbibes the grand moral principles of love of God and love of his fellow men.

In this same atmosphere the children of the *lamdan* live and are brought up. From their earliest youth they become not only acquainted with biblical verses, Talmudical sayings and phrases, but are trained in the *love* of the *Torah*, and taught to seek knowledge of it as the aim and end of all human happiness and perfection.

Secondly, there is in Jewish life an essential element that greatly contributed towards the formation of the Jewish character: piety; a feeling of love and reverence towards our forefathers—towards those who have distinguished themselves in goodness and learning, and especially towards their teaching, their opinions, their wishes, and their behests. When on the occasion of *haskarath neshamoth* (recalling to memory the souls of departed friends and relatives), we are sometimes moved to

tears, it is chiefly piety that creates the feeling of sorrow in our heart, that the great and good have been taken away from our midst. This feeling of piety is also the origin of the idea of *Yichus* (יחוס): a certain feeling of pride to find oneself related to one that has been known as a good and great man. The idea of Yichus is an incentive to imitate the good ways of the object of our pride, and in our youth we are accustomed to look up to such persons as the ideal which we might well approach but would never be able to reach.

Such was the atmosphere in which the ancestors of the late Chief Rabbi, Dr. Nathan Marcus Adler moved and lived; such was the air breathed by Rabbi Mordecai Adler, Rabbi in Hanover, and father of Dr. N. M. Adler.[1]

He imbibed *ahabhath ha-torah* (love of the Torah), and that sense of *yichus* which moved him to do honour to the name of the great *lomede torah* among his ancestors by his own achievements. But we venture to ask was the *Torah* atmosphere in the house of Rabbi Mordecai Adler as pure, as free from foreign elements, as it was in the house of his ancestors? The *lamdan*, secluded as he was from the outer world, wholly engaged with the various branches of *Talmud-Torah*, was not unconcerned with the great events that took place outside the Bethhamidrash, the consequences of these events having penetrated also into the innermost recesses of his study. Voltaire, the French Revolution, the rise and the fall of Napoleon, had caused great changes in the inner life of the Jews in Germany. The Jews were brought into closer contact with their non-Jewish neighbours; the ambitious now found a wider sphere in which to satisfy their desire for honour and distinction, and even the most modest Jew had to try to assimilate himself to his Christian fellow-citizens in all non-religious matters. The course of education of the young had to be changed. Two great men had prepared their brethren for the changed circumstances—Moses Mendelssohn and Naphtali Hartwig Wessely. They advocated the training of our young in general knowledge, and the introduction of an improved method in teaching the Bible. Both were conservative, and did not aim at effecting any laxity in the fulfilment of religious duties. But their disciples and followers thought themselves, nevertheless, justified in throwing overboard a portion or the whole of Judaism. The Jewish congregations were thus split into conservatives and reformers,

[1] Dr. Nathan Adler is said to have received his name from Nathan ben Simeon Hakohen Adler, mentioned in the Introduction to לשון הזהב.

and the immediate effect of the split was that the more thoughtful conservatives, in order to prepare themselves for the fight, had to adopt the very method suggested by the above-named men; they added to the old curriculum of Talmudic studies a regular course of University instruction.

This course was also taken by Rabbi Mordecai Adler with regard to his son Nathan. He gave him both Rabbinical and secular education. The foundation of Dr. Adler's Rabbinical training was laid by his father, and a good foundation it must have been, for it had to support a high and wide building. He shared this good fortune with his brothers, for they all excelled in the knowledge of the Talmud. One of them, Rabbi Gabriel Adler, spiritual chief of the congregation of Mühringen and Oberdorf, edited and commented upon *Leshon-Zahabh* ("A golden tongue"), a halachic work of his great uncle, Rabbi David Tewele Schiff, Chief Rabbi in London; and a second brother, Rabbi Baer Adler, was *Dayyan* in Frankfort. After the completion of his preparatory studies, Nathan went to Würzburg, where he continued to study the Rabbinical literature under the direction of the Chief Rabbi, Abraham Bing, and attended the lectures at the Royal Würzburg University, where his course of study was very wide. He concluded his University career in the regular way, and on the 5th of June, 1828, he received from the University at Erlangen his title, *Doctoris Philosophiæ et AA. LL. Magistri*, after having shown *laudabilis eruditionis specimina* in a dissertation, *De idea summi Numinis*, in a "rigorous examination," and especially in a wide knowledge of Semitic languages.

In spite of the time required for the University studies, theology was by no means neglected. The Rabbi, Abraham Bing, admired the young scholar's knowledge of Rabbinical literature, as well as the zeal and earnestness with which he applied himself to the understanding of the Talmud and to the solution of most difficult problems in the science of halachah. On the 27th of March, 1828, Dr. N. M. Adler received his ordination as Rabbi; his teacher gave him the document, authorising him to decide questions concerning the practice of religious precepts—*hattarath horaah*—and probably, at the same time, laid his hands on his head, as a symbol of the transmission of authority—*Semichah* (Num. xxvii. 23).

Armed with the titles of Doctor and of Rabbi, the fruit of three years' work at Würzburg, Dr. Adler returned home to Hanover, July, 1828, where he seems to have stayed only a very short time, for on the 1st of August, 1828, he already received in Frankfort a very flattering letter from the poet, Fr. Rückert.

On the 9th of April, 1829, the Senate of Frankfort solemnly declared that "Dr. N. M. Adler, son of a Jewish citizen, having passed the examination which the decree of the 27th of January had ordered, may, as a private teacher of Oriental languages, Jewish theology and philosophy, be admitted to taking the oath of a Jewish citizen on the occasion of his marriage with Henrietta Worms, the daughter of a Jewish citizen, *præstitis præstandis*, and that this decision be communicated to the Income-tax Commission and the Council of the Jewish Community." The son of the Jewish citizen married, as was anticipated in the above document, became a citizen, took his oath, paid his fees and taxes,[1] and also served his term as a soldier, but it cannot be said with equal certainty whether he had much occasion to teach Oriental languages, Jewish theology and philosophy. To be a private teacher, however, was neither his ambition nor his mission. He had prepared himself for the office of a Rabbi, and he had not long to wait for the opportunity of applying for a post of this kind. The Rabbinate in Oldenburg was vacant; he had an interview with the Grand Duke of Oldenburg[2]—probably also with the President of the Jewish Congregation. According to the regulations of the 14th of August, 1827, the Jews of the Grand-Duchy of Oldenburg were instructed to appoint a Chief-Rabbi (Landrabbiner), whose election had to be confirmed by the Government. The Chief Rabbi had to superintend all Jewish schools and synagogues of the country, as the responsible officer of the Government, and was obliged to send in a report from time to time. He had, however, no power of appointing or discharging any teacher or priest without the permission of the Government, whose consent he had to seek even for the introduction of a new text-book of religion for the schools under his direction. Dr. Adler was duly elected and confirmed as Chief Rabbi of Oldenburg. He was one of the first Rabbis that preached in pure German. His regularity, punctuality, and conscientiousness in the fulfilment of his duties, his loyalty to the Government, and a certain refinement in his conduct, procured to Dr. Adler the love and respect of all—Jews and non-Jews—who had the opportunity of making his acquaintance.

Oldenburg did not enjoy the ministrations of Dr. Adler for any length of time. In the kingdom of Hanover laws similar to

---

[1] On the 22nd of April, 1829, he paid 34 fl. 48 xr. for citizenship, fire-bucket, new gun, gate-closing, and *pro inscriptione*.

[2] It is remarkable that also in his election as Chief Rabbi of the Jews in England, non-Jewish influence was active in favour of Dr. Adler.

those of Oldenburg regulated the religious affairs of the Jews. The Government was anxious to see the teaching and preaching in the Jewish congregations superintended by a Rabbi who, in addition to his Rabbinical learning, had had a regular academical training. Dr. Adler's father, who performed the functions of a Rabbi, did not fulfil this condition, and was, therefore, not recognised by the Government as Chief Rabbi. Pressed by the Government, the Jewish congregations of Hanover elected the son of their Rav, Dr. N. M. Adler, as the man fittest for this important post.

The election took place when Dr. Adler had scarcely had time to settle down in Oldenburg. He did not think that his services would be required immediately; it was a feeling of piety and modesty that made him hesitate, and put off from time to time the entering upon his duties in Hanover, where he was officially to be placed above his father. In December, 1829, he was still far from leaving Oldenburg; he became a member of the club in the town, and paid his entrance-fee with his contribution for the year. But the Hanoverian Government would not allow any delay, and sent on the 22nd of February, 1830, an ultimatum to Dr. Adler, which left him no alternative. He was told that any further delay would be treated as evidence that he actually resigned his post as Chief-Rabbi of Hanover, Kalenberg, Göttingen, Lüneburg, etc.

Of his achievements in Oldenburg nothing particular is known. His first sermon (Antrittsrede), delivered on the 6th of June, 1829, was published in the *Sulamith* (vii., pp. 103-120). The text was taken from 1 Sam. xii. 23, 24, and the subject was "The reciprocal duties of a pastor and his flock."

The Rabbinate of Hanover was now held by Dr. Adler, and Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch (later Rabbi in Frankfort-on-Main) was his successor in Oldenburg. Dr. Adler's accession to the Rabbinate of Hanover is marked by improvements in Jewish schools and in religious classes. His conscientiousness in the performance of his duties as superintendent of the Jewish schools, and the power given him both by the congregation and by the laws of the State, combined to make the teachers conscious of the importance of their vocation, and their teaching more efficient by the adoption of improved methods.

One of his earliest sermons in Hanover is contained in one of the numerous MSS. left by him. It was delivered on Rosh-hashanah, 5590, its text was taken from Ps. xxxix. 5-8, and its subject was: "Human Life, with its Transient and

its Permanent Element." The sermon is divided into four parts, which are described in the original as follows:—

1. Die Zeit in ihrer Flüchtigkeit.
2. Die irdischen Güter in ihrer Nichtigkeit.
3. Die geistigen in ihrer Wichtigkeit.
4. Das Leben in seiner Beständigkeit.

The fervour and the earnestness of the preacher may be noticed in the short prayer intervening between the introduction and the body of the sermon: "I wish I could kindle a fire of enthusiasm for these truths that will continue burning till the last breath of life! and thou, Father, give me power and strength to approach this task!"

A summary of his work in his diocese is found in two official documents, written respectively by the Council of the Jewish Community at Hanover, and by the Königlich-Hannover'sche-Landdrostei. In the first Dr. Adler is described as "trustworthy judge in religious questions, pillar of Jewish faith, true guide and excellent preacher, speaking to the heart as well as to the intellect." The writer of the second is pleased to learn that "the conscientious and praiseworthy performance of his official duties" found due recognition in his appointment as Chief Rabbi of the Jews in Great Britain.

The warm interest for Dr. Adler displayed by State officials and by members of the Royal house was the fruit of his deep-rooted loyalty to the laws of the country in which he lived, to the Government, and to the head of the State. He gave expression to this feeling on various occasions of joy and sorrow in prayers and sermons. On the occasion of the celebration of King William IV.'s birthday, the 27th of August, 1836, he preached "On the Patriotism of the Israelites."[1] He explained how love of the Fatherland was rooted in the heart of the Jew, nursed by the duty of gratitude, and commanded by his religion. This patriotism consisted in loyal obedience to the laws of his country, in willingly taking his share in the work for the welfare of the State, and in his affection for the father of the Fatherland.

When the Fatherland was changed (1845), the claims of Great Britain were as loyally responded to as those of Oldenburg and Hanover had been up to that time, and occasions for giving evidence of his feeling of patriotism were not wanting.

On all occasions, whether of joy or mourning, Dr. Adler's esteem and affection for the members of the Royal Family

[1] *Des Israeliten Liebe zum Vaterlande.* Published Hanover, 1836.

were manifested in fervent and appropriate prayers of תפלה ותחנונים, תפלה תודה, תפלה, תודה וקול זמרה, שיר שיר תודה.

In the same way he shared in the anxieties and rejoicings of his fellow-citizens when calamities befell or threatened us, when famine, war, or plague troubled the country, and when relief filled the people with feelings of gratitude towards the Almighty. He wrote on these occasions prayers and supplications and thanksgivings, and taught his flock by his own example how to be good Jews and good Englishmen. What the prayers still left undone was completed by the sermons which generally accompanied the former. In one of these, delivered on the Day of Humiliation (April 26th, 1854), at the beginning of the Crimean War, he showed (1) the evils of the impending war; (2) the blessings by which the war might be attended; and (3) the duties which the war enjoined; exhorting his brethren to act as faithful citizens, to bring sacrifices to the aid of the country willingly and readily, and to contribute liberally for the relief of the families of those who imperilled their lives for the benefit, safety and glory of this country.

The prayers are composed in Hebrew, and, it is scarcely necessary to add, in correct and good Hebrew. It would be very strange if a Rabbi of the old school could not fluently express his thoughts in the language of his ancestors. The merit of Dr. Adler's compositions is to be found in the fact that they are simple, and present no difficulty for those who are familiar with the Bible and our daily prayers. Words and phrases are, as a rule, Biblical; rare forms and figures are carefully avoided; modern ideas are transformed and expressed in the language of the Prophet and the Psalmist.

Besides these prayers of a general character, the late Chief Rabbi wrote also a number of occasional prayers in connection with Sir Moses Montefiore's journeys, which were undertaken in behalf of our suffering brethren in different countries. These philanthropic undertakings won him the heart of Dr. Adler. They were the source of the friendship and the mutual respect which united these two men during their long life till death separated them. The acquaintance began long before Dr. Adler came over to England. In a letter of Sir Moses Montefiore to Dr. Adler, dated 12th November, 1841, the former, in acknowledging the receipt of £20 towards the relief of our suffering brethren in Smyrna, gives expression to his great regard for the Chief Rabbi of Hanover, and asks him to send him a copy of his sermons. However different the two characters were, love of Judaism,

love of Palestine, and ardent desire to improve the condition of our brethren abroad, especially in Palestine, were common to both.

The congregations of England, whose spiritual chief Dr. Adler undertook to be, were in a state of great confusion, which was much favoured by the interregnum necessarily intervening between the death of a Rabbi and the appointment of his successor. A secession had taken place, and it was, of course, discussed what would be, or what should be, the position of the Chief Rabbi with regard to the new congregation. Some expected the new chief, by judicious concessions, to bring the lost sheep back to their fold, or, at least, stop further secession; whilst others hoped that he would, by absolute refusal of all concessions, fence the divine vineyard against foreign intrusion. Dr. Adler was not a novice in this kind of discussion. The peace of the Jewish congregations in Germany had been disturbed by Philippsohn's *Zeitung des Judenthums*, Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, the Berlin attempts at reform, and the conference of the Rabbis at Brunswick. In previous years the Reform party asserted that they fought as men of progress against men content to stand still. They could not assert this any longer. There were also men of progress in the camp of their opponents if progress meant the addition of a regular academical training to the study of Bible and Talmud, as a concession to the requirements of the time. Men like Frankel in Dresden, S. R. Hirsch in Emden, M. Sachs in Berlin, and N. Adler in Hanover, were certainly men of progress, but emphatically opposed to the reforms demanded by the other party. After his election Dr. Adler wrote, in a letter of thanks addressed to the "Council of the United Congregations assembled in London," that he hoped to be enabled, by the help of the Almighty, "to take up the stumbling-block out of the highways, to remove thorns out of the fields, to lead back those whose souls were diseased, from the shadow of death to the shadow of the Almighty; for, in accepting this responsible post, he had only this one ambition: to exalt the horn of the Torah and to keep the way of the tree of life."

The task which the new Chief Rabbi proposed to himself is clearly defined in the sermon which was preached on the occasion of his installation in the Great Synagogue, 8th July, 1845, in German, and was afterwards translated into English by Barnard van Oven. In accordance with the scriptural text (Zec. iii. 7), he describes his duties as follows:—1. To walk in the ways of God; 2. To maintain his Law; 3. To superintend the houses of learning and instruction; 4. To watch the House of God; and

5. To make *way* into the hearts of those *standing* before him —*i.e.*, to win the confidence and affection of his flock. In explaining the second and the third duties, the preacher said: "The Rabbi is to be the guardian of the Law. It is extremely difficult to guard it at a time in which one party seeks its glory in pulling down existing structures of religious theory and practice; the other in preserving everything hallowed by age, though opposed to the foundations of the Law; in which one minister worships progress, the other adores conservatism. He who is an earnest and faithful servant of God and his Law must stand upon the wall, defend the precious inheritance, and preserve it in its integrity; judge and advise according to the best of his knowledge and conscience; distinguish between that which is true and that which is false—between light and darkness; stand between the living and the dead, and stay the religious plague." "It is the mission of the minister," to watch the courts, "to see that the courts of the House of God accomplish their holy purposes, that everything be removed that is inconsistent with the dignity and holiness of the place, or interferes with the devotion of the worshippers, and that nothing be introduced that is contrary to the Law."

Dr. Adler's private and official life was the realisation of the above programme. He was himself an example of true and genuine piety; taught in impressive sermons the truths of our religion; took a lively interest in the educational institutions of our community; watched over the places of worship, and preserved in them the spirit of devotion and attachment to the Law; promoted the amalgamation of the Synagogues under his jurisdiction into the "United Synagogue;" and, lastly, became the object of love and veneration, not only to his own congregation, but to all who had opportunity to come in contact with him. In evidence of this statement, I quote from *A Tribute to the Memory of the Venerable Rabbi, from a Member of the Berkeley Street Congregation* (*Jewish Chronicle*, *Jan.* 29, 1890):—"However differently some of us may have been trained in our views of Judaism from the conceptions which he (Dr. Adler) represented, all of us who are attached to our religion and our race feel that in him has passed away one of the purest and one of the most cultured exemplars of them which the present century has produced. . . . . As a man, as well as an Israelite and a Rabbi, the personality of Dr. N. M. Adler reflected those finer emotions of the ancient faith which are sadly becoming more and more rare. . . . . He was ready to recognise fellowship with any other Israelite in whom he

perceived a devout intention, even though he might differ from a particular method. He never repelled one—he invariably attracted. He represented Judaism in England in a manner that we all rejoice about when we contemplate it. The Chief Rabbi of England is now a household word, known throughout the country among every denomination, and associated with scholarship, with profound piety, and with dignity, which command the universal regard of all sections of Englishmen."

The office of *Rav* implies that of a Chief Judge. In this capacity Dr. Adler was *abh-beth-din*, President of a *Beth-din* (lit., "house of judgment"), a Court, having, as a rule, its seat in the *Beth ha-midrash*, and consisting of a President and two judges (*dayyanim*). The judges are ordained Rabbis, possessing *hattarath horaah* (p. 372). All matters affecting the practice of the Jewish Religion are settled in this Court; the legality of a marriage, the execution of a religious divorce (after a civil divorce has been obtained); the examination of *shochatim* (persons who undertake to kill animals according to Jewish Law); the granting of licenses to sellers of *Kosher* provisions, and the like. The interference of the *Beth-din* is frequently sought in disputes of a general character; the *Beth-din*, then acting either as peace-maker, or as a Court of Justice, if both parties desire to have the matter settled by a *din-torah* (Talmudical Law). The Court holds its sittings, according to a rule which Tradition attributes to Ezra the Scribe, on Mondays and Thursdays.

The same days were chosen by the late Chief Rabbi for the reading and expounding of the Talmud with its Commentaries to the members of the Talmud-Association (חברת ש"ס) who met on the days named, in the evening from eight to nine. These duties of a Judge and a Teacher were performed by Dr. Adler, with his usual regularity and punctuality.

Of the educational institutions in which Dr. Adler took a lively interest, the Jews' College occupies the first place, in as far as it is his own creation. The idea of establishing a seminary or college for the training of the Jewish ministry was not an entirely new one. It had found advocates when a Montefiore testimonial was contemplated in the year 1840 (*Voice of Jacob*, I., No. 5, etc.), and Dr. Adler was able to form a committee of men who were not only familiar with the idea, but also favourable to it. On the 8th December, 1851, the office of the Chief Rabbi issued invitations to men of education, means, and influence, requesting their attendance "at a general meeting, to be held at Sussex Hall, on the 4th of January next, at twelve o'clock; Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart., will

preside." The object of the meeting was to find the means for establishing a college for the training of Jewish ministers and teachers, and a day school for the sons of our middle classes. Outlines of a plan, prepared by the Chief Rabbi, were annexed. A council was elected, committees, and sub-committees were formed, and meetings followed meetings. The fifteen paragraphs of the scheme were discussed *seriatim*, numerous alterations were suggested, but the soul of the plan remained in its integrity, and is the basis of the new constitution. The election of a headmaster and principal engaged the attention of the committee for a long time. Applications were received from all sides, but they were rejected. On the 29th of June, 1854, Dr. L. Loewe, "a gentleman of great experience and high attainments," was elected as headmaster, at an annual salary of £300 and free residence, the engagement commencing October, 5616, when the College was to be opened. The first annual report was issued 1857.

From the opening of the College up to the time he was obliged to leave London, Dr. Adler superintended the work of the College, frequently examined pupils and students, encouraged the teachers by his presence, and watched the scholars' attendance, industry, conduct and progress with the greatest possible care. But, strange to say, his influence as the spiritual head of the community, the high esteem in which he was personally held by all alike, and the accumulation of wealth in the possession of his friends, could not procure for the institution any substantial endowments. The congregations thus left to Dr. Adler the laborious task of soliciting year by year the aid of his friends in support of Jews' College. It is probably the realisation of the old maxim: "Be careful with regard to the poor, for it is from them that learning shall come forth" (הזהרו בבני עניים שמהם תצא תורה). In accordance with the same principle the scholarships for students have been left in a poor and meagre condition.

Dr. Adler's care for instruction in elementary Hebrew and religion is noticed in the introduction of the Chief Rabbi's code for the different standards, analogous to the code for the Elementary Board Schools. The code is still in force; and Hebrew, Bible, and Jewish history and religion are taught accordingly, in eight divisions—infants and seven standards. The code is capable of expansion, and we hope that, in course of time, higher standards will be fixed for the different grades.

The preparation for his vocation during his studentship, and the manifold duties which engaged his attention and time,

in his official capacity, were not favourable to a brilliant literary career. But owing to his great capacity for work and study he left a rich legacy of printed and written products of his genius. We possess of his works: 1, numerous Hebrew compositions in form of prayers; 2, Sermons in German and English; 3, Lectures in Hebrew; 4, Correspondence; 5, Translation of and notes on Rabbi Judah ha-Levi's Cuzari; 6, Commentary on the Targumim.

1. The motive, contents, and style of the *Prayers* have already been described.

2. His *Sermons* testify to his genuine piety, his true conception of the duties of the spiritual guide of a Jewish community, and his zeal and fervour in defending the binding character of both the Written Law and the Oral Law. They were the result of study and thought, and were always instructive and impressive.

In addition to those mentioned above—A sermon in German on the Patriotism of the Jews, and the sermon preached on the occasion of his installation into office as Chief Rabbi of Great Britain and that on the present war (April 26th, 1854)—the following sermons were published: 1. An appeal to the sympathy of his brethren for the sufferers in Ireland and in the Highlands of Scotland. (March 24th, 1847). 2. The Jewish Faith (Jan. 29th, 1848):—On the three Principles of our Creed: The Existence of God, Revelation and Divine Justice. 3. How can the blessings of the House of God be attained? (July 19th, 1848). By regular attendance, is the answer, by earnest devotion, and by letting the purity and sanctity of our heart, attained during the service, penetrate all our actions outside the Synagogue when we are not engaged in divine worship. 4. The Bonds of Brotherhood (Jan., 1849) that bind all Israelites together are explained to be: the same religious belief, the same holy language, and the same history. This sermon, preached in the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, referred to "the spirit of union and concord prevailing among the different congregations"—the Germans and the Spanish and Portuguese. 5. Solomon's Judgment (Hanucah, 1854): On the Unity of the Written and Oral Law. 6. Funeral Discourse, (4th of Tishri, 5623) at the burial of Lady Montefiore. 7. The Morning and Evening Sacrifice (Jan. 28th, 1865). The belief in the Unity of God and the proclamation of our principle of love towards our neighbour are valueless, if not accompanied by acts which testify to our belief and to our principle by morning and evening sacrifices. The sermon was preached in support of the claims of the deaf and dumb

in the Jewish Community. 8. The Second Days of the Festivals (2nd day of Passover, 1868). Dr. Adler shows the necessity of continuing to keep these days as holy days.

3. *Derashoth* were delivered twice a year, on *Shabbath Shubhah* and *Shabbath ha-gadol*, in the presence of a select audience of persons interested in the study of the Talmud, in the *Beth ha-midrash*, and later, when he resided at Brighton, *privatissime* in his study. *Derashah* (*lit.* "Disquisition") is the name given to a lecture the principal feature of which is the exposition of scriptural, Midrashic and Talmudic passages; the parenetic element, though never entirely absent, was of secondary importance, and was frequently more implied than directly taught. The *Derashah* appeals to the intellect, the modern sermon to the heart. The *Derashah* of *Shabbath Shubhah* was, as a rule, based on a passage taken from *Yoma*, that of *Shabbath ha-gadol* on a passage from *Pesachim*. The latter concluded with *dinim* (rules) concerning "leaven" and "unleavened bread" on Passover; the former with exhortations to repentance, and *dinim* concerning the fast on the Day of Atonement. The body of the *Derashah* had mostly for its object the reconciliation of two passages of the Talmud, which seemed to contradict each other, or of a *halachah* (law) in the code of Maimonides or in that of Rabbi Joseph Karo, with the apparently opposite view expressed in the Gemara, or the exact definition of the divergence between *Rashi* and *Tosaphoth* in their different explanations of a Talmudical dictum, or the right understanding and application of such general rules as to whether the regulations for the performance of a *mitsvah* must be based on the *Keri* or on the *Kethib*. However complicated the questions arising out of the text of the *Derashah* may have appeared to be, Dr. Adler always managed to remove all difficulties by a simple exposition of the text and its parallel passages. Dr. Adler left several volumes of the *Derashoth* which he continued to deliver till the last year of his life, and which, if published, would delight the hearts of many of his learned friends.

4. *Correspondence.*—There is an important branch in Rabbinical literature called Responsa, or Questions and Answers (תשובות or שאלות ותשובות). Almost every Rabbi of fame had two kinds of questions addressed to him: 1, Theoretical questions as to the explanation of difficult passages in Talmud and Codes of Law (*Posekim*); 2, Practical questions of laymen who did not know whether a certain thing was forbidden or permitted; or who, not satisfied with the decision of their own Rabbi, appealed to a higher authority; or of Rabbis, considering the arguments *pro* and *contra*, were unable or

unwilling to take upon themselves the responsibility of a decision. These decisions were recorded, collected, and frequently published. The reputation of Dr. Adler's learning had spread to all the four corners of the earth, and numerous letters were daily brought into the Chief Rabbi's office in London, with questions, urgent and not urgent, necessary and unnecessary, genuine and vexatious. After the publication of the Commentary *Nethina la-ger* on the Targum of Onkelos, the correspondence was considerably increased by scholars who missed certain notes which they expected to find in the Commentary, or thought themselves able either to corroborate or to refute any of Dr. Adler's explanations. In this correspondence we learn on the one hand the esteem in which Dr. Adler was held by fellow-Rabbis and by other eminent scholars, and on the other hand the patience, thoroughness and pleasure with which he approached the task of answering all inquiries. If printed, the volume of Responsa (שו"ת) would in importance and scholarlike treatment of subjects of the greatest variety be inferior to none of the collections of Responsa hitherto published. It may be added that the volume of Dr. Adler's correspondence contains several Responsa in reference to the Ritualistic questions which at present agitate the Jewish Community in England.

5. *Chiddushim*, "Novellae."—These are short notes on the Talmud and *Posekim*, especially the *Turim*. Such novellae are contained in his Derashoth and in his letters; but there is also among the MSS. of Dr. Adler a separate large collection of notes, the greater part of which seems to date from an earlier period of his life, whilst in the later period the correspondence, Derashoth and Targum fully occupied his attention, and left no time for writing *Chiddushim*. To this may be added some annotations made by Dr. Adler on the Commentary of R. Hai Gaon on ספר טהרות (Berlin, 1856).

6. *German Translation of Rabbi Jehuda ha-Levi's Kuzari*, with copious explanatory notes. There seems to be only extant the last portion of the third book and the beginning of the fourth book. Whether the whole had been translated or not could not be ascertained. It is not likely that Dr. Adler began the translation in the middle of the third book. The translation was made by Dr. Adler in Hanover, where he expounded the Kuzari to a class of friends of Hebrew literature.

7. *Commentary on the Targumim.*—Dr. Adler felt himself especially attracted by the Targumim, as they seemed to embody the traditional interpretations of the Scriptures and the Oral Law. In the year 1875 an edition of the Pentateuch

with many Commentaries appeared, including the *Nethinah la-ger* on the Targum of Onkelos. The Targum of Onkelos was held in high esteem by Rashi, Maimonides and Nachmanides, who never fail to take due notice of the opinion expressed in the Chaldee Version. Rabbi Jashajah Berlin, in his מיני תרגימא, contributed valuable material to the Targum literature. S. D. Luzatto treated the Targum more systematically in his Philoxenus (אוהב גר). In opposition to this scholar's view that all deviation from the literal rendering and all paraphrasing was to be explained by the desire of Onkelos to make his work popular, Dr. Adler holds that it was the object of the translator to embody in his work the Oral Law and the traditional interpretations; that the words of Onkelos were weighed in the balance of knowledge and fixed by the measure of tradition. The success of the translation, the fact of its adoption for use in the synagogues, where it was recited to a mixed audience of learned men and laymen, of Jews and non-Jews, supports the opinion of Dr. Adler. This question, as well as problems, like the following:—Who was the author? Was Onkelos identical with Aquilas? What relation exists between the Greek Version of Aquilas and the Chaldee Version of Onkelos? are briefly but thoroughly discussed in the Introduction to the Commentary. In the latter Dr. Adler points out, where opportunity is given, that Onkelos had before him exactly the same text of the Pentateuch as we have at present in our Masoretic Bibles, and traces the source of every deviation from the literal rendering to a passage from Talmud or Midrash. It is especially with regard to these references that the remarks of Dr. Adler were subjected, by his learned friends, to minute criticisms, which were carefully read, examined, and answered by the reverend author. In connection with this Commentary he edited the *Sefer Yaer*, or *Pathshegen*, and a *Massorah* on the Targum.

A second work in the same style and with the same tendency is *Ahabhath Jonathan*,[1] a work which is complete in MS., but is not yet printed. It consists of three parts: 1, Introduction; 2, Commentary on the Targum of the Earlier Prophets; 3, Commentary on the Targum of the Haphtaroth. Various literary topics connected with the Targum are fully

[1] Hebre[illegible] do not directly announce the contents of the book; they are rather fancy names, implying various extraneous ideas. [illegible] *thinah la-ger* is intended to imply the name of the author: *Nathan*, and the fact that Onkelos was a proselyte. The title *Ahabhath Jonathan* is probably meant to imply the name of the author, and the fact that he was fond of the Targum of Jonathan.

discussed in the Introduction, such as the origin of the Targum; the authorship and age of the Targum of the Prophets; the relation of the Targum of Jonathan to other and earlier Targumim, later additions and different readings, the Targum Jerushalmi; the office of the Methurgaman; *hapax legomena;* the importance of the Targum; the method adopted by the translator and the principles which guided him; the translation of nomina propria; the relation of the Targum to Halachah and Agada, etc. In the Commentary notice is taken of the best editions of the Targum in the Bibles and of the Targum of the Prophets, edited by Prof. de Lagarde, and of a Bodleian MS. of the Targum. It being the intention of the present possessors of this treasure to have it published as soon as possible, the public will soon be able to judge for themselves as to the quality of the fruits which many years' persevering labour of so eminent a scholar has produced.

In taking leave for the present of our revered *Rav* ז"ל, we turn involuntarily round to look once more into his house, admire the generosity and liberality which made the Rav's house not only a place of learning, but, literally, an open house for the poor and the stranger, and wonder at the patience with which he listened to the sad tale of the needy, and the pleasure he evinced when able to comfort and to relieve.

The above portrait of the late Chief Rabbi זכרונו לברכה is depicted in accordance with the Rabbinical maxim: "Say only part of thy fellow-man's praise in his presence, and the whole of it in his absence;" for although the dead are "forgotten out of mind," Dr. Nathan Marcus Adler is still living, —הצדיקים במיתתן קרואים חיים—and will ever be present in the heart and mind of those who knew him.

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

FRANZ DELITZSCH.
(1812-1890.)

A Palm-branch from Judah on His Newly-covered Grave.

"The purely scientific interest in the literature of the Jews, and the spiritual interest in their conversion, have long struggled for the mastery of my soul."—Delitzsch.

If, at the decease of so rare a man as Franz Delitzsch, there be any consolation at all, it is to be found in the sorrow universally felt by all countries and all creeds. Like two reconciled angels, the old and the new covenant accompany his bier. Jew and Christian alike mourn the loss of a great man. One must go back to old times to find his equal—to the time of Pico de Mirandolo, or to that of Reuchlin and Münster, of the Buxtorfs and Reland, of Ed. Pococke and Lightfoot, of Rittangel and Knorr von Rosenroth, of Wülfer and Wagenseil, of Johann Christian Wolf and Vitringa, only to mention a few of the most meritorious men who have done so much for the spreading and furtherance of Jewish literature; in the present time one would seek in vain for names to compare with his. Many dwarf shrubs have, indeed, sprung up, which may deceive the eyes of him who stands in the midst of them; but when time shall have rolled on, and the searching gaze of scrutiny shall fall on all these new growths, then one from among them will stand forth like a cedar of Lebanon—Franz Delitzsch.

If the title of a divine has ever been justly given to any man, it was given to him. From the very first, he devoted his feelings, thoughts and desires, his researches and discoveries to the service of the Ideal, which was his faith. But if he, nevertheless remained free from narrow-mindedness the reason is to be found in this — that his love was as great as his intelligence. Gifted with a noble heart, with an originality of mind, which made all that came under his care thrive, he was able to enter upon new fields from which many would have been deterred, and to

display an activity that might easily seem divided and contradictory to the superficial observer. Therefore it is that the Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic, and the Canon of the Bishopric of Meissen, must be reckoned among the heralds and pioneers of Jewish science, which awoke under his eyes, and that his name will shine in the list of the best Jewish names that have gained for themselves a place in the history of this awakening. Indeed, in that portion of his works which concerns Jewish literature, no indications of a difference of faith are observable—a triumph of the spirit of that true knowledge, which shines like a rainbow of reconciliation over the clouds that separate man from man. His love for Israel's literature and language existed before his love for Israel's people—a love which wished to gain, to possess, and to conquer. He did not become a theologian in order to forge weapons against the people of Holy Writ; he did not bring foreign fire to the altar on which he sacrificed; therefore it was that the language of Zion and the spirit of its works revealed themselves to him, that he reached heights which none of his co-religionists, striving after him, have attained, that the believer within him was never able entirely to overshadow the scholar. True to his creed, he began as a Philologian. For there was a time in the history of the world when Philology became a force and motive power. That period was the Reformation. This love for the original meaning of the words of Scripture, this zeal to comprehend the original records in the spirit in which they were given, never wholly forsook him. The theologian, much to his advantage scientifically, never quite stripped off the philologist. His enthusiastic devotion to Jewish literature, and the profound learning which he had acquired in this field with the eagerness of youth, made even his later works, which are pervaded by the missionary spirit, instructive and enjoyable to the Hebrew student. As there is no work of Wagenseil's from which the treasure-seeker of Jewish science could not obtain a grain of gold for his own purposes, so Delitzsch, in all his productions, even if he had lost the creative power of the best days of his youth, remained a friend, whose words, full of intelligence and special knowledge, were always worth listening to, even when they were seemingly disconnected with the subject-matter. The reader, who studies the first productions of his literary activity, would probably conclude (unless he knew the truth already), not only from the wealth of special knowledge, but especially from the ardour and inner sympathy of his charming style, that the author was a follower of the Jewish faith. As the thrilling song of the lark announces the coming of

spring, so his first book, *A History of Jewish Poetry, from the close of the Holy Writings of the Old Covenant, down to the most Recent Times,* the preface to which was dated May 1st, 1836, appeared to lead up a May-day to the honour and appreciation of Jewish spirit and Hebrew poetry. A Christian, of barely 24 years, stepped before his contemporaries to tell them of the sleeping beauty he had discovered among the thickets of the primeval forest, in the world-forgotten Jewish writings, through which he had made his way with ardent zeal and resolute strength. He was everywhere at home, he had searched through the Talmud and the Midrashim, he had drunk deep draughts of delight at the magic springs of the mediæval Spanish poets, and had gazed with a discerning eye upon the after-shoots of modern times. Here for the first time the standards and categories of classical literary history were applied to matter which had never been considered from such a point of view. With wonder the non-Jewish world learned from this book that the Hebrew language had never died, but continuing in undying youthful vigour had developed a richness of poetical styles and forms, which many a living language might envy; that it had served, unchangeable through all times, as the pliant and plastic expression of sacred and secular subjects of every kind. Dukes, Sachs and Zunz had not yet hewn the building-stones of Jewish literature, when the learned Christian came forward to erect his spiritual edifice. Far-sounding and startling, like a herald's call of Jewish poetry, was the effect of this spring-tide gift.

Delitzsch here displayed his intimate acquaintance with the sunny and most fascinating portion of the Jewish writings, and the opportunity for proving his excellent scholarship and special knowledge in obscurer and more remote fields was soon to present itself. The town of Leipsic was just about to publish the catalogue of the valuable manuscripts preserved in the Town Council's Library. Fleischer undertook the description of the Arabic and other Oriental MSS., Delitzsch that of the Hebrew. The Christian specimens which were to hand, with the exception of J. Chr. Wolf's, could not be considered as worthy of imitation. Jews had till this time hardly ever themselves ventured upon the field of MS. knowledge. Delitzsch was here also the pioneer; his description written in elegant and easy Latin kept the middle path between uninstructive, misleading brevity on the one side, and limitless prolixity on the other. It did not take the place of the study of the MS., but it gives enough of their contents to incite to a closer study of them. Proper names

and geographical designations, which at that time had not been fully ascertained, were here given with a discerning certainty, worthy of remark. Zunz's *Additamenta* gave an additional charm and lasting value to this forerunner of scientific Hebraic MS. catalogues. Thus, in this work also, undertaken in 1837, and published in Grimma in 1838, the learned Christian became a pioneer of Jewish science.

In 1837 he also published, with a Latin introduction, Moses Chayim Luzzato's drama *Migdal Oz*, with notes by Samuel David Luzzatto and M. Letteris, a proof of his complete mastery of Jewish poetry, the fame of which he had so loudly announced to the world the year before. In his book, *Science, Art and Judaism, Descriptions and Criticisms* (1838), there seemed to be put forth a kind of palinode, which Zunz (Literaturgeschichte, p. 11) made out to be a reversal of the verdict upon Jewish poetry which had appeared two years before; but Delitzsch's continued devotion to Hebrew literature proved that an inner and real change had not taken place, and that the unkind, harsh tone can only have been the consequence of a somewhat sudden decline of his ardent enthusiasm. In the same year (1838) his book, *Jesurun sive Prolegomenon in Concordantias Veteris Testamenti a Julio Fuerstio editis*, gave a satisfactory proof of undiminished absorption and loving penetration in the language and literature of the Hebrews. Who could have set forth more convincingly than he the claims of the Hebrew national grammarians to the gratitude and appreciation of posterity, or pointed out more warmly and impressively that before Gesenius, Ewald and Hupfeld, there had been men, and Jewish men, who had penetrated further than any of those who came after them into the construction of the Hebrew language. This portion of his elegantly written Latin book deserves attentive consideration, even at the present time, when the gist of the whole, the enquiry into the relationship of Hebraic with Sanskrit roots, is, as it were, already stored in the museum of scientific antiquities. Delitzsch was in this only the shield-bearer of his master, Julius Fürst, with whose theory of similarity between Semitic and Indian linguistic elements, a new morn appeared to have dawned for philology. Delitzsch had received too much valuable instruction from Fürst, especially in the field of Rabbinical and later Jewish literature, for him to have become afterwards untrue to his master on account of this one false doctrine. Rather he joined him, being of a grateful disposition, in further literary collaboration. He became a zealous and invaluable promoter of *The Orient*, which was

edited by Fürst and contained important literary contributions.

His previous productions had already entitled Delitzsch to the rights of citizenship in the dominion of Hebrew science, but in 1841 he came forward with a work which few learned men, born in the Jewish faith and trained in Jewish literature, would have been able to carry out in such perfection, namely, an edition of the religious-philosophical work of Aaron b. Elia, of Nicomedia, the Karäite antitype of Maimonides. This book, written in 1346, entitled *Ëz Chayim*, a prize in the Ofen booty of 1686, is one of the most precious MS. in the collection of the Leipsic civic library. To edit this voluminous work, with the index of contents which Kaleb Afendopolo had drawn up, was a very bold undertaking, when the richness and variety of the matter, the difficulty of the terminology, and the total want of preparatory works are taken into consideration. The style of the edition, the abundance of learned *addenda* from the Arabic and Karäite literature, the neatness of the references, the trustworthiness of the elucidations, the many-sidedness of the explanatory comments naturally excited great astonishment, and secured for the book a lasting place of honour among those editions of the Jewish and Karäite religious-philosophical literature which have a right to be called scientific. Here, also, Delitzsch appears in collaboration with a Jewish scholar, Moritz Steinschneider, with whom he had become acquainted at the Arabic lectures of Fleischer. The index, forming an attempt at a dictionary to the religious-philosophical language and terminology, was mainly due to a work of Steinschneider's, whose assistance was in other ways also given to Delitzsch's book.

The year 1842 marks a turning point in the course of Delitzsch's studies. With the commencement of his academic activity in the theological faculty of the University of Leipsic, where, on February 16th, 1842, he defended his dissertation, *De Habacuci Prophetæ vita atque ætate*, the exegesis of the Old Testament became the special province of labour, to which he remained faithful during the rest of his life. The peculiar excellence of his erudition, gained at the sources of the traditions of synagogue and church, shows itself already in this essay, truly an inaugural work, which exhaustively and sagaciously collects together all traditions concerning the prophet Habakkuk which are to be found in Jewish and ecclesiastical literature. In connection with these traditions he discusses, towards the end, the smaller writings, wrongly passing under the names of Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, and of

Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus. Such a combination of Rabbinical and patristic erudition as was shown in this dissertation necessarily directed public attention to the Licentiate of Theology, who had been previously a pioneer of Jewish science, and now was on the point of becoming a Master of Protestant Theology. From Leipsic he was called to the professorship of Theology in Rostock, from thence to Erlangen, where he also held the office of Pro-rector in 1859, until he was at last permanently attached to the University from which he had at first come. Through all the years of his fruitful academic activity, the interpretation of the Old Testament remained his life-task and his constant aim. In 1845 there appeared *The Prophetic Theology,* in 1855 *The System of Biblical Psychology.*

A chronological bibliography of Delitzsch's exegetical works is not needed, for they belong not only to his life, but to that of science in general. They are household books of Biblical exegesis, very groundworks of Old Testament knowledge, widely known and circulated alike in Germany, England and America. Conjointly with Karl Friederich Keil he brought out a *Commentary on the Old Testament,* in which the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon and the Prophet Isaiah are commented upon by his masterhand. By the side of this, there appeared his independent *Commentary on Genesis.* This book ran through four editions, and in 1887 was re-issued, completely revised, and even re-written, under the title of *New Commentary upon Genesis.* Delitzsch's distinctive characteristics as a commentator are based not only on his unique learning, but also on the qualities of his mind and disposition. Most sensitive to the slightest variation in the mood and diction of his authors, gifted, like Herder and Rückert, with great linguistic powers, unusually original in idea and expression and rich in suggestiveness, he was always completely master of his subject and familiar with its every detail. The history of the exposition was like an open book before him. His work is invariably stimulating, instructive, lucid and delightful. For however much the objectivity of his exegesis may have been influenced by his Christianity, he still remains the best informed and most competent expositor of the Hebrew language among all Christian commentators. His intimate acquaintance with the Rabbinical literature and post-Biblical Hebraism give to his exegetical works the quality of original authorities, which even the Jewish enquirer may always consult with profit, beside the old Hebrew commentaries. The excursus and notes with which Fleischer, the Nestor of European Arabic scholars, and

Consul Wetzstein, the greatest connoisseur of Arab Bedouin life, graced these commentaries, greatly increased their value and many-sidedness. For the better understanding of grammatical points, for the fixing of the signification of roots and words, as well as for the quick perception of the deeper connection between the verses and sections, and for the better appreciation and full recognition of the contents, Delitzsch has done more than the whole of his competitors.

Delitzsch's position towards the questions of modern Biblical criticism were not only indicated in his commentaries, but also laid down in a series of incisive investigations, which are to be found in Chr. E. Luthardt's *Magazine for Christian Science and Christian Life*, 1880-1886.

The exegesis of Delitzsch rests on the firm basis of the auxiliary sciences, such as Hebrew grammar, the Massorah and the comparative philology of the Semitic languages. On all these subjects he could easily have written independent books, but he only used his knowledge of them for the benefit of the one master science of Biblical exegesis, to which he devoted his life. Those who wish to see, in an independent work, the perfection with which Delitzsch had mastered these auxiliary sciences should study the work, *Complutensische Varianten zum Alttestamentlichen Texte, ein Beitrag zur biblischen Text-Kritik* (1878). The Jews had for several years done their best for the printing of the Biblical text, when the Church also, in the person of Cardinal Ximenes, began to interest itself in this subject. In 1515 there appeared in his Polyglot Bible the first of those five volumes which, in the *Complutensis*, comprises the Old Testament. Alfonso Zamora, one of the Christian Hebrew collaborators, bears witness that the Cardinal had bought for the sum of 4,000 gold pieces, seven Hebrew manuscripts which had belonged before the expulsion of the Spanish Jews, in 1492, to the synagogues of Toledo and Maqueda. In two of these MSS., which are still in the University library at Madrid, Delitzsch discovered the chief sources of the deviations of the Complutensian text. The manner in which he tests and weighs their correctness in the scales of grammar displays great philological acumen, one might almost say beauty, surprising as this expression may here appear. Each question is rounded off with great skill to an artistic whole. The delightful feeling of having a completely trustworthy guide comes over the reader.

Delitzsch rendered imperishable service to the text of the Old Testament through inducing S. Baer, of Bieberich-on-the

Rhine—the most distinguished living critic of the Massorah—to edit separate portions of the Biblical books. These masterpieces of criticism, which have gradually supplied us with a trustworthy Biblical text, based on the oldest and best manuscripts, are a memorial of the scientific bond existing between these two men, the Christian and the Jewish enquirers. The brilliant Latin introductions which Delitzsch prefixed to these editions show how deeply he penetrated into the obscure regions of the Massora. He revered it as one of the most wonderful and astounding productions, one of the titles to glory of the Jewish people. For Ezekiel he secured the invaluable aid of his son Frederick, the celebrated Assyriologist of the Leipsic University, in order to secure for Baer's edition the results of the most recent researches. Always at the highest level of contemporary science, Delitzsch was one of the first, in his work entitled, *Physiology and Music in their importance for Grammar, particularly for Hebrew Grammar* (1868), to apply the teachings of the modern physiology of languages to Hebrew, and to point out in the writings of the Jewish national grammarians presentiments of the lately-disclosed truths. Not only acoustics, but optics also he presses into the service of Hebrew vowel-sounds, the appropriate names of which had already astonished Chladni. The resonator-flame apparatus of Rudolf König converts the constituent parts of the vowels into pictures of flame, by which means an old obscure image of the Yezira book becomes, as it were, embodied. New light is here thrown on the music of the Hebrew language and on its accentuation. In special musical appendices, Delitzsch makes clear the intonation of the Pentateuchal and Prophetical perikopes, in other words, the singing of the "Torah Sections" and of the Haftara according to the German rite. Not easily will a work on Hebrew grammar be found which combines so great a stimulative interest, such abundance of new thoughts (amidst which, moreover, the classical languages are not forgotten), such a high level of general culture with such a degree of special technical knowledge, as are contained in this little book.

In the work, entitled *Jewish-Arabic Poetry of Pre-Mahommedan Times: a Specimen from Fleischer's School, and a Contribution to the Celebration of his Jubilee* (1874), Delitzsch raised his own memorial to his Arabic studies. This work, a translation of the poem ascribed to the Jewish poet Samaual Ibn Adiya, and contained along with a commentary in the Hamasa, is linguistic rather than historical; but even after Rückert's classical translation and Nöldeke's

historical treatment of the poem, it possesses intrinsic value. For Delitzsch, in the course of his industrious life, appropriated more from the Semitic languages than is customary among commentators.

But these incomparable and penetrating researches into the Old Testament, and this singularly intimate acquaintance with the Rabbinical and lay-Jewish literature, were for Delitzsch only preparations for the great task of his life, the elucidation and translation into Hebrew of the New Testament. No one was better fitted to recognise in these records a product of Jewish literature than he, who lived in the atmosphere in which the Gospels took their origin, who conjured up by the might of his knowledge and the force of his mind the spiritual scenes they reflect, who had walked with the rabbis of Jerusalem and with the fishermen of Galilee. He was capable of piercing through the words to the realities behind them, and of realising, through the veil of tradition, the original signification of the spoken discourse. This faculty was clearly proved by his work, *A Day in Capernaum*, or *Artisan-life at the time of Jesus*, which appeared in 1868.

What may be considered as a fault in his Biblical exegesis, namely, that he interprets the Old Testament by the help of the New, is here, where the circumstances are reversed, to be esteemed as a distinct advantage. For he here pourtrays everything arising out of its conditions—the facts in their real relation to each other as appearances of contemporaneous Jewish life of their time. All his works on the New Testament bear, therefore, in a measure, the stamp of rabbinical commentaries, and demonstrate fully the inestimable advantages he derived from Talmudic literature for his work of elucidation. Already, in 1853, there appeared *New Investigations into the Origin and Design of the Canonical Gospels*, the first part of which, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, was, however, not continued. In 1857 followed the commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, with archæological and dogmatic digressions on the sacrifice and the atonement, after which came in 1861-2 the two books of *Discoveries in MS.*, containing studies on the Text of the Apocalypse. *A System of Christian Apologetics*, which appeared in 1869, was followed in 1870 by *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, translated into Hebrew and illustrated from Talmud and Midrasch. This last book brings us to his greatest, and to himself, most pleasurable work, the translation of the whole of the New Testament into Hebrew. He had solemnly vowed to himself to accomplish this task, into which he intended to put the sum

of his discernment, the life-blood, as it were, of his learning. Every sentence in it was counted and weighed, repeatedly tested and corrected, and subjected to a continuous process of emendation. The work, and the revision of it, occupied years; he had time enough, as a publisher was not found until the British and Foreign Bible Society took the work under the shelter of its mighty wings and published it in the spring of the year 1877. In 1882 the fourth edition was issued in electrotype, followed immediately by a fifth edition and by a sixth, in crown 8vo. Out of gratitude to England, he gave an account of his corrections, on the occasion of this fifth edition, in a little pamphlet written in English, and entitled: *The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society, a Contribution to Hebrew Philology.* The valuable remarks on various alterations in his translation, and the candour and humility of his corrections, make this little work a precious memorial of his greatest literary production. But even then he did not consider the work as perfect, but always represented it as needing improvement. He listened attentively to every proposal which appeared likely to better or correct even the minutest point in this, to him so sacred, task. He conducted an enormous correspondence with Jews of all countries, and received everybody's objections and remarks with meekness and gratitude. By this translation he obviously could not win the confidence of the great mass of those whom I might call Hebrew writers by instinct. What he brought forward was not a genial masterpiece, but the matured fruit of learning, working and advancing step by step. Here everything was set forth consciously, and with due calculation; nothing was jotted down unconsciously, as a gift of momentary inspiration. Therefore Salkinson's translation has found more favour with many people, for it was more Hebraic, *i.e.*, in reality often more un-Hebraic, more suited to the bad taste by which disorder is considered order, and loose expressions and slipshod carelessness are accepted as tokens of genuine philological attainments. Delitzsch's New Testament is a precious addition to Hebrew literature, an attempt based on the sure groundwork of honestly and hardly-won erudition, and undertaken with the strict self-discipline of genuine knowledge, to restore to or conquer for the language of Zion the *origines* of Christianity.

Must I not fear to snap the string, which has sent forth such glorious sounds, with a shrill dissonance, if I say, in conclusion, that Franz Delitzsch was no friend to Judaism? For not only latterly, but from the very beginning, ever since he gave his mission-lecture in the Orphanage Church at

Dresden in 1841, on "The Three Chief Causes on the Christian Side which Hinder the Conversion of Israel," proselytism was the very breath of his soul. To unite Church and Synagogue, that is, to let Judaism be absorbed by Christianity, to bring Jesus nearer to the Jews, to spread the Gospel in Israel; this was the most passionate desire of his heart, the task of which he dreamed, and for which he watched, the central point of all his aims and efforts. All the ill success of his endeavours, the most grievous disappointments, the bitterest experiences could not turn him from this, his one master passion. It does one good to glance over the great number of his achievements on the field of scholarship, when one sees such great and noble talents spent in so useless a struggle. One could not well expect an impartial estimate of Judaism from a man whose Christian faith was so deeply rooted, but one must go further, and allow that he himself was not free from an exaggerated sensibility, as far as regards Christianity, which does not well become him who is possessed of the greater power. When at one time the sky began to darken over Israel, and the storm-clouds threatened more than ever, he appeared for a moment to consider it as a punishment, because a few inconsiderate Jewish voices had spoken presumptuously against Jesus. For a time, also, it seemed as if he so deeply lamented anti-Semitism, only because it was likely to fall like a hoar-frost on the evangelization of Israel, and must wither the blossoms which, as it was, were but pale and feeble. This was the sad time of the revival of the "Instituta Judaica" at the German universities. Leipsic led the way in 1880, and in the writings of the institute there, at whose disposal Delitzsch placed his guidance, his collaboration, and his erudition, many a word has gone forth which has cut every faithful Jew to the heart. In the numerous volumes of the missionary periodical *Sowing in Hope*, which he supported many years before, the flowers had bloomed in secret, and words died away as in the desert. But now there was a pulpit in the market-place, and proselytism was carried out of professional circles into publicity and ordinary life. It was inevitable that he should experience opposition, and see that the veneration with which he had formerly been regarded in all Jewish circles was here and there fading away.

But like rays of the sun, so the brightness of his unblemished soul pierced through the mists which seemed to darken his fame. When the fulness of time came, the proselytiser of Israel was transformed into its champion, the missionary became a brother in arms. Well for him

that he was deemed worthy to fight, in the day of danger, with a bright shield and gleaming sword, for those who could not defend themselves, and to come forward as a witness for us, to whom his word must be of the greater service, the less he could be accused of prejudice in our favour or even of bribery and corruption. How the venerable Delitzsch rose up with all the courage of youth, to go to battle with untruth and to bear a testimony to Truth which will endure as long as the sense of truth lives in the hearts of men, this is one of those things which it is a pleasure to have experienced.

It was a disgrace for German theological science, in which Rabbinical studies had been decreasing for a long time, that Rohling was allowed to put before the German nation in his *Talmud-Jew* the repulsive concoction he had borrowed from Eisenmenger. In vain were the replies from the Jewish camp; like the insolent Goliath, the miserable plagiarist went day by day through the ranks of intimidated Israel, and hurled the most shameful invectives and the most dangerous inflammatory speeches at them without fear of punishment. Then Delitzsch came on the scene! The spirit of truth came over him; not in vain had he enjoyed the hospitality of Rabbinical literature during the best years of his life. The desire to bear loud, unimpeachable testimony to the purity of this wickedly outraged literature burned like fire within him. With the safety lamp of criticism he lighted up the pool of sin and ignorance, from which miasma and germs of disease had spread all over Germany. How Rohling's *Talmud-Jew*, exposed in all its falsity by Franz Delitzsch, shrivels up before the righteous anger of the lover of truth! It was, indeed, easy for his superior erudition to demolish the poverty and the paltry wisdom of the infuriated Rohling, but it was a difficult and manly deed to speak, when it would have been so easy, so opportune, aye, and so advisable to keep silent. What he said, others could have said too, perhaps not so pithily, so perfectly, but in substance the same; but that *he* has said it will be for ever a meritorious and saving deed.

But it was assigned to him to step forth in a still more decisive and even providential manner on behalf of Judaism. From the plains of Hungary a Fata Morgana, a spectre of mediæval terrors had risen on the horizon of Europe, which blanched the cheeks of those who lived to see it. What the malice and cunning of many centuries had vainly tried to establish, what the hatred of many generations had not been able to prove, that was now to come to light in the court of justice at Nyiregyháza, before all the world! It was publicly to be proved that Jews use Christian blood.

A minister of Justice was at the helm, whom infatuation had blinded; false witnesses prospered; the mouth of the child was to condemn the father. A sword hung over the head of Justice; there appeared to be no escape. Then, in order to fill up the measure of horrors, Augustus Rohling offered to swear before the court that the use of Christian blood was a Jewish tradition, which he had now succeeded in authenticating in plain words in a Kabbalistic writing. A man of Jewish race, who, with due conceit, called himself Justus, was the prompter, whose fiendish inspiration Rohling had only to confirm on oath. Delitzsch had already, like so many other Christian scholars, demonstrated in writing the madness of this terrible accusation. That, however, did not suffice. It was necessary to refute the alleged literary proof, which was supposed to have been just discovered, to follow crime to its hiding-place. Again it was Delitzsch who took up the challenge and gained the victory. The manner in which he acquitted himself of this task is a triumph of science, which here, for once, stepped forth into practical life to bring salvation and delivery. Only moral indignation, the revolt of a great heart, could utter such accents, "Checkmate to the liars, Rohling and Justus!" Thus sounded the thundering "Halt!" which he cried out to their bloodthirsty witnesses before the decisive battle of the Tisza-Eszlar crusade (1883). The bitterness which his appearance on behalf of the Jewish cause called up against him was very great, but as he had spoken according to the promptings of his spirit, and not for favour, and as he consistently refused to receive any thanks from the Jews, so he let the waves of excitement, which from the Christian world beat audibly against his house, flow on unregarded, feeling secure of divine reward in the consciousness of duty done.

Therefore may Judaism and Christianity unite in mourning his death. Like a priest of reconciliation, he carried the Old and New Testament in his heart. "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem" was his motto towards Israel. Though he was a missionary, let it not be forgotten that he has also been a propagator of Judaism, of its language and literature among the Christian world. He was able justly to say of himself that he had worked with Rapoport and Zunz, with Luzzatto and Steinschneider, at the task of raising the literary history of Judaism to the rank of a science. He has done enough besides, moreover, to make his name live unforgotten on the pages of Jewish history, and to cause it to be thankfully praised wherever Jewish hearts beat high. He will continue

to be a witness and a champion for Israel, and gain friends for us, even after his death. It is a grief to see so rare a man quit this world in such troublous times, but the thought that his name will continue to be a symbol of reconciliation, an example for coming generations to imitate, brings some consolation. If the synagogue promises admission into the life eternal to every pious man on earth, then Franz Delitzsch will live doubly the immortal life.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

12th March, 1890.

JEWISH TAX-GATHERERS AT THEBES IN THE AGE OF THE PTOLEMIES.

MOST travellers on the Nile know by this time what is meant by "ostraka." They are potsherds of various shapes and sizes, inscribed with demotic characters, or more commonly with cursive Greek. The use of this curious writing material first became fashionable in the Ptolemaic age, and was continued through the Roman period of Egypt down to the time when the old religion of the country was superseded by Christianity, and the Coptic alphabet took the place of the complicated demotic script. For the most part, the ostraka are neither more nor less than tax-gatherers' receipts, and the information they give us in regard to the payment of taxes in ancient Egypt throws a welcome light on the economical and social history of the valley of the Nile in the Græco-Roman epoch.

It was on the island of Elephantinê, opposite Assuan, that the first discovery of ostraka was made which attracted the notice of European scholars. Subsequently others were found at Dakkeh, in Nubia—the Pselkis of classical geography—though the supply derived from the latter place has never been very large. The ostraka discovered in Elephantinê, on the other hand, are numerous, and date from the later Ptolemaic age to the reign of Pertinax. But the spot where they were found, which, doubtless, represented the ruins of the public offices of the city, has now been exhausted. For the last four or five years no more ostraka have been discovered there.

While, however, the supply of ostraka from Elephantinê was becoming exhausted, a new mine of extraordinary richness was opened at Thebes. I spent the winter of 1881-2 at Luxor in company with Dr. Wiedemann, now Professor of Egyptology at Bonn, and in our rides to the ruined temples of Karnak we lighted on a new source of supply. On the northern side of the ruins are the mounds of an old village, the greater part of which seems to have been built when Roman rule in Upper Egypt was beginning to decay. At all

events, the bricks of baked mud, of which the walls of the houses were composed, were cemented together with the help of inscribed potsherds, the spoil, evidently, of the public record office of the town. Some of the ostraka we purchased from the boys of the modern village, others we extracted from the bricks with our own hands. A new industry was thus started, which has gradually grown into considerable proportions, so that at present one of the common articles of trade among the dealers in antiquities at Thebes are the ostraka of Karnak. An immense number have been already found, and the supply still seems inexhaustible. About three-fourths of them are Greek, the remaining fourth being demotic. They form a connected series, which begins with the reign of Ptolemy Physkôn (or earlier), and comes down to the time of Aurelian and Claudius Tacitus in A.D. 275. It is possible that the revolt of Egypt eleven years later brought with it the sack of the fiscal office, and the removal from it of the records of former taxation.

I have come across another supply of ostraka at Qoft, the ancient Koptos, where potsherds inscribed with Greek and demotic characters are found by the natives at a little distance within the eastern gate of the Roman wall. Unfortunately my attention was not drawn to them until a large number had been destroyed by the discoverers in ignorance of their commercial value. Koptos was overthrown by Diocletian in A.D. 293, and the ostraka have doubtless been lying among the *débris* of the old city since that date.

At Gebelên, south of Thebes, again, I have picked up Greek and demotic ostraka, but even the promise of pecuniary reward has not succeeded in inducing the unintelligent Bedouin squatters in the place to discover others like them. As the ruins of the ancient town of Gebelên have been pretty thoroughly turned over by the diggers for *sebahh*, or nitrous earth, it is probable that the ostraka which once lay among them have all been destroyed. The same is also probably the case as regards the ostraka which must have been buried under the mounds of Memphis; on the other hand, we may still look for an unimpaired supply from the unexcavated remains of Menshîyeh or Ptolemais.

The use of potsherds as a writing material lasted long after the time when the Greek and Roman officials recorded upon them the receipts of the sacred and imperial treasuries. Coptic monks covered them with prayers and extracts from favourite sermons, and at Ekhmîm they were employed by the superintendents of the oil-presses for noting the amount of "pure oil" allowed to the slaves.

So far, it will be seen, Elephantinê and Karnak have been foremost in providing us with these curious records of ancient taxation, and in thus affording materials for throwing light on an important chapter in the economical history of Egypt. The cursive Greek of Elephantinê is comparatively easy to read; but most of the handwritings found at Karnak are abominably bad, and the difficulty of deciphering them is increased by the numerous contractions and strange symbols with which they are filled. Thanks more especially to a young German scholar, Dr. Wilcken, most of these symbols can now be explained, and the collection I have myself formed has helped to clear up the meaning of others. Comparatively few of the ostraka still resist decipherment.

A practised eye will at once distinguish between those which belong to the Ptolemaic era or the early part of the reign of Augustus, and those which are of later date. The handwritings and formulæ are different, and a white-glazed pottery is usually employed in the earlier period, whereas the ordinary red pottery was preferred in the Roman age. Why the tax-gatherer kept his accounts on broken sherds is not difficult to discover. They cost nothing, whereas papyrus and parchment were expensive, and there was plenty of room in a government house for any amount of them.

Occasionally we come across bilingual ostraka written both in Greek and in demotic. One in my possession has upon it the following Greek text: "The ticket (*σύμβολον*) of Horus, the son of Harsiesis, for the land of Ammon,[1] 10 ardebs of corn." In the Roman period payment was ordinarily made in wheat or barley, in the case of the land-tax at all events; and one of the most common formulæ at Karnak will be found in the following example: "There have been measured for the treasury of the capital on the crops of the 16th year of Hadrian Cæsar, the lord, the 29th day of the month Payni, in the name of Petemenôphis, the son of Pamonthas, on behalf of Pthuminis Dioskurides, on account of the land-tax, 4 ardebs, a third and a twelfth. (Signed by) Pamonthas." In the case of other taxes, however, as, for instance, those on palm-trees, or on the permission to practise a trade, the payments were in cash. In the time of the Antonines the cash payments were calculated both in "good money" and in "dirty money," or potin, a drachma of good money being equivalent to a drachma and an obol of dirty money.

It is seldom that an ostrakon rises above the sphere of mone-

[1] That is to say, the land belonging to the Temple of Ammon, the Theban Zeus, at Karnak.

tary transactions. Last winter, however, I secured one which is known by the handwriting to belong to the age of Augustus, and is unique of its kind. It runs thus: "O my lord Isidoros, come and bring me the glosses (λέξεις) on the first book of the Iliad, as I have asked you." For once in a way the fiscal office at Thebes contained a clerk who had literary tastes.

But this was not the only ostrakon of unusual interest which I obtained last winter from Karnak. I also obtained two or three of the Ptolemaic period, which disclose to us the existence of a Jewish family residing at Diospolis or Thebes and practising there the office of "publican." The first of them reads as follows: "A copy. Simon, the son of Eleazar (Ἰλζάρου), who has taken the cobblers' fourths (ὁ ἐπιειλημφὼς τῶν τετάρτων τῶν ἀπήτων) for the 28th year [of Ptolemy Physkôn], sends greeting to Mesôreus. I have received from your son in payment of the tax in the month Tybi 4,000 copper drachmæ. Dellus (Δέλλους) is the scribe, at Simon's request, as he does not himself know how to write."

The document is a very remarkable one. It shows that in B.C. 141—the age of Simon Maccabæus—a Jew was engaged in levying the taxes in Upper Egypt, and acting in common with another tax-gatherer whose name Mesôreus seems to indicate that he was a Greek. But the most curious part of the document is its conclusion. It is not probable that a person who held the position of Simon in the cultured Alexandrine epoch should have been wholly illiterate, and it would therefore appear that when it is said he could not write, what is meant is that he could not write Greek. A receiver of the taxes could scarcely have carried on his business unless he had been able to write in some language or other. What could this language have been except Hebrew? If it were Hebrew, the fact would be of historical importance, as it would show that even in Upper Egypt a Hellenising Jew in the second century before the Christian era still retained a knowledge of the sacred language of his forefathers.

It is unfortunate that the exact value of the copper drachma is still in dispute. M. Revillout has shown indeed that it had two values, an earlier and a later, and that in the one system it weighed from 8·35 to 9 grammes and represented the 8th part of an obol and the 48th part of a silver drachma, while in the other system it weighed from 3·35 to 3·60 grammes and represented the 120th part of the drachma of silver.[1] But the cases to which the one system or the other is applicable are still an open question.

[1] *Revue égyptologique*, II. 2, 3 (1881).

The second of my ostraka which refer to Simon is dated three years earlier than the one translated above, in the 25th year of Ptolemy Physkôn. Another is dated in the 27th year, and runs thus: "Marius sends greeting to Simon; there has been paid for the tax on the pasturage (*τὸ ἐννόμιον*) to the Theban Zeus, for the 27th year, 3,440 copper drachmæ." The ostrakon is countersigned in demotic, with a note that it relates to the "sacred" treasury of Ammon.

The document is remarkable from many points of view. It shows us that Simon not only collected money for the royal treasury, but was also willing to do the same for the sacred treasury of the sanctuary of Ammon, "the Theban Zeus," at Karnak. It further shows us that in this work he was associated with a colleague whose Latin name indicates the extent to which Roman influence had already spread in Egypt. The pasturage upon which the tax was levied was within the great wall of enclosure which surrounded the temple of Ammon—the exact spot, in fact, where the modern villagers of Karnak still claim the right of feeding their herds, to the serious damage of the ruined shrine.

Simon appears again on an ostrakon, which must have been written about the same time as the first I have quoted. Here we read: "[In] the 28th year, the 11th [day] of Tybi, Simon, the son of Eleazar, the receiver of the corn [tax] has paid [*literally*, measured] into the treasury that is in Diospolis the Great, for the 28th year, 90 ardebs of wheat, in conjunction with Bryôn." Then follows, in a different handwriting: "Apollônios [has paid into it] 90 ardebs, [and] Hermokratês 90 ardebs."

Simon was succeeded in his office by his son Philoklês, whose Greek name proves how thoroughly the family had now associated themselves with the Greek inhabitants of Egypt. It is, of course, possible that the mother of Philoklês was Greek. I have three ostraka which were written by him, two of them being duplicates of the same document. These latter are dated in "the third year," presumably of Ptolemy Lathyros, and are as follows: "The 3rd year, the 13th [day] of Pakhons, Philoklês, the son of Simon, has paid [*literally* measured] for the registration-tax (*τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν*) of the district around Thebes, for the same year, 100 ardebs of corn. [Countersigned by] Kritolaos." The other ostrakon is similar: "The 5th year, the 26th [day] of Pakhons, Philoklês, the son of Simon, has paid for the registration-tax, for the 5th year, 153 ardebs of barley." A name written in demotic intervenes between the first and second part of a statement in Greek: "He has registered 153 ardebs for the same," and

two lines of demotic are inscribed on the back of the potsherd.

The New Testament had made us acquainted with the fact that the taxes were farmed in Palestine by Jews during the Roman period; and the history of Joseph, the nephew of Onias, given by Josephus (*Antiq.*, xii. 4), had shown that a Jew might be employed by the Ptolemies in collecting the taxes of northern Egypt. But the ostraka of Karnak carry us one step further. They prove that, not only in Alexandria and its neighbourhood, but even the distant "metropolis" of Thebes, in the heart of native Egypt, the office of tax-gatherer might be held by a Jew in the second century B.C. They further prove that the Jew who accepted the office was already on the road to disowning both his faith and his nationality. Simon, the son of Eleazar, it is true, could not write Greek; but he did not shrink from collecting the "sacred tax" due to the great heathen sanctuary of Upper Egypt, and in associating himself with pagan colleagues. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that in the next generation the family were removed yet one step further from Judaism, and that his son and successor no longer bore even a Jewish name. The facts throw a strong light on the Hellenising tendencies which in the age of Simon threatened at one time to absorb the people of Israel.

A. H. Sayce.

THE JEWISH SIBYLLINE ORACLES.

WHEN speaking about the Jewish Sibylline Oracles it will not be necessary for me to enter on an examination of the origin, importance, and probable contents of the genuine Sibylline Oracles of antiquity. No doubt such an inquiry would be not only most profitable, but also highly interesting. The story goes that an unknown old woman came to King Tarquinius with nine books of divine oracles, which she offered him for sale at an enormous price. The king scornfully refused to pay the desired amount, whereupon she burnt three of the books, and demanded the same price for the remaining six. On the king again declining her offer with derision, she calmly burnt three more of the books, and desired the same sum for the three that remained. But now the king was struck by her collected and determined demeanour; he began to consider the matter more seriously, and ended by giving her the full price for the remaining three books. This tale, and others of the same nature, were handed down to posterity in evidence of the great sacredness of the Sibylline Oracles, which were preserved and concealed in the Capitol. They were only consulted on special occasions, and by direct order of the Senate, till they were burnt with the Capitol in the year of Rome, 671. A Commission was afterwards sent to several places, famous for supposed Sibylline prophecies, in order to replace, as far as possible, the lost collection. The number of Sibylline Oracles which the Commissioners found to exist was enormous, but they selected only such as were in their opinion indisputably genuine. The mass of prophetical poems continued to increase, and reached astonishing dimensions. When Augustus became Pontifex Maximus, he had all oracles that were not authenticated destroyed; the Sibylline Books were, however, spared, and occasionally consulted, till they were publicly burnt in the reign of Honorius. But the Roman oracles were not the only written oracles extant, nor is it certain that they were the oldest. The question whether the Roman oracles, in spite of the jealous anxiety with which they were kept secret, were not for all that partly or wholly known to the public; the consideration of those few fragments of genuine

ancient oracles that have come down to us, and the results to which such an inquiry must lead, are topics which I am obliged to pass by.

I have to give my attention to counterfeit fabrications, to such portions of that collection of spurious productions, which is known under the name of *Χρησμοι Σιβυλλιακοι* Sibylline Oracles, as can with the greatest probability be traced back to Jewish authors. I have to limit my inquiry to the investigation of such questions as are best calculated to give a satisfactory idea of these Jewish oracles, of the probable age of some of them, of their contents, their origin, and of the kind of criticism which has to be applied to them. Those of my readers who would wish to gain an insight into the whole collection —comprising pieces of Heathenish, Jewish and Christian origin—I refer to an article on the Sibylline Books which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, in July, 1877 (vol. cxlvi). Out of the immense mass of literature on the subject, I shall confine myself to the following few references, which can be said to be of real moment in the investigation of the Jewish oracles, to which all other inquiries on the subject written since, be they of great or small compass, always return, to discuss them, to decide between their conflicting opinions, while the new suggestions are only of trifling importance.

The modern criticism of the Oracles can be said to commence with Friedrich Bleek's treatise on their origin and composition.[1] Exhaustive in every respect are the two editions and the bulky book of dissertations of Charles Alexandre (Paris, 1841-56-59). Joseph Heinrich Friedlieb edited the Oracles in 1852, with a German metric translation, a long introduction, and critical notes. Friedlieb's translation of the third book was reprinted with introductory remarks and notes, under the title of *Alexandrinische Messiashoffnungen*, by Dr. Z. Frankel, of Breslau, in his monthly magazine in 1859. Frankel, as well as Graetz, in the third volume of his *History of the Jews*, follow on the whole Friedlieb's views. But the opinions of Alexandre and Friedlieb found a severe critic in Professor Ewald, in his essay, *Ueber Entstehung, Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllinischen Bücher*, 1858. He altogether differs from the views of Alexandre and Friedlieb, more particularly in reference to the part which is the principal subject of the

[1] Über Entstehung und Zusammenstellung der uns in acht Büchern erhaltenen Sibyllinischen Orakel, in the *Theologische Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher und De Wette*, Berlin, 1819. I doubt whether a copy of this important treatise exists in any of the large libraries in England. See *The Jewish Messiah: a Critical History of the Messianic Idea among the Jews*, etc. By James Drummond, London, 1877, page 11, note 2.

present inquiry, namely, the third book. In 1857 there appeared in Jena a little work under the title of *Die Jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlicher Entwicklung*, etc., by Dr. A. Hilgenfeld, in which the poem under consideration is subjected to a searching investigation. Hilgenfeld's and Ewald's notions on the third book are essentially the same ; they only differ in some points of minor importance. It is remarkable that Ewald does not make any mention of Hilgenfeld's inquiry, although Hilgenfeld's preface is dated January, 1857, and Ewald's essay was not produced before September, 1858. And lastly, I have to mention a dissertation on the Jewish Sibylline Oracles, and a treatise on the fourth book by Dr. Benno Wilhelm Badt.[1] No subsequent inquiries have materially increased our knowledge of the Jewish Sibylline books.

After this cursory sketch of its critical literature, I return to the subject itself. I called the Oracles spurious ; meaning by the word that they are not the Oracles, nor part of the Oracles of the Capitol, neither of those alleged to have been purchased by Tarquinius, nor of the later collection which was deposited there after its restoration. The authors of the older parts of our body of poems may have interwoven some ancient genuine Sibylline productions, as current in antiquity, in their works ; but if so, they did it only very sparingly. The oracles which we have are without exception imitations, none of them is a remnant of the emanations from such a source as was recognised in antiquity as truly Sibyllic. This, of course, denies them all authority as real prophecies. But in the same manner we should refuse credence to the genuine ancient oracles. This, however, was not the case with the first teachers of Christianity. There can be no doubt that most of them accepted the Sibylline Oracles as authoritative, and considered them as having emanated from real prophetic inspiration. Paul, the Apostle, must perhaps be cited as the oldest among them. He is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus as exhorting the heathens to consult the writings of the Sibyl for the belief in one God, and for the predictions of future events by her. Alexandre presumes that Clemens must have quoted some apocryphal Pauline book, although he admits that it is neither absurd nor impossible to assume that Paul should have quoted the Sibyl. The same author treats exhaustively[2] of the credit the oracles enjoyed with the

[1] *De Oraculis Sibyllinis a Judæis Compositis*, Pars I. Dissertatio Inauguralis philologica quam . . . . . defendet Benno Guilelmus Badt. Breslau, 1869. Ursprung, Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der Sibyllischen Orakel von B. Badt. Breslau, 1878. [2] Vol. II. Excurs. IV., p. 254, *sqq.*

fathers of the Christian Church, and even with later Christian writers. People continued in the Middle Ages to imitate the oracles, and to prophesy without scruple on comparatively modern historical events. Great Britain has in this way been particularly taken notice of by Sibyls of that class, whose productions were then ascribed to some renowned author quite after the classical style of literary forgery. Thus, an oracle which was most probably composed by some German or Italian towards the end of the twelfth century, was fathered on the venerable Bede, who lived at the beginning of the eighth century. Bladud, Hudibras, and the hero of so many fables, Cadwalldr, the last king of the Britons, had special attention paid to them by some such Sibyl. Of the latter it is particularly related that he consulted, among other prophecies, also those of the Sibyl. Nay, a meddlesome prophet had something to say even about the Wars of the Roses, and himself took the side of the Yorkists.[1]

Such fabrications, however unimportant in themselves, show of what lasting influence the impulse was, as given by those Sibylline authors of old. The belief in their authority was shared by many well informed writers even of later ages. I shall give two examples of English authors who tenaciously clung to that belief. The first whom I think it worth while to mention, because I have not found his name alluded to in this connection by any author on the subject, is Roger Bacon.[2] He implicitly believed in the prophetic power of the Sibyls, relying on the authority of Augustine and Isidore, and "all the saints." He is quite sure that they promulgated Divine oracles, and concludes *a fortiori* that if such frail women were thus inspired, how much more was this possible for philosophers. The second example is important as a specimen of learned men of a much later period, who attached credence to the Oracles even after the belief in their genuineness had already been seriously shaken. William Whiston edited, in 1715, a *Vindication of the Sibylline Oracles, to which are added the genuine Sibylline Oracles themselves, etc.* In this work Whiston admits that most of the Sibylline Books are fictitious; but some of them, namely, those which he reprints, he holds to be not only remnants of the ancient oracles, but also to contain really Divine revelation. He says,[3] "It is not reasonable for this age to recede from the ancient opinion in this matter, without any new and good evidence to the contrary; but they ought still to allow the Sibylline Oracles

[1] Alexandre, Vol. II., p. 298.

[2] *Opus majus*, II., cap. viii., p. 39, compare p. 169. *Opus Tertium*, pp. 79 and 81.

[3] P. 82.

to have been Divinely inspired. . . . . It appears, therefore, that though God gave positive laws, or an institution of religious worship only to the Jews, and intrusted them only with those Divine oracles that related to the same, yet that he did not wholly confine Divine inspiration to that nation; but supported the law and religion of nature, and the right worship of himself as the one and true God, among the heathens also, all along by these oracles till the light of the Christian revelation was spread over the world."

It is needless to state that no Jewish author ever attached any importance to these oracles. Josephus,[1] in speaking of the tower of Babel, cites the words from the third Book, which I shall have to discuss afterwards. He says, "the Sibyl also" mentions the tower. That he drew from a heathen source, but not from the poem itself is clear, for the "God" of the poem is, in his quotation, "the Gods." That Philo ever mentioned them is doubtful. In the works of his which we possess no mention of them is made.[2]

After these preliminary remarks, I proceed to consider that part of the collection, of which two things are certain: first, that it is the most ancient of all these oracles; and, secondly, that it was composed by a Jew. There is some difference of opinion as to the constituent parts of the whole poem. Two fragments, namely, have been preserved by Theophilus of Antioch in his Book to Autolycus, under the name of "the Sibyl." According to Hilgenfeld, Ewald and others, they are a part of the same poem as the greater portion of the third Book. But, according to Alexandre, they exhibit proofs of having been composed, not by a Jewish, but by a Christian author. I shall cite a few verses from the first fragment, in order to give a specimen of its contents, and also to illustrate, by means of them, some of the arguments brought forward by Alexandre for assigning them to a Christian author. The fragment commences: "O mortal men, made of flesh, mere nothings, how are you so full of self-importance, not considering that your life must end? Neither do you tremble at, nor fear God, who governs you; the supreme Lord, who knows, sees, and is aware of all things; who is the Creator who preserves all, who sent his sweet spirit into every one, and made it the governor of all men. There is one God, the only God. He is very great, unbegotten, omnipotent, invisible. He sees everything, but cannot be seen by any mortal. For what flesh can behold with his eyes the celestial, true, and immortal Being, who lives in Heaven, since men,

[1] *Antiq.*, I. iv. 3.

[2] See Friedlieb's Introduction, p. 9.

who are born mortals, made of bones, veins, and flesh, cannot even bear to look at the beams of the sun. Worship him, the only God, the governor of the world, who alone exists from everlasting to everlasting. He exists from himself, is unbegotten. He governs all things at all times."

It is evident that in these verses, as translated here, there is nothing that could not have been written by a Jew; nay, the whole tenor of the piece points to a Jew as its author. Alexandre, however, sees in the words: "Who sent his sweet spirit into every one, and made it the governor of all men," a sign that it must have been composed by a Christian. He prints the word *Πνεῦμα*, Spirit, with a capital letter; and asserts that what is called here the sweet Spirit is nothing else but the λόγος, the "Word" of the New Testament, and is equivalent to the Son. He maintains that the expressions used are taken from the first chapter of John, but that the author of our fragment confused the Spirit with the Word or the Son; and adds, that it was an error, common in the first ages of the Church, to confuse these two persons. "Verum, hanc duarum personarum, saltem sermone tenus, confusionem primis ecclesiæ temporibus vulgatam fuisse, certum est." And he considers the words, "Who sent his sweet Spirit into every one, and made it the governor of all men," only a reproduction of the sentence in John i. 9: "That was the light which lighteth every man that comes into the world." Gfrörer[1] proves from Philo's writings that the word πνεῦμα was well known to Hellenistic Jewish authors, and is equivalent to νοῦς, Intellect. This is true enough. But really we need not confine ourselves to this technical meaning of the word πνεῦμα in order to understand this passage. Our author did nothing but reproduce the words of Genesis, "And he breathed in his nostrils the breath of life, or the spirit of life," taking them in the same sense as they are understood by many Jewish commentators, among others by Nachmanides and Mendelssohn.

Alexandre finds also evidences of a Christian authorship in the following expressions (ver. 23): "You walk in pride and madness, leaving the straight way; you wander through rocky and thorny paths. O vain men! Cease to wander in darkness, in a black and obscure night. Leave the darkness of the night and enter into light. Behold, he is manifest to all, and does not deceive. Come, and do not pursue this thick darkness; behold the pleasant light of the sun shining gloriously." Alexandre avers that the light mentioned here cannot mean

[1] *Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie*, II., p. 124.

anything else but the light of Christianity. Well, to the unprejudiced mind it is obvious that "he" in this passage refers to God. The poet admonishes the Gentiles to forsake their dark superstitions for the light of truth, and to turn to God, whose light shines bright and is a guide to all men.

Besides these large fragments, there are two small ones, one of which was preserved by Lactantius, and the other by Theophilus. Both belong most probably to our section. The one of them argues: "If it were true that gods were born to continue alive and to be immortal, there would be in the end more gods than human beings, and no standing-room would be left for the mortals." A heathen, if he were only orthodox enough or frivolous enough, could easily have met this argument. We know, namely, the myth according to which Saturn devoured some of his children. We see, therefore, that the notion of immortality does not exclude the possibility of being eaten when young. This expedient could thus be resorted to by the older and more hungry gods, whenever such an over-population of gods should threaten to become in the least troublesome. This would not be a survival of the fittest, but of those endowed with the best appetites. However, to speak seriously, the objection must certainly have sounded most awkwardly on the ears of a faithful pagan of those days. Now it is true that a Christian could have made use of such words on other occasions. Yet he would hardly have employed them in an address to the heathens, and thus have provided his opponents with a cue for retorting on him.[1] Nor would a Christian have said to them, that he is a God who cannot be seen by any mortal. He would not have called him invisible, unbegotten, nor would he have used the expression which we find in the second large fragment,[2] that a God cannot possibly be created from the loins of man or woman. All these expressions show to demonstration that the author of these fragments was a Jew. The fact that in the second fragment the folly is shown of worshipping serpents, dogs, cats and birds, and images of stone, or heaps of stone, shows clearly that the author lived in Egypt, where such forms of idolatry were most rampant.

These fragments were, according to Ewald and others, part and parcel of that celebrated Sibylline Oracle which commences with the 97th verse of the third Book. It is, as said before, the most ancient portion of the whole collection, and is unmistakeably of Jewish origin. The two large fragments were quoted by Theophilus as belonging to "the Sibyl."

---

[1] See Badt, p. 17. [2] v. 40, Alexandre—Zweites Fragm., 1, 2 Friedlieb.

Besides these two pieces, Theophilus also cites two other short passages, one of which we find in the third Book. Now Theophilus speaks all along only of one Sibyl; all the verses quoted by him must therefore have occurred in the same piece. Lactantius mentions part of the proœmium (this is the title our fragments bear in the editions), as belonging to the Erythræan Sibyl, but he quotes also another passage, which we find in the third Book. We know that he ascribed the body of our poem to the Erythræan Sibyl. It is evident that the fragments and the bulk of the third Book were to him also one whole poem. We may, therefore, unhesitatingly assume that the poem, as continued in the greater part of the third Book, commenced with the address to the Gentiles, preserved by Theophilus.

Between this latter fragment and its continuation, as we find it in Book iii., v. 97, there must have been some verses which are lost. According to Ewald, a rather large passage is missing. Let us read the last words of the proœmium and its continuation in the third Book, and then consider what it was that may have filled up the existing gap. The end of the fragment is: "To him who has the power of life, and of incorruptible and eternal light, and who can give to men joys exceeding all the sweetness of honey, to him alone bend the neck, and follow the way of eternal righteousness. But you have forsaken all these; you have drunk a cupful of the unmixed wine of God's vengeance, which is very strong and thick, by your madness and folly. Neither are you willing to become sober and sound in your minds to know the true God and King, whose providence is over all things. Wherefore the burning of a fervent fire shall seize on you, and you shall burn in flames continually for ever; and be ashamed of your unprofitable false images But they who worship the true and eternal God shall inherit life. They shall inhabit the flourishing garden of Paradise and there feast on the sweet bread which comes from the starry skies." Thus the fragment ends, and Book iii., v. 97, proceeds:—"But when the threats of the great God are accomplished, with which he once threatened the men who built the tower in the country of Assyria, all spoke the same speech, and they wished to ascend to the starry heavens. Then the immortal God sent violent storms, and when the wind had overthrown the great tower which excited mutual contention among them, therefore men gave to that city the name of Babylon."

Ewald contends that the Sibyl was obliged, after the powerful exhortation to the heathens, to enter on a narrative about

the creation of the world and of mankind. She probably also mentioned the Flood. Then she went on to speak of the wickedness of the human race, which grew constantly, and (thus the Sibyl prophesied) will go on growing till the time of the Messiah. This led her to mention the threat of the Messianic judgment, and to foretell a subsequent completion of the empire of that nation, which now already was the bearer of the true religion. And at this point she continues: "But when the threats of the great God will be accomplished, which were once threatened to men, who built the tower in the country of Assyria."

No doubt, a passage exhibiting this flow of ideas, in the regularity of their sequence as suggested by Ewald, would be splendid indeed, if only we possessed it. But it is lost, if ever it did exist. It is true that there is nothing in Theophilus' fragments that could be called threatenings; therefore something about threats must have preceded the opening verses. But it is doubtful whether we must assume the loss of such an elaborate composition as Ewald speaks of. And what does Ewald mean, when he says that the Sibyl prophesies the triumph of that religion which *already now* flourishes in some nation of the earth? Now already! When? At what time must we imagine the Sibyl to utter her prophecies?

In my opinion some verses may have become lost between the so-called proœmium and verse 97 of the third Book. The poem was certainly rather roughly handled by the compiler of the Sibylline books and before his time. A portion of it was not taken up in the collection. The poem was lacerated, a piece thrust out, the best part of it tacked on to the first ninety-six verses of the third book, to which it does not belong. Thus, the only thing to be surprised at is that so much of it has been saved. Nevertheless it does not seem to me that the poem as a whole suffered so much as Ewald supposes.

To prove this I must stop for a moment to consider the question already touched upon before, about the time at which the pretended Sibyl wishes us to believe that she produced her vaticinations. Now it has been observed by more than one critic that our Sibyl plays her part remarkably well. She rarely forgets herself. She meets all questions that could arise as to her genuineness by her diction, by her tone, by the figures she employs, and by the direct information she imparts. One of the objections to be anticipated from some sceptic or other would be what is her origin, and how is it that a Sibyl, whose sole object is the glorification of the

Jewish nation, of its religious tenets and its Messianic hopes, should try to attain her object by speaking Greek to Greeks.

Sensible of this incongruity, she obviates beforehand any such objection by concluding her prophecies with the following words (verses 808-811):—"These things I prophesied concerning God's wrath upon men, when I was inspired with madness, and left the high walls of Babylon in Assyria, sent as a fire to Greece, to prophesy to men these divine enigmas." These words I consider to be the conclusion of the whole poem. By Babylon she means the Babylon of old. She professes to have been sent from Babylon to disclose the future to the Greeks. She pretends to have lived at the time when all people still spoke the same speech, that she witnessed the dispersion of the human race, on which occasion she herself left Babylon for Greece, sent to its inhabitants to lift the veil which conceals the future. She was called by some the Hebrew Sibyl, because of the contents of her prophecies, which only tend to the exaltation of the Hebrew race. But on account of the information she gives here of herself some called her the Babylonian, others the Chaldæan Sibyl. And now the reason is obvious why she commences her predictions with the history of the tower of Babel. If this explanation is correct, the gap between the introductory address to the Gentiles, and the historical part cannot be very considerable.

I do not ignore the difficulties of this explanation. I must assume that all the seventeen verses after verse 811 are later additions. It is true Bleek also rejected them, but he also rejects the passage which I consider as the conclusion of the whole poem. Others believe that only the last eleven verses are fictitious. Ewald, however, defends the whole passage, which runs as follows:—"These things I prophesy concerning God's wrath upon mortal men, when I was mad and left the high walls of Babylon in Assyria, sent as a fire to Greece, to prophesy to men these divine enigmas. And the people of Hellas say that I am from another country, from Erythræ, and call me shameless. Others call me the mad, the lying Sibyl, the daughter of Circe and Gnostos. But when all shall be fulfilled, then you will remember me, and nobody would call me, the prophetess of the great God, mad. He disclosed to me the past about my parents as well as generally, and God sent me to speak to mortals of the past and of the future. For when the world was deluged by the waters, only one good man was left in a house made of wood floating on the waters, with animals and birds, that the world might be filled again. Then I was his daughter-in-law, and of his blood. To him

the former things were shown and the last; therefore everything said by me is true."

Ewald's words in explanation of this passage, which he assumes to be genuine, are as follows: "The poet desired, above all, to invent a suitable Sibyl, who could speak his words for him as they flowed from his heart. According to the vv. 812-815, he found two Sibyls of fame and authority among the Greeks; namely, the Erythræan, whose fame was of long standing, and another in Italy, whom, it is true, he does not call the Cumæan, but who is sufficiently designated as belonging to Italy, by being called by him the daughter of Circe and Gnostos. He was evidently very well acquainted with the verses that were current under the names of such Sibyls, and he was obliged to follow their manner. But the Sibyl who speaks for him must stand high above these; and this must be the case even if the Erythræan Sibyl had not already been called shameless by the Greeks, and the Italian one lying, as the poet thinks was done in his days."

Now, it must be admitted, that if all these verses are genuine, we must assume that a large portion of the beginning of the historical part of our poem has disappeared. For although the first event mentioned in the Bible after the history of the deluge is the dispersion of men at the building of the tower, yet the Sibyl says that it was also her vocation to speak of things past. But I cannot acquiesce in Ewald's theory about the genuineness of that passage in which she calls herself Noah's daughter. Even that part of the epilogue in which she deprecates being confounded with the Erythræan Sibyl, or with the daughter of Circe and Gnostos, is more than suspicious. Not to speak of Bleek's objections, which Badt considers to have been fully met by Hilgenfeld, I ask, how can we possibly believe that the author of v. 809 could immediately afterwards have written vv. 815-817? She says of herself, "When I was mad, οἰστρομανής." It seems here to be taken as a highly respectable attribute for a Sibyl. But a few verses after she says, "Many call me mad, μαινομένη, but in time it will be recognised that I am not mad." Here mad is evidently taken in a bad sense, and uttered in one breath with ψευστείρα, lying. If being οἰστρομανής, (furious, mad, a maniac) is such a great recommendation in one respectable Sibyl, why should it be a blame in others? Or, on the other hand, if it is a disgrace for a Sibyl to be a maniac, why should she profess herself to be such? For the word οἰστρομανής just as the more classical οἰστροπλήξ, literally, "stung by the gadfly," and μαινόμενος, mean the same thing, "mad." Therefore I maintain that the author of

808-811 was not the same as the one who wrote the subsequent passage.

The motive for making the addition was this. The author of our poem, who certainly followed the pattern of the older Sibylline poems, imitated some of the verses which were known as belonging to the Erythræan and to the Cumæan Sibyl. Our piece, when it was first produced, was called a Sibylline oracle. Some, as is evident from the passage in question, called it an oracle of the Erythræan, others of the Cumæan Sibyl; according to the esteem in which they held either prophetess. But in the confusion of Greek and Oriental legends, there were some who invented a Hebrew or Jewish Sibyl, according to the tenor of the poem; some assumed a Babylonian or Chaldæan Sibyl, from the information she gives of herself. These fables were further spun out, and the Queen of Saba, whom some called Nicaula,[1] was credited with Sibylline qualities. This led some to call the Sibyl right out Saba, which again was altered into Sambethæ.[2] But some one, probably a Christian, in the early times of Christianity, must have been shocked by the fact that such holy things, which he fully believed to be real predictions, should be ascribed to heathenish false prophetesses. He, therefore, in vindication of his prophetess, who professed to be of Babylon, added these verses: "May they call her the Erythræan, or the Cumæan, and not the Babylonian Sibyl; there will be a time that they will acknowledge her as the prophetess of the great God." He dismissed both Sibyls with a compliment or two. The Erythræan he calls shameless, the other a lying maniac, quite forgetting, in his zeal, that being a maniac is a quality of which a true Sibyl ought to be proud, and which his own client ascribed to herself.

That the last part, in which she calls herself a daughter-in-law of Noah, is spurious, is evident simply from the fact that Noah is said to have been the only man (τις ἀνὴρ μόνος) who was saved with animals and birds. The whole passage is very corrupt. Ewald tries to doctor it by alterations of the text and explanations. But certainly ἀνὴρ μόνος means only one man; and this is in contradiction with the narrative of Genesis where there are four. Such a blunder could have been made by one of the authors of some of the other books, who sometimes betray a merely superficial

---

[1] Thus ספר יוחסין (ו)ניקולאה (ed. Filipowski, עקואלה), most probably from Josephus, *Antiq.* VIII. vi. 2.

[2] See Alexandre, II., p. 82, *sqq.*

acquaintance with the Pentateuch; but not by the author of the third Book, who displays all through an intimate knowledge of the Bible.

That the poet ascribes the destruction of the tower to the winds presents no difficulty. It is an essentially Jewish tradition: it is found in the Ritual of the German Jews, and in some other Jewish books.[1]

Our poet next gives a narrative of the fight of the Titans. He says that, ten generations after the Flood, Kronos, Titan and Iapetos reigned on earth. They were the sons of Ouranos and Gaia, of Heaven and Earth. This couple received these names because they were so extremely good. The sons ought to have reigned each over a third part of the earth; but when their father died the sons fought for the supremacy. The struggle was particularly fierce between Kronos, and Titan; but by the interference of Rhea, Gæa, Aphrodite, Demeter and Dione, a compact was entered into between Kronos and Titan, that Kronos should have the sovereignty for life, but that it should devolve on Titan after his demise. To prevent the kingship being withheld from Titan by Kronos' sons, the following measure was adopted: The Titans were watchful whenever Rhea gave birth to a child. Twice already they had destroyed Kronos' male issue; but the third time Rhea was delivered of twins, Hera and Zeus. Hera was born first. When the Titans saw that a girl was born they went away satisfied, and Rhea contrived to save Zeus. She also managed to save Poseidon and Pluto. When the Titans saw that they had been deceived, Titan came with sixty sons and kept Kronos and Rhea in prison. But the latter's sons waged war with the Titans, and this was the first of all wars.

The general opinion is that here the author closely followed the narrative of the fight of the Titans, as found in Hesiod's *Theogony,* with the exception of such alterations as were demanded by the monotheistic view of the author. He, therefore, changed Hesiod's gods into human beings, made them dwell on earth, and remoulded the myth so as to make it appear to be a piece of ancient history.

I myself do not think that our author took all this trouble. I am of opinion that he found these alterations ready to hand. Hilgenfeld says that he explained the myth after the Euhemeristic fashion; but I am convinced that all he did was to put the very words of Euhemeros into verse.

---

[1] In a piece recited on the Day of Atonement, beginning אמיץ כח; and in the בעל הטורים s. v. ויתדלו. Evidently it was an old Midrash.

There lived about the year 300 before the Christian era, a man called Euhemeros, most probably a native of Messana, in Sicily, who, induced by his protector, King Cassander of Macedonia, composed one of the most curious books that ever were written. He called it ἱερὰ ἀναγραφὴ—Sacred History. In this book he started the theory that the gods were in reality human beings, who had been deified after their death. The geography, topography and archæology, which he required to prove his propositions, he invented himself. He declared that on his travels he had read of the most important actions of Uranus, Kronos and Zeus, in an inscription on a golden column in the Temple of Zeus Triphylios, on the island of Panchæa, in the Southern Ocean. Now this island was not situated in the Southern Ocean; the only place of its existence was in the fertile brains of Euhemeros. This Sacred History is lost; but the quotations from this book, as given by some authors, together with the fragments of the Latin translation by the poet Ennius, sufficiently prove that Euhemeros' account of the strife with the Titans is essentially the same as that given by the Sibyllist. His very expressions often correspond to the letter with those in the Sibylline account. Uranus was, according to Euhemeros, a mighty king, who owed his name to his great knowledge of astronomy. It would only be repeating the Sibyl to give his version of the Titanic quarrels. Euhemeros was called a wicked atheist by his contemporaries and by some later authors. In the present age of comparative mythology his method is called shallow, unpoetical, and unscientific. But, however easy it may be to sneer at his system, it was, nevertheless, a mighty effort in his days, and produced great consequences.

When we consider the eagerness with which new theories are taken hold of by some people, who are dazzled by their novelty and their plausibility, we must not be surprised that the learned Jews of Alexandria, having become acquainted with the imposing mass of Greek myths, were only too glad to find a system ready at hand by means of which they could reconcile them with their own monotheistic notions. I do not doubt but that they really believed the myths to be ancient history, which had been corrupted by the stupid, idol-ridden crowd. To them Euhemeros must have appeared in the light of a beneficent sage, and his system as the acme of wisdom. That his whole theory has been exploded is a fate that has been, and will be, met with by many systems which in their day were worshipped as oracles.

After the narrative of the Titanic war, our Sibyl begins to

prophesy in good earnest. She narrates how the word of the great God flew into her heart, and bade her prophesy to all mankind. The house of Solomon will reign over the horsemen of Phœnicia and Macedonia and the isles. A second nation will be the Hellenic-Macedonian power, and then the Romans will rule over many countries and terrify all kings. Their avarice and greed will cause much misery to mankind until the reign of the *seventh* king of Hellenic origin over Egypt. Then the people of God will be strong again, and be the guides of life to mortals.

Here we have reached one of the moot points at issue between Alexandre and Ewald. If we reckon from Alexander the Great as the first king, the seventh will be Ptolemæus VI., Philometor. He was taken prisoner by Antiochus Epiphanes in 170, and died in 146. Now, if we assume with Alexandre that by "the seventh king" Philometor was meant, then our oracle must have been composed before 170, for after that time Philometor was neither the sole nor the undisputed possessor of the throne. In that case a large portion of the third Book (vv. 295-488) cannot belong to our Sibyllist, because it contains allusions to events after Philometor's time. Alexandre, therefore, assigns that piece to a much later period. But if we assume, with Ewald and others, that the seventh king is Ptolemæus Physcon, then all those allusions may refer to contemporary facts, and the piece in question would be an integral part of our oracle, and the whole written during the latter years of Physcon, when he wielded undisputed power. When comparing the arguments of Ewald and of Alexandre, it appears that Ewald, and before him Hilgenfeld, have proved their propositions, and the piece relegated by Alexandre to a later time has to be considered as a portion of our poem. It is curious that the author of the article in the *Edinburgh Review*, who follows Ewald's guidance all along, agrees on this point with Alexandre. He says that it seems quite impossible that a pretending prophet, writing at any period subsequent to the successful rising under Judas Maccabæus, or at least to the death of Simon in the year 156, could have given utterance, in the form of a prediction, to the high hopes which are embodied in these verses.

But, first of all, Simon did not die in 156, but in 135; and, secondly, why could not such hopes be fostered by a poet living at the time of John Hyrcanus? But granted even that the poem dates from the early years of Simon, even in that case our author could have lived in the days of Physcon, for when Simon became High Priest, Philometor had been dead already for three years.

The Sibyl, speaking of the Jews, prophesies that misfortune will befall the pious men, who live about the temple of Solomon, who have their origin from Ur of the Chaldees. They do not turn themselves to the circuit of the sun, or of the moon, nor to monstrous phenomena on earth, nor to sorcerers, nor charmers, nor ventriloquism, nor Chaldæan astrology, nor to the stars. They practise justice and virtue without greed for money. They have just weights and measures. They do not rob each other, nor remove the landmarks of their neighbours. The rich does not grieve the poor nor oppress the widow, but rather assists them, giving them part of the harvest, in obedience to the sacred law of God. A description follows of their miraculous wanderings through the desert under Moses' leadership. God gave the law from Heaven, which they must faithfully observe. But they would have to leave their splendid temple and their country. Every land, every sea, will be full of them, but their own land will be empty of them. Their fortified hill, the temple of the great God, and the high walls, all will be cast to the earth, because of their sins and idolatry. They will be slighted by everyone for their customs. But happiness and great honour would return after seventy years of hardship. There is a royal clan whose family will not go down. It will reign in the course of time, and commence to build the temple of God. The poet alludes here to Zerubbabel, who was of the house of David. The kings of Persia, he continues, will assist. God himself will give a holy dream in the night, and then the temple will be again as it was before. Our pretended Sibyl maintains her assumed part by feigning to be exhausted. She prays to God to relieve her, but God again orders her to prophesy to the whole earth.

She first addresses Babylon, foretelling her utter ruin and destruction for having overthrown the temple. This passage is most poetical; in it, however, the Sibyl, in her ecstasies, seems to forget for once the part she plays, and shows her true colours in verses 312, 313: "And thou shalt be filled with blood, as thou hast *formerly* spilt the blood of good and righteous men, which *even now* cries to Heaven." So difficult it is, even for ever so dexterous an imitator, to keep up a *rôle* throughout a work of about a thousand lines.

The next vaticination is about Egypt (314-318), in which again the seventh generation of kings is mentioned. Thereupon follow predictions about Gog and Magog, and the Libyans, and about the miseries of a great many cities. Passages, like the one that follows next, describing the great power and predicting the ultimate fall of Rome, chiefly in-

duced many learned men to consider a great part of the poem as having been written at a later date. Rome, they argue, had not risen yet to that power at the time of the poet of the other parts; neither could he have known of any reverses the Romans had sustained, nor of the full prosperity of that nation. But if the poem was composed in the later days of Ptolemæus Physcon, after the fall of Corinth and Carthage, the poet could have justly described Rome as risen from earth to heaven. That he alludes to the ultimate fall of the virgin, the daughter of Rome, as he calls her—in imitation of the Biblical "virgin, daughter of Zion"—has its ground in the conviction of the Jewish author, that it was to be a king from the holy land who would dictate in the end to the nations of the earth.

After this follow the remarkable words:—

Ἔσται καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος, ἐσεῖται Δῆλος ἄδηλος καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη,

"Samos will become a heap of sand (ammos), Delos will disappear (adelos), Rome will be a village (rume)." I abstain, in going through the contents of our poem, from pointing out the places in Holy Writ to which the author refers; but I must make an exception in this case. First, because I am not aware that it has been pointed out before that this play upon words is an imitation of Zephaniah ii. 4. There we find a prophecy about Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod, and Ekron: "For Gaza shall be forsaken and Ashkelon a desolate place; they shall drive Ashdod out at noon, and Ekron shall be uprooted." About the first and the last cities the Hebrew text reads כי עזה עזובה תהיה . . . . ועקרון תעקר. The prophet is rather utilising the similarity of sound in עזה עזובה and עקרון תעקר than playing upon the words; the expressions are placed at the beginning and end of the sentence, and thus avoid offending good taste. In imitation of this our Sibyllist brings in his predictions about Samos, Delos, and Rome, in three consecutive puns.

And, secondly, if my surmise about an imitation of Zephaniah is correct, it would settle another point which is not without importance. For if the poet observed the play upon words in Zephaniah he must have read the Bible in Hebrew, for it is lost and quite unnoticeable in any translation. This circumstance would at once raise our author above a large crowd of other Sibyllists and of Jewish Hellenistic writers—not, perhaps, excepting even Philo—whose knowledge of the Bible was only acquired from translations, because they were ignorant of the Hebrew tongue.

The author proceeds to depict the Messianic period. But that time will not come soon, other events will precede it. He alludes to Alexander of Macedon as a pretended descendant

of Jupiter, but in reality, he says, he is the offspring of slaves. He mentions the conquest of Macedon by the Romans; and consequently cannot have written before 146. He pays special attention to the fate of the Seleucides in an obscure passage, which has been satisfactorily explained by Hilgenfeld and Ewald, as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, Alexander Balas, and Tryphon. The poet speaks of Troy, and calls Homer a lying writer, who certainly has much wit and eloquence, but borrowed from her, the Sibyl. After many predictions about Rome and various other heathen countries, the Sibyl was again exhausted, but God commanded her again to speak. This part is chiefly devoted to the glorification of the Jewish nation, the holy stock of righteous men, who will observe the counsels of the supreme God, and will honour his temple by offerings. They do not serve idols, but every morning, when they rise from their beds, they consecrate their hands with water before honouring God, and above all they will be mindful of holy wedlock. And after a description of the misfortunes and disturbances in nature, which will precede that happy consummation, the Sibyl concludes with the words which I have discussed already, and which form, in my opinion, the natural conclusion of the whole poem.

Having thus given an outline of the contents of the greater part of the third Book, I shall only add a few words about the other oracles which are presumably of Jewish origin. The first 96 verses were in my opinion not written by a Jew. A Jewish authorship can only be assumed by the most forced arguments, by a disputable explanation of the words ἐκ Σεβαστηνῶν, by assuming that the name Beliar (Belial), as a proper noun and applied to a kind of enemy of man, of an Anti-Christ, was a Jewish conception,[1] and the like.

The fourth Book is most probably the work of a Jew, nor is there any ground to assume with Hilgenfeld, Ewald, and Delaunay,[2] that it was written by an Essene. When he speaks in depreciating words of a temple, he means, as is evident from the context, heathen temples. When he says: "Happy will be those men who will love the great God, praying before eating and drinking," he alludes to an absolutely Jewish rite, not one, which according to Ewald, points to an Essene. Nor is it a proof of either Christian or Essene authorship when

[1] Neither for the use of that word as a proper noun, nor for the whole conception, does any foundation exist in Jewish writings. Ewald's remark (p. 56), that there exists no Antichrist against the more lifeless Jewish Messiah, is very striking.

[2] Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité Judeo-Grecque. Paris, 1874. This author scents Essenism everywhere.

he says: "They abrogate all temples and altars, the seats of dumb stones, soiled with the blood of animals"; for here again he speaks only of idol worship. They are soiled by the blood of offerings, but the same thing in the temple of the Jews, which was already destroyed, would tend to the glory of God. And thus he adds immediately (line 30) *βλέψουσι δ' ἑνὸς θεοῦ εἰς μέγα κύδος*. There is nothing strange in the fact of a man blaming in one case the very thing which, under other circumstances, he would praise. He is not indifferent to the destruction of the temple, which he calls the temple of God. And when he summons the Heathens to repent, to turn to God, and "to bathe their whole body in rivers," he simply alludes to the bath which Jewish law demands of every proselyte. "They do not murder, nor steal, nor covet another man's wife, nor do they commit unnatural vices. Other people do not imitate such piety and such manners, but sneer and laugh at them in their folly, and impute to them their evil doings. For the whole human race is incredulous, *δύσπιστον*." Thus at least the passage is usually translated. But I think *δύσπιστον* is to be taken in the less classical, passive meaning of untrustworthy, lying, in which sense the word is used by some later authors, and that the sentence is a reproduction of Psalm cxvi. 11, "all men are lying." The complaint about being laughed and sneered at, and having the evil doings of others imputed to them, is really quite in keeping with experiences of the Jews of all ages, and must certainly have emanated from a Jewish source.

The fifth Book was also undoubtedly composed by a Jew. It breathes the most unbounded patriotism, and has peculiar beauties of its own. All alleged traces of a Christian authorship of this book vanish one by one on closer inspection. And that passage which was thought to be the clearest evidence of the author's Christian persuasion, is nothing but the hope of a reappearance of Moses. The words are: "But an excellent man will again come from Heaven, the best of the Hebrews, whose hands approached the fruitful stick, who once stayed the sun, and spoke with beautiful speech and holy lips." The "fruitful wood" was explained as alluding to the cross. Ewald, however,[1] understands the words as expressing the hope of a reappearance of Moses; but he gives no explanation. Badt gives only a confused explanation, because, like all commentators, he finds that mention is here made of Joshua, *ὃς ἠλίον ποτε στῆσε*, who caused the sun to stand still. Who else can be meant here if not Joshua? The fact is that no

[1] P. 56, note 5.

mention whatever is made here of Joshua. But who else caused the sun to stand still, if not Joshua? Well, Moses himself, according to a very old Jewish tradition to be found in Midrash Tanchumah, and thence also in Rashi, to Exodus xvii. 18: "His hands were steady until the going down of the sun. The Amalekites had calculated the hours by means of their astrology. But Moses caused sun and moon to stand still, and confused their hours, and it is this to which the prophet Habakkuk alludes,[1] when he says:—He (Moses understood) lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still." The Sibyllist thus speaks only of Moses, who by lifting his staff stayed the sun and thus defeated the Amalekites, all perfectly in accordance with ancient Jewish traditions. The whole book would deserve a more minute analysis, but space does not allow it.

After all, on considering the Jewish Sibylline oracles, the chief interest centres in the poem of which I have given a fuller description, namely the third Book. The whole is pervaded with a spirit of the purest monotheism. The author's love for his country and his race, his unshaken attachment to Jerusalem, his profound veneration of the law of God, are evident in almost every line. The ultimate greatness of the Jewish nation, the glorious restoration of Jerusalem, and the acknowledgment by the whole world of the religious doctrines of the Jews are to him not matters of faith, but certainty. His diction abounds with expressions taken from the Hebrew prophets, in whose works, it is plain, he was well read. Gfrörer has proved that his philosophical and ethical views are those of the learned Alexandrian Jews of his age. As a poem, his work may rank among the best productions of all ages. A special affection for Hellas is apparent; the author evidently endeavours to amalgamate the myths, the wisdom, and the poetry of Greece, with the history and lore of Israel. But, as Ewald truly says, Hellas gave him only the rough material, and the outer garment; she furnished him only with her language and with a number of phrases, but it is Israel that supplied him with the spirit which animates the whole.

In his endeavour not to display his true colours, he only mentioned such Biblical precepts, the expediency and utility of which can be easily understood, the משפטים, the מצות שכליות. He excludes the חקים, the מצות שמעיות, commandments of obedience, ritualistic commandments. That he mentions offerings, which are certainly ritualistic, is accounted

[1] Ch. iii., end of verse 10 and beginning of verse 11.

for by the fact that the idea of sacrifices was not foreign to the Greek mind. Such precepts as have an exclusively national importance are also omitted. Not even the Sabbath is mentioned.

Our author bears in this respect a close resemblance to Pseudo-Phocylides, whose work must be named here, although it is not of a Sibylline character. For the compiler of our collection, when he was tinkering together the most heterogeneous elements, thought good to insert in the undoubtedly Christian second Book ninety-three verses from the Pseudo-Phocylidean poem.

This false Phocylides was in reality a Jew, the question about whom has been finally settled by the late Jacob Bernays.[1] But in one point our author stands high above Pseudo-Phocylides; for the latter never openly and candidly condemns idolatry. In his endeavours to be taken for the ancient Phocylides, he is satisfied with keeping his aphorisms free from polytheistic colouring. Our Sibyllist, on the contrary, fearlessly and vigorously denounces idolatry in all its phases.

That he chose to promulgate his thoughts and feelings under the disguise of a Sibyl, must be accounted for by the times and the surroundings of the author. The two centuries after Ptolemæus Philadelphus were most fertile in the production of apocryphal books. But the growth of fictitious books was by no means confined to that period. When Bernays says that the profession of fabricating spurious books commenced with the attempts of Onomacritus, in the time of Pisistratus, and lasted till late in the Middle Ages, this is only to be understood of such books as were written in Greek. Generally speaking, however, what Bentley said is true, that the making of spurious books is almost as old as letters. But the period mentioned before was particularly prolific in that branch of workmanship. The rivalry and competition between the courts of Alexandria and Pergamus in enriching their libraries certainly gave a great impetus to that kind of activity, which was industriously pursued by people of all creeds. But it would be a mistake to apply the same hard and fast rule to all works of that kind, and to hold, for instance, Ovid guilty of fraud for his epistles of heroes and heroines, equally with downright forgers.

The Jews of Alexandria also occupied themselves to a great extent with that kind of work. We must, therefore, not be

---

[1] Some of his opinions have been opposed, but not with sufficient arguments.

surprised, however sad it may be, that there were Christian scholars who put the whole stigma attached to such fraudulent authorship upon the Jews. Valckenaer, in his learned essay on the Jew Aristobulus, shows that this teacher of Ptolemæus was a great culprit in that line. But he lays more to his charge than he really committed; and, says Valckenaer, he was so glad to find that a Jew, and not a Christian, was the author of those forgeries; for, although his was a pious fraud, yet he much rather sees a lying Jew to be the cheat than a Christian. That he himself in his essay has to speak of religious forgeries committed by Christians is of no account, as it seems. Even the great Böckh, so well known also for his humanity, in one of his earlier writings[1] speaks, in connection with some verses falsely ascribed to the tragic poet, of the rather impious than pious fraud, which is ingrained in the nature of the Jews. And, curiously enough, a few lines before this tirade, on the very same page, he mentions the fictitious drama Clytemnestra, as written by a monk, and a few pages after, a Christian interpolation in an alleged letter of Plato.

Now one should think that no work is more calculated to dispel such bias than the books of the Sibylline Oracles. The greater part of them was written by Christians, with the deliberate purpose of propagating Christianity by these means. We find that Alexandre endeavours to defend their authors, and that he finds the deception venial, because it was the literary fashion in those days for authors to pass their works off under some old celebrated name; and that the writers of the Sibylline poems never had any direct intention of fraud, but used this form only as the most convenient one for circulating their views among the heathens. One would suppose that Alexandre would mete out equal justice to the Jewish Sibyllists. But no! He gladly seizes an opportunity (p. 352) of falling foul of the Jews generally in a terrible onslaught on the author of the fifth book. That man is to him, if not a Jew, certainly of Jewish extraction, because he displays the true nature of a Jew, in his blindly sticking to the Old Testament; in his unconquered faithfulness to his country and his religion, which is rather fanatical attachment than sincere piety. He shows nothing of that sanctity which pervades the other books. *He* cannot have the advantage of the excuse of pious fraud. He either wrote from hatred to the Romans, or in order to

[1] *Græcæ Tragœdiæ principum . . . num ea quæ supersunt genuina omnia sint*, etc. Heidelberg, 1808, p. 146.

get money from Jews and Judaizing Christians for his praises of the Jews and his merciless invective against the Romans. I fear the fate of Balaam overtook the learned Alexandre when he was writing these words. Even whilst writing, his intended condemnation, against his will, turned for the most part into a warm eulogy. It is worth noticing how blind fanaticism and mercenary motives, two very incongruous incentives indeed, are described here as acting on the same persons at the same time.

Quite a new theory was started by Frankel. He sees in the Jewish Oracles, and in some other supposititious books written by Jews, an Alexandrian Hagada, which was totally different from the Hagada of Palestine. These poems were, according to Frankel, never intended for heathen, but exclusively for Jewish readers. This theory is, in my opinion, untenable. The rigorous exclusion of all ritualistic and all specially national Biblical precepts from these poems, shows clearly that they at least were intended to be read by non-Jews. Their authors, inspired by their faith in the glorious future of Israel, imbued with its sublime teachings, but tinged at the same time with the philosophical ideas of their age, and struck with the grandeur and beauty of the literature of Hellas, wished to bring these various elements into harmony, and to place the results before the eyes of the Gentiles with the most fascinating art at their command. They found that the system of writing books under borrowed names was almost openly practised, and they lacked the moral power of rising above the spirit of their age and their surroundings. They are certainly neither more nor less guilty than a host of other writers of their own time and of subsequent ages; but however venial their mode of proceeding may be, it can never be fully justified before the forum of truth and religion. Ewald holds that the use of the Sibyl was a poetical license, similar to the invocation of the Muses by a modern poet, with this difference, that a poet calling on the Muses, may relate that which they inspire him with in their name; but that a Sibyl, according to the accepted usage, was always to speak of herself. Granted even this most lenient view of the matter, it ill accords with that veneration of the Holy Scriptures which we should expect from a Jewish scholar of those days, for him to assume, under whatever pretext, the title of a prophet, and to pass off his composition as the word of God revealed to him. However much we may try to excuse these Jewish Sibyllists, it cannot be denied that they have cast a slur on the fair fame of the Jewish sages.

The learned Fabricius[1] is of opinion that none of the oracles were composed by Jews, that all of them were written by Christians. And what are the arguments he bases his opinion on? Let us hear his words. "Jews," he said, "never used to spread false prophecies among the heathens, but were in this respect most religiously careful; and while they were possessed of the true and Divine prophets at home, they were solicitous neither to add anything to them nor to take anything from them. There is scarce any mention made of, and never any value put upon the Sibylline books by the Jews. Josephus does, indeed, by the way, mention them, but that only once; Philo not once. Nor, that I can possibly learn, have the Talmudic writers any regard for them. We never read that the heathens brought against the Jews the charge that they forged or interpolated the Sibylline verses, though we do read such an accusation against Christians." I wish I were able to conclude my essay with these words of Fabricius, who, in his estimation of the Jewish sages of old, is, on the whole, so correct. But I cannot do this. Confronted by the practices of these Egyptian Sibyllists I am obliged to gainsay Fabricius, and that it should be so is a circumstance which I cannot but call highly deplorable.

S. A. Hirsch.

---

[1] *Bibliotheca Graeca*, I. 1, 133.

NOTES UPON THE DATE AND RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

THE wisdom literature of the Old Testament—Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes — presents to the biblical student many features both of interest and perplexity. Proverbs alone is sufficient to show that these three books are the outcome of a class of authors, who, in spite of individual differences, shared certain common characteristics that marked off their writings from those of Prophet, Psalmist, or Lawgiver. But the value of the wisdom literature when regarded as an element in the history of the Jewish Religion, would be considerably increased if we could be sure of the dates when its chief productions were compiled. Of Ecclesiastes we know at least that it could not have been written till far on in the history of the Second Temple. Outside the limits of the Canon we also possess a large and important monument of Hebrew wisdom (the book of Sirach), the date of which can be fixed with tolerable accuracy and precision. But when the great poem of Job was composed is even now uncertain, and what is yet more unfortunate, in regard to the Proverbs themselves, the earliest, most comprehensive, and in many respects most instructive of the wisdom books, it is still disputed whether they are to be used as evidence for the religion of the First Temple or of the Second.

It is clear that those who accept either the pre- or post-exilic origin of Proverbs can draw from them many an important illustration in their general picture of Israel's morality and religious faith. Thus from the pre-exilic point of view one can discuss how far the teaching of "the Wise" may have aided the triumph of the higher prophetic doctrine, or again one can use the undoubted monotheism of the Proverbs to refute those who would deny the appearance of such a conception before the destruction of the Jewish State. If the post-exilic date is assumed, one can point out how the supposed peculiar aridity and eudæmonism of the latter Judaism already showed themselves in the gnomes of the Sages, or how the universalist tendencies of the greater Prophets had engendered a religious humanism, which, stimulated by the influence of Hellenic culture, was only swept away by the ill-timed violence of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The pre-exilic origin of Proverbs (with the exception of chapters xxx. and xxxi.) is still, I believe, adhered to by the majority of scholars. It has been defended in Holland by Hooykas and Kuenen, in Germany by Delitzsch and Nowack, in England by Davidson and Cheyne. On the other side there stand the Nestor of biblical criticism, Edward Reuss, and the great enricher of post-exilic literature, Bernhard Stade.[1] The last-named scholar will not even use the help of Proverbs in his sketch of the Jewish Religion in the period between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great, and his disciple and continuer, Holtzmann, treats of Proverbs, Sirach and Pseudo-Phocylides in one and the same chapter.

In the present paper it is proposed to put together the main arguments on either side of the question, with a short criticism of their respective merits.

The evidence adducible is both internal and external. That the book from chapter x. to xxix. is a stringing together of gnomes, many of which must have been in existence a considerable time before the collections themselves were made, is indisputably evident, but for the purpose of illustrative quotation it is the date of the whole collections which is of the greater importance. For the collector will probably have picked out from, adapted and added to the material before him; and it is precisely the religious Proverbs that are least likely to reflect the religious views of any other age than his own. The heading in chapter x., affixed to the first collection (x.-xxii. 16) "Proverbs of Solomon" can scarcely be used as a good argument for a pre-exilic date, when one remembers how exceedingly improbable it is that a single one of our 150 Psalms is due to David, and how entirely out of place any of the religious and moral Proverbs would be in the mouth of King David's son.[2] Nor can the value of the heading for chapters

---

[1] Hooykas, *Proeve eener Geschiedenis der Beoefening van de Wijsheid onder de Hebreën* (1862). Kuenen, *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het Ontstaan en de Verzameling van de Boeken des ouden Verbonds.* Derde Deel, 1st edition (1865). Delitzsch, *Commentary on Proverbs* (1873), or Article "Sprüche Salomonis," in Herzog-Plitt's *Real-Encyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd ed. Nowack, "Commentary on Proverbs," in the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (1883). Cheyne, *Job and Solomon; or the Wisdom of the Old Testament* (1887). Davidson, "Proverbs," in *Encyclopædia Britannica.* 9th ed. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), or *La Bible, Ancien Testament.* Sixième Partie. *Philosophie Religieuse et Morale des Hébreux* (1878). Stade, *Geschichte des Volks Israel.* Vol. II., p. 216, 292.

[2] The origin of the tradition attributing the Proverbs to Solomon will be similar to that attributing the Psalms to David. Compare Stade, *Geschichte des Volks Israel*, Vol. I., 309*f.*

xxv.-xxix. be assessed at a much higher rate. "These are also Proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah, King of Judah, copied out (העתיקו)." Nowack, indeed, while denying that the Proverbs which the men of Hezekiah thought to be Solomon's were really his, considers that we have no ground whatever to doubt the accuracy of the heading so far as it refers to Hezekiah (p. xxvii). Prof. Cheyne, too, says "That Hezekiah was the instigator of the compilation need not be disputed" (p. 143). But the value to be set on headings of this kind could not counterweigh any good internal evidence drawn from the compilation itself. Even if Hezekiah did attempt a collection of Proverbs, we can not be sure that we possess that collection in chapters xxv.-xxix. of our present book. The word "also" in the heading to those chapters proves that its author (clearly not one of Hezekiah's "men" himself) was already aware of the existence of chapters x.-xxii. 16, but it can almost conclusively be proved that xxv.-xxix. must nevertheless have had an entirely independent origin. Thus the men of Hezekiah could not have done what the heading attributes to them—gathered up the remaining fragments of Solomon's gnomic wisdom—and this fact seems to throw doubt upon the accuracy of the whole assertion. And it is also true, though perhaps of no particular moment, that the books of Chronicles know nothing of Hezekiah's labours in collecting Solomonic Proverbs.[1]

Next let us consider the external evidence which can be drawn from illustrative passages in other books of the Bible. The question is at what age we are to look for the first appearance of a class of teachers, who, though looking at religion from their own distinctive point of view, were yet in sympathy with the main principles of the prophetical doctrine. The evidence culled from the Prophets does not really go very far. Isaiah once or twice uses words or phrases which belong to the distinctive phraseology of the wisdom literature, but this does not prove that the wise men of his day were the thoroughly religionised wise men of our canonical Proverbs. Thus for instance, in Isaiah xxix. 24, it is said "They also that erred in spirit shall get understanding (בינה), and they that murmured shall receive instruction" (לקח "A word in the gnomic style, six times in Proverbs," Cheyne). So also the passage, Isaiah xxviii. 23-29 is considered gnomic (notice especially the word תושיה in v. 29, which also occurs Micah vi. 9). But it cannot be said that moral lessons drawn from

[1] Compare Reuss, *Geschichte*, §§ 400-403, or *La Bible*, VI., pp. 150-157, and Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. II., p. 216.

the processes of agriculture are found in Proverbs, and in Isaiah xxxii. 6-9, another passage with a certain gnomic tinge, the words נבל,[1] כילי and נדיב are not specially characteristic of them.

A parallel instance of another kind is furnished by Jeremiah ix. 23, of which the thought closely resembles Proverbs xx. 24, xvi. 9. Isaiah, it is said, emphasizes strongly the excellence of "wisdom" as a special gift of God. Thus (xi. 2) the spirit of God, which is to rest upon the Messiah, is divided up into a spirit of חכמה and בינה, a spirit of עצה and גבורה, a spirit of דעת and יראת יי, and in xxxiii. 6, the "steadfastness" of the regenerate Judah's "times" is said to consist in "a store of salvations," and in "wisdom and knowledge."[2] Are these passages sufficient evidence for Prof. Cheyne's view that "the prophets in tone and phraseology are sometimes evidently influenced by their *fellow teachers*," whose "friendly feeling" they thus returned? (p. 120.) On this hypothesis it is surprising that they do not more definitely refer to them. Kuenen, Hooykas and others have thought they saw such references in Amos v. 10 (compare Hosea iv. 4) and Isaiah xxix. 21, where there are friendly allusions to those who reprove in the gate (המוכיח בשער). But these passages probably allude to the judges, and are at any rate too slight and unsupported to allow of any deduction as to the existence of a class of religious wise men being validly drawn from them.[3] What Isaiah and Jeremiah rather seem to point to is the existence of men whose wisdom was opposed to the prophetic teaching. Thus Isaiah inveighs against those "who are wise in their own eyes, and in their own view are understanding" (v. 21; compare Proverbs iii. 7, xxvi. 12) where Prof. Cheyne finds a possible allusion to "the indifferentist or humanist section of the class of 'wise men,' who had no positive religious belief" (compare also Isaiah xxviii. 14-22, xxix. 14-20, Jeremiah iv. 22, viii. 9), but in these passages we must, with Prof. Cheyne, probably understand, not like Ewald, "an opposition party of sceptical wise men," but either generally those who are (? afterwards) so often referred to in Proverbs as having "broken through the restraints of law and religion," or the politicians of the court, who were "popularly considered 'wise men' but not in

---

[1] For נבל, meaning fool, Proverbs generally uses כסיל.

[2] Perhaps it should be noticed that Stade regards both these passages as post-exilic.

[3] Hooykas, however, lays much stress upon these passages, and strongly denies that the "Reprovers in the Gate" can possibly mean the Judges (pp. 163, 123-127). His list of allusive passages in the Prophets (p. 37) is, I think, exaggerated.

the technical sense" of the book of Proverbs (page 120). By far the most significant allusion to the "wise men" is in Jeremiah xviii. 18, where the prophet's enemies are represented as saying, "Come, and let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for teaching (תורה) shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel (עצה) from the wise, nor the word (דבר) from the prophet." Yet here again it should be noted that the wise men referred to are not Jeremiah's followers, but the allies of his assailants.

On the whole not much, whether for or against a pre-exilic date, can be won from the allusions in the Prophets. Yet it would seem probable that the wise men of Isaiah and Jeremiah's days were not yet thoroughly penetrated with the spirit of the Yahvistic religion. "Wisdom" was originally a wide term with many applications. It was not thought to be the privilege of Israel only. The Edomites were famous for their wisdom, there were "wise men" also in Egypt (Jer. xlix. 7, Obad. 8, Isaiah xix. 11, 1 Kings iv. 31). It was only gradually that every branch of wisdom was regarded as the special gift of God. Thus Hiram the builder, whose father was a man of Tyre, "was filled (= happened to be filled) with wisdom and understanding and knowledge to work all works in brass" (1 Kings vii. 14), whereas in Exodus xxxi. 3 (a late chapter, see Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, § 6 *n*13) Bezaleel is directly filled "with the spirit of God, in wisdom and in understanding, and in knowledge and in all manner of workmanship" (compare Exodus xxxv. 31, 34, 35, and for agricultural skill as due to God, Isaiah xxviii. 26). The (? exilic) Deuteronomist bids the Israelites look for the mark of their own peculiar wisdom, in "keeping and doing" the "statutes and judgments" which had been given them by God and taught to them by Moses (Deut. iv. 6).

From the external evidence obtainable from passages outside Proverbs let us now turn to the internal evidence which the various collections themselves supply.

The language of Proverbs (apart from chapters xxx., xxxi., which by pretty general consent belong to the post-exilic epoch) does not seem to offer any very convincing proofs on either side. The Aramaisms which were adduced by Hartmann so long ago as 1833, are rebutted by Kuenen in his *Onderzoek*. Prof. Cheyne too thinks that his instances "require testing," and that "an argument of this sort (except in more extreme cases) is not conclusive as to date" (page 168). The gnomic form of the Proverbs would seem to stamp them as ancient, but ancient proverbs can be edited and adapted in a later era. The pithy distichs of the first collection (x.-xxii. 16) ap-

parently mark them out as not only the oldest portion of the book, but in themselves of great antiquity, and many scholars hold this view. Prof. Davidson, on the other hand, believes that the Hezekian collection (xxv.-xxix.) is the earlier in date. Its maxims, "particularly those in xxv.-xxvii., approach much nearer to what we should imagine the early popular proverb to have been than many of those in the other large collection; they are simple, usually contain a comparison, and have none of the abstractness which characterises many of the maxims in x.-xxii. This may be regarded as a guarantee of their great antiquity" (page 879*b*). No safe conclusions can thus be drawn from either the language or the form of the Proverbs; the balance, so far as I am able to judge, seems to incline towards the pre-exilic period.

We tread firmer ground when we come to deal with the contents of the book, and the inferences that may be gathered both from what it says and from what it leaves unmentioned.

Even a cursory reader of Proverbs cannot fail to have noticed how wholly disconnected with Israel and its fortunes are the religion and the morality which they teach. God is indeed called by his Jewish name Yahveh, but the word Israel does not occur once. The aspirations and the calamities of their people are never alluded to by these calmly contemplative Sages; its institutions and its history are alike unnoticed. Thus no mention is made of priest or prophet (except one doubtful allusion in xxix. 18), the coming of the Messiah or of the messianic age is not desired or anticipated, and idolatry receives no reprimand. Thus we hav. apparently to assume the existence of a class of teachers who were earnest inculcators of justice, temperance, and truth, and who closely identified the practice of these virtues with religion (= the fear of Yahveh), but who showed no particular interest in Israel's national religious institutions or in the men whose life was bound up with them. If this class of teachers lived before the exile, we must add that, while they agreed with the Prophets that moral wickedness is irreconcileable with the fear of God, they paid no attention whatever (although they were not theorists but practical men of the world) to the other great popular sin of that time, to the degraded worship of Yahveh and to the worship of other gods.

One cannot help wondering whether in the troubled times that lie between the 9th or 8th century and the fall of the Jewish State, when the popular religion and the higher teaching of the Prophets were fighting for the mastery, there is room for these sober teachers, who, interested as they are in the moral and religious well-being of their people, never

allude to the very subject round and in which, according to the Prophets, the religious and moral deflections of the people circle and centre. Moreover, in the teaching of Proverbs there seems no allusion to any existing difference of opinion as to what goodness and badness imply; yet the good and the bad form two sharply contrasted classes, one God-fearing and strictly moral, the other heedless of all restraint, whether human or divine. It appears to be assumed that the judgment passed upon the moral worth of both classes would be acknowledged as true by any ordinary listener or reader. This argument for a post-exilic date is well brought out by Prof. Oort, so far as Proverbs i.-ix. are concerned, in an essay in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (1885). Something of the same kind had already been urged for the whole book by Vatke in his famous *Biblische Theologie.* Vatke holds that the wise men were the successors of the Prophets, the prophetic enthusiasm or inspiration passing into the form of contemplative reflection. "The former opposition between the outward worship and the freer prophetic teaching was now changed into the careful adhesion to the letter of the Levitical Law on the one hand, and on the other into a free reflectiveness which even got rid of particularism altogether. Meanwhile the lyric inspiration continued, uniting in itself and reconciling both these opposite moods" (pages 552 and 563). But without estimating the value of this more general argument, which rests on an interpretation of the development of Judaism between Nehemiah and the Maccabees which cannot in this place be even adequately explained, far less criticised,[1] it must, I think, be allowed that the absence of any allusion to idolatry is an exceedingly powerful piece of evidence for the post-exilic date. How is it to be explained, cries Reuss, that a book which sets itself to preach all human duties, to inculcate all the virtues, and to combat all the foibles and evil passions of the human heart, could have forgotten or neglected this prime aberration, the source of so many vices, if it was still in existence when the compilation was made? (*La Bible*, VI., page 156.)

Delitzsch's explanation—that the wise men, true to their universalism, leaving the battle with heathenism to the Prophets, confined themselves to their special vocation of naturalising in the Yahvistic religion the treasures of general moral and religious truth, and using them for the ennoblement

[1] Thus Holtzmann regards Proverbs as the product of the Ptolemæan epoch, when the gradual diffusion of Hellenic culture was making many Jews turn their main attention to the general and universal elements in their national religion.

of Israelites as men—seems to me scarcely adequate (page 35, compare Hooykas, pages 61-62).

Yet if the absence of any reference to idolatry favours a post-exilic date, is it so sure that the silence respecting the priesthood points in the same direction? And, above all, what is the attitude of Proverbs to the Law, which after Nehemiah becomes the acknowledged standard of religious practice?

By the beginning of the second century before Christ, the Law and the priesthood were too closely connected with Jewish piety for even one of the wise men to neglect them. The attitude of Sirach is very significant. He does not disguise the purely Jewish character of the wisdom he teaches; he offers prayers for Israel's prosperity and for the conversion of the nations in the manner of the Psalmists. The Law he speaks of is unquestionably the Pentateuch, and next to the fear of the Lord comes the reverence of his priests (vii. 29). Wisdom itself is practically identified with "the Book of the Covenant of the Most High God" (xxiv. 23). It would seem as if an interval of many long years, and not merely a difference of character or view, must separate this writer from the authors of Proverbs. In Proverbs it is doubtful whether the תורה and the מצות which are now and again mentioned refer to the Pentateuch at all.[1] Both Delitzsch and Hooykas strongly deny that they can ever bear this application. "The word תורה," says the former, "has a far wider and less definite connotation than that of the written Sinaitic Law (cp. xxviii. 4, xxix. 18, with xxviii. 7, xiii. 14, and similar passages)." Kuenen, in his *Onderzoek*, thinks this assertion exaggerated. In his opinion, xxviii. 4, 7, probably, and xxviii. 9, xxix. 18, certainly refer to a written code. Even these last two verses are, however, doubtful:

> He that turneth away his ear from hearkening to the Law,
> Even his prayer is an abomination.
> Where there is no vision (חזון) the people grow wild,
> But if they keep the Law, they are happy.

In the last passage תורה may very probably refer to the prophetic teaching, and in the former to God's revealed word generally. At any rate, the references to *the* תורה in Proverbs, even if they exist, are very different in kind from those in Sirach. There are, moreover, few allusions to particular enactments. The most important is in iii. 9: "Honour the Lord with thy substance (מהונך) and with the first fruits

[1] Compare the passages x. 8; xiii. 13, 14; xvi. 20; xix. 16; xxviii. 4, 7, 9; xxix. 18; xxxi. 26; i. 8; ii. 1; iii. 1; iv. 2, 4; vi. 20, 23; vii. 1, 2.

of all thy increase (מראשית כל תבואתך)"[1] Vows are referred to in xx. 25, vii. 15, and Lev. v. 1 would seem to be the legal basis of xxix. 24. Kuenen, on the other hand, has pointed out that vi. 31 seems to conflict with Ex. xxi. 37 and vii. 15 with Deut. xii. 17.

Prof. Davidson asks very pertinently whether these meagre allusions to the Law are compatible with the hypothesis of a post-exilic date. If other arguments are sufficient to substantiate that hypothesis, a later date than the beginning of the fourth century will at any rate hardly be conceivable. To these more general considerations I will now add a variety of more particular arguments on either side. First may come those which tell for the pre-exilic date.

(1.) Excluding the undoubtedly post-exilic thirtieth chapter, the authors of Proverbs do not show any trace of religious perplexity. The old doctrine of accurate earthly retribution satisfies them still. If it be said that Sirach accepts this doctrine no less than the Sages of Proverbs, and that he, too, puts forward no doubt as to the justice of God, Prof. Davidson replies that this is because Sirach, although aware of these speculations, "consciously declines to entertain them" (p. 881 *a*).

(2.) There are several proverbs in the collection which would have no application in the post-exilic period, and would scarcely have even been incorporated into a compilation made at that time; such are xxii. 28, xxiii. 10, xxix. 18.

(3.) The kings occupy a prominent place in Proverbs. In x.-xxii. 16 the references to kingship seem to accentuate its good side (xiv. 35, xvi. 10-15, xx. 8, 26, 28, xxii. 11; cp. also xxiv. 21): in xxv.-xxix., we hear more of the evils wrought by bad kings and foolish rulers (xxix. 2, xxviii. 2, 16). Thus it is supposed that x.-xxii. 16 dates from the earlier and better period of the monarchy, xxv.-xxix. from the days of its decline and fall. As to this last point, Prof. Davidson, in arguing for the earlier date of xxv.-xxix. has already shown its partial weakness (p. 883 *a*). It has also been said that Sirach never refers to kings, but this is an error (vii. 4, 5, x. 3, xi. 5. Cp. Proverbs xxxi. 4, Ecclesiastes iv. 13, viii. 4, xi. 6, 17, 20). It is, therefore, quite possible that the kings of Proverbs did not reign in Samaria or Jerusalem.

(4.) The condition of society in i.-ix., which is generally acknowledged to be later than x.-xxix., favours a pre-exilic

---

[1] Hooykas (page 154, note 2) defends Ewald's translation, "More than thy substance, etc."

date. The city in which the scene is laid is populous, and enjoys much material prosperity. Prof. Cheyne consequently argues that before the time of Sirach, there is no period in the post-exile history in which the life of Jerusalem can have resembled the picture given of it in Proverbs i.-ix. (p. 168). It might, however, be noted, on the other side, that even Haggai already speaks of men dwelling in "inlaid houses."

(5.) There are many reminiscences of Deuteronomy in Proverbs i.-ix. (cp. iii. 3, vi. 21, vii. 3, with Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 18-21, and iii. 12 with Deut. viii. 5). Who, asks Delitzsch, can fail to hear in Prov. i. 7-ix. an echo of the Shema of Deuteronomy? (p. 29). It is therefore supposed that i.-ix. was written only shortly after Deuteronomy, that is, between Josiah and the fall of Jerusalem.

(6.) There is no trace of any post-exilic narrow-mindedness and sterility (Nowack). This argument seems to me of little or no value. Are not Jonah and Ruth undoubtedly post-exilic, and, turning the tables upon Nowack, is a catholicity of temperament to be expected, outside the Prophets, before the Captivity?

The counter-arguments for the later date include the following:

(1.) The high position assigned to woman, and the prevailing monogamic point of view seem incongruous with an early period in the nation's history; moreover, it is only the Judaism of the Second Temple which came to lay such great stress upon chastity. The "strange woman" forms a prominent theme of chapters i.-ix., but she is not unknown in the earlier collections (cp. xxii. 14, xxiii. 27, 28). Prof. Oort lays the greatest stress upon this argument in his essay upon i.-ix. It is not quite clear, however, who the "strange woman" is. Some, *e.g.* Reuss, think she is always a wife, an adulteress pure and simple, and not a foreigner; the mere harlot, he holds, is not alluded to in i.-ix. While in xxiii. 28, he translates the זונה and the נכריה by *courtisane* and *la femme adultère*, as if they were separate people, in vi. 26 he renders אישה זונה and אשת איש as if they were one and the same person. It seems more probable, to judge at least by vi. 26, that the Sage warns his pupils against harlotry as well as adultery. With some other scholars, Prof. Oort holds that the strange woman (נכריה) is a foreigner, and finds an extra proof of the late origin of i.-ix. in the inclination to doubt the capacity for chastity in the married women of foreigners.[1]

[1] Compare especially ii. 17. Delitzsch's note is confused. If נכריה must mean foreigner, how are אלוף, and "the covenant of her God" to be ex-

(2.) Stade thinks that the personification of wisdom and her relation to Deity in chap. viii. were not the fruit of unaided Jewish speculation. He detects in them the influence of Hellenism. If this is denied, it is at least probable that they represent a later stage of thought than that of Deutero-Isaiah (cp. Reuss, *La Bible*, VI., 156).

(3.) Possible parallels between Isaiah ii. and Prov. i.-ix. have also been alleged. Compare Prov. ii. 15, Is. lix. 8; Prov. i. 24, Is. lxv. 12, lxvi. 4.[1]

(4.) There are several parallels between Proverbs and the Psalms. If the post-exilic origin of the Psalms is assumed, the parallels are obviously important. Psalms xxxvii. and xlix. present many features akin to Proverbs, while some of the more isolated parallels are the following:[2] Prov. x. 7, 28, Ps. cxii. 6, 10; Prov. x. 22, Ps. cxxvii. 2; Prov. xiv. 21, Ps. xli. 2; Prov. xv. 11, Ps. cxxxix. 8; Prov. xv. 25, Ps. cxlvi. 9; Prov. xix. 21, Ps. xxxiii. 11; Prov. xx. 12, Ps. xciv. 9; Prov. xxi. 31, Ps. xx. 7; Prov. xxiii. 6, Ps. cxli. 4.

(5.) I venture to add here an argument, of the validity of which I feel doubtful, but which still deserves consideration. It is the use of שאול (Sheol) in Proverbs. Prof. Cheyne, with many other scholars, has denied that the idea of a future (blessed) life was known to the Sages, and it is undoubtedly a fact that even Sirach, following his predecessors, somewhat pointedly asserts the finality of death, as if other notions were current in his day, but seemed to him outlandish and false (cp. also Ecclesiastes). Yet Oehler has already indicated how mysterious a veil is thrown over the death of the righteous in Proverbs.[3] Sheol seems to be the lot of the wicked only. The attitude of the Sages is not unlike that of the authors of the late Psalms xlix. or lxxiii. Delitzsch, in drawing conclusions from the corrupt distichs xii. 28 and xiv. 32 (see Cheyne, pp. 122, 123), goes obviously too far, but he is right in saying

---

plained? Oort translates אלוף by *leideman* (guide), *opvoeder* (teacher), (LXX. διδασκαλίαν), and thinks it refers to God, but the God is her own God, not Israel's. This partial acknowledgment of a foreign God he compares with Malachi i. 11. In chapters vi. and vii. he thinks married women are referred to; in ii. and v. "*hetairai*," including harlots.

[1] The general resemblances between Isaiah lix. and Prov. i.-ix. are not without significance. "The Prophet," according to Prof. Cheyne, "is, at any rate, influenced by some proverbial work similar to Prov. i.-ix." (p. 166). Prof. Graetz (*Geschichte*, 2*b*, 384) lays considerable stress upon the parallelism, and holding Isaiah lix. to be exilic, relegates Prov. i.-ix. to the exilic period also. Against this view chapter vii. alone seems to offer insuperable obstacles. But Isaiah lix. is probably not exilic, but post-exilic. Cp. the review of Kuenen's *Onderzoek*, in the April number of this *Review*.

[2] With Prov. i.-ix. the parallels are more numerous.

[3] *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 858.

that Sheol in Proverbs does not refer to death in general, but to a death which carries man off in his sins, and before his time. Notice the gnomes:—

(Withhold not correction from the child,
For if thou beatest him with the rod, he will not die).
Thou beatest him with the rod,
And deliverest his soul from Sheol.
(xxiii. 14, a verse noticed by Stade as belonging to a very late period).
There is a path of life upwards for the wise,
That he may escape Sheol beneath. (xv. 24.)
He knoweth not that the shades are there;
And that her guests are in the depths of Sheol.
(ix. 18. Compare vii. 27, v. 5, ii. 18.)

Here the conception of Sheol, according to Delitzsch, tends to pass into that of Gehinnom; from being the dwelling-place of all the dead, good or bad alike, to be the receptacle of the wicked only. Life is identified with virtue, sin and death are synonymous:—

The labour of the righteous leadeth to life;
The revenue of the wicked to sin. (x. 16.)

These passages seem to mark a kind of midway station between the oldest Hebrew notions, in which death was a misfortune, but not a punishment, and the later teaching, in which Hades changes into Hell.

(6.) The gnomes of Proverbs are mainly concerned with the individual. Individualism we know to be a comparatively late growth in the development of the Jewish religion; its claims are first strongly recognised by Ezekiel.

(7.) A prominent feature in Proverbs is the conception of discipline or instruction (מוּסָר). This point is well brought out by Holtzmann (*Geschichte des Volks Israel*, p. 297). "Life is regarded from the point of view of a pedagogic institution. God educates men, and men educate each other." These conceptions rest upon the existence of a settled national ideal of good and bad, which was not thoroughly formed till after the exile. This argument goes back to one of the more general considerations, which was touched upon before.

(8.) Lastly, as an amusing contrast to Nowack's plea for a pre-exilic date, may be quoted Stade's argument for the opposite view. "The matter of fact observations about the actions and fortunes of man; the cool, sagacious judgments upon the value of the external goods of life, and the counsels given to the sensible citizen who is anxious to adopt a course of life which will lead to their attainment, are all based upon and take for granted the monotheism and the belief in divine

retribution that are characteristic of Judaism" (*Geschichte*, II., p. 216).

The conclusion to be drawn from these various arguments seems to me in favour of the post-exilic date. The proofs for that view go more to the root of the matter, and deal with more essential and pervading elements of the whole book than those upon the other side. The civic luxury and populousness suggested by i.-ix., the reminiscences from Deuteronomy, the frequent appearance of the king, can be more easily got over and explained than the silence respecting idolatry, the individualism of the teaching, the praise of chastity, the monogamic point of view, and the general coolness and certainty of temper and tone. The real *crux* of the matter is, where and when the phenomenon of the "wise men" and their teaching may best be fitted in. Where and whensoever it be, certain common-places of the newer criticism will have to be modified because of them. If they lived and taught before the exile, then certainly some of the deepest truths of the Prophets must have been far more widely accepted and assimilated than the prophetical or historical books would otherwise have led us to imagine. If, on the contrary, we assign their influence to a period after Nehemiah, we must assume that the life under the Law did not necessarily tend to produce that narrowness of mind and mood, that absorbing interest in ceremonialism and the written Word, and that rigidly particularist point of view, which are all so frequently ascribed to it. Moreover, though the important differences between Proverbs and Sirach would seem to indicate that a lapse of many generations must lie between them, Ecclesiastes is little earlier than Sirach, and he is as "humanist" and "universal" in his teaching as any of the older Sages. Neither Koheleth nor the author of Jonah may have been as exceptional in their views in these respects as we, through their isolation in the Canonical Scriptures, naturally incline to believe. When the supremacy of the Law had been once securely established, and a definite religious stamp impressed upon the community, the universalist tendencies of monotheism which are visible in the Law itself came gradually to the fore. (A priest naturally looks at religion from his own priestly point of view, so that the books of Chronicles must not be regarded as a convincing refutation of the argument.) Before those external influences appeared upon the scene, which to some seemed inimical to the very principles of Judaism, and therefore heightened the value they set upon all its forms and ceremonies, the general belief in one God not unnaturally produced a series of teachers who were very possibly dutiful children of the Mosaic Law,

but whose teaching and thought were but little touched by the Temple services or moulded by the phrases of the written Code. When Hellenism brought into view a new culture which to many proved seductive, it was not improbable, even before persecution engendered the usual passionate attachment to the forbidden object, that more conservative spirits should have refused to see a phase of Yahveh's wisdom in that which led to the neglect of his commandments, or should have begun to lay more and more stress upon those elements in their religion which marked them off from the new learning and the foreign civilization. If this line of argument be correct, critics will have to unlearn the customary assumption that the Law in itself necessarily tended to stifle every wide and liberal religious impulse, and drive all who paid it allegiance into the narrow groove of letter-worship and formalism.

I have purposely avoided any allusion either to the parallels to Job, or to the unquestioned and unquestioning monotheism of Proverbs, because the date of Job is itself uncertain, and the era when pure monotheism was first commonly taught and believed is still *sub judice*. What makes the dispute respecting the date of Proverbs so specially interesting is the very doubt on which side of this controversy its valuable evidence may properly be used.

If Stade is right, and the religion and morality of Proverbs represent a phase of post-exilic Judaism, it is important to consider what estimate should be assigned to them. We must, I think, be very careful to distinguish between the elements (both good and bad) of this teaching, which may be laid to the credit or the charge of Judaism generally, and those which are mainly or even exclusively due to the peculiar character of the literature to which the book of Proverbs belongs. Thus the lack of passion and enthusiasm in Proverbs (its *Nüchternheit*) is a characteristic of gnomic literature generally. In religion as in other things, μηδὲν ἄγαν. We must not expect to find in Proverbs the mystic fervour of the Psalms. But it is surely ignorance or prejudice which would regard the want of the mystic element in piety as a characteristic of Judaism. This is what Prof. Chavannes does when he says of the author of Proverbs i.-ix.: "On sent bien à de tels passages (*e.g.* vi. 29-35) que notre auteur, pour représenter le bon judaïsme, reste cependant en plein judaïsme, que l'élément mystique de la piété lui fait trop défaut."[1] It

[1] Chavannes, *La Religion dans la Bible*, I., page 393. What a useful word, by the way, "Judaic" is for some theologians, and what a wide connotation

is to be hoped that this unsupported assertion may before long meet with refutation from a hand more competent than mine. It is the Talmudic literature itself—the incarnation, I should imagine, of "le bon Judaïsme"—which will supply for that refutation a full and satisfactory material.

In Proverbs the teaching of the Prophets has been so well assimilated, that religion and morality are closely identified with each other. "He who walks uprightly, fears God (*i.e.* is religious); he who is perverse in his ways despises him." "Whoso mocks the poor reproaches his Maker." "The reward of humility is the fear of God." Another point in which the Sages resemble the Prophets, is that they pay no attention whatever to the thousand and one shades and *nuances* which bridge over the gap between the righteous and the wicked. The Sages know, indeed, that human righteousness is merely comparative: for "who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from sin?" There is also no trace of self-righteousness about them. The humility they preach is quite sincere. But mankind is nevertheless, to their eyes, split up into two classes; the good and wise on one side; the bad and foolish on the other. The good have all the virtues; the bad have all the vices. Moreover, the good become better and better; the bad, (nor are the sages very sorry), go from worse to worse. This is a defect. The noble doctrine of Ezekiel, "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live?" was not applied and expanded by any great Jewish teacher before Jesus of Nazareth, in whose life and teaching the loving refusal to recognise the permanent badness of any human soul or its incapacity to turn to the light and be saved, is a striking and fruitful feature.

The catalogue of virtues upon which the Sages lay stress is no small one, and the ideal man whom they sketch out to us would pass muster before an exacting criticism.

Like Aristotle's moral hero he would possess a certain amount of "external goods," but not too much of them, lest he should become full and deny his God (xxx. 8). He would be charitable to the indigent, and recognise that the poor and the rich are alike the creatures of God. He would show reverence to his parents and love to his wife. In business he would be scrupulously honest, in public matters rigorously just. He would avoid slander and tale-bearing; but where words would serve

---

it has! It means at will "particularist," "formal," "legal," "self-righteous," "without enthusiasm," "narrow," "eudæmonist," "revengeful," etc., etc Compare "*Zug*" and "*Schlag*" in German. *Tramp Abroad*, page 545.

good purpose, he would not shrink to speak them. He would not requite evil with evil, but be willing to forgive. Enemies he might have, yet over their fall he would not rejoice, but help them readily when it lay within his power. He would be industrious and zealous in his daily labour, regarding the fruit it yielded as a blessing from heaven; but if trouble came and misfortune, he would not murmur, for he would see in them the loving discipline of God. He would be truthful and temperate in action and in speech. He would not merely take care that his actions came up to a certain outward standard, but before all things he would give heed to his "heart" as the source alike of good and evil. He would know that sacrifices are no counterbalance against wickedness, but like the prophet, he would acknowledge that true religion was comprised in justice, lovingkindness and humility.

This after all represents no meagre ideal, and that it is not exaggerated, every careful reader of Proverbs should, I think, allow. For it must be remembered that this catalogue of virtues, if decked out in elegant phrases and artfully made the most of from a literary point of view, would look far more comprehensive and imposing, than when simply described in inventory fashion, one virtue after another. The "staid, quiet, 'douce,' orderly burgher, diligent in his business, prosperous in his affairs, of repute among the elders, with daughters doing virtuously, and a wife that has his house decked with coverings of tapestry, while her own clothing is silk and purple" (Cheyne, p. 296, quoted from Mr. Binney), does not deal adequately or even fairly with the wise man of Proverbs.

One cannot deny that there is mixed up with the more ideal teaching of the Sages, a certain amount of worldly wisdom. Although they are aware of the vanity of riches, deprecate the striving after wealth, and frequently urge the superiority of small means, combined with religion and love, over great treasure with disquietude and hatred, they are quite alive to the advantages of the well-to-do over the poor. But, is this more than honesty? Again the self-restraint of the wise man tends to degenerate into a cautious selfishness. The repeated warnings against suretyship are anything but pleasing, and in the lofty praise of wisdom (i.-ix.) they sound a rather jarring note. But Reuss seems to hit the nail upon the head when he says:

On y rencontre bien par ci par là certaines règles de prudence qui n'accusent pas précisément un sentiment bien généreux, un cœur noble et dévoué, mais qui prennent le monde tel qu'il est, et se bornent à mettre les gens, qui ont besoin de conseils, en garde contre les déboires

qui peuvent résulter pour eux de leur inexpérience. Ailleurs et plus souvent encore l'enseignement s'arrête à constater les faits tels qu'ils se produisent dans le cours ordinaire des choses, surtout ceux qui sont la conséquence des défauts moraux ou intellectuels des hommes, et laisse au lecteur le soin d'en tirer telle leçon qu'il voudra. (Page 159).

A somewhat violent attack has been recently made by Prof. Oort upon the morality of chapters i.-ix. He is especially hard upon the motives with which the author urges his disciples to do good and to refrain from evil. According to Prof. Oort, they are purely utilitarian. Why should one have nothing to do with the cozening adulteress? Because one will be robbed. Why should one not "cast in one's lot" with sinners? Because they will come to a bad end. Why should one try to find wisdom? Because wisdom leads to honour, reputation, long life and riches. In short, do good and be wise because it pays; avoid evil and folly because in the long run they do not. Prof. Oort thinks this lowness of motive is a sign that we have to do with a writer who lived under the Law. He was in possession of no religious principle which could form a counterpoise against the ever growing legalism of his time, and its two mournful results, formalism and eudæmonism. So here again we have to do with a specially Jewish fault, the consequence of that dreadful Law, under the bondage of which the spirit of religion was so cruelly fettered and wronged. To Prof. Oort, legalism is like the reddest rag to the most irritable bull. He is always on the watch for its horrors!

But though painful to certain Jewish prepossessions, are not Prof. Oort's strictures true? The answer, I think, is that they are only a distorted representation of the truth. The Sages believed strongly in the doctrine of earthly retribution, and they also held that, *cæteris paribus*, sufficient means, honour, and length of days were better than poverty, disgrace, and an early death. But though they maintained that under normal circumstances wisdom and righteousness were followed by honour, length of days and sufficient means, it is not true that they desired these virtues merely because of their results; wisdom and righteousness were ends in themselves, to be sought first and foremost; if they are so sought, the other and lower goods will follow. (Compare Matthew vi. 33: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.") So to Solomon, who asked not for long life, nor for riches, nor the life of his enemies, God thought it just to promise riches and honour and length of days. The Sages do not mean to say "Do good because it pays," though they are equally far from saying "Do good although it does not

pay." They will not allow themselves to believe that honesty is not always the best policy. They are therefore inclined to give false judgments like the friends of Job. We must remember that they did not clearly believe in a compensatory future life, and God's just and merciful rule over man was for them only capable of being manifested upon earth. But is it true that in chapter viii. wisdom is praised because riches and honour are with her? Yes, but it is also true, though not mentioned by Prof. Oort, that men are urged "to receive wisdom's instructions, and not silver; and knowledge rather than choice gold." This contrast is curiously characteristic. Wisdom is more precious than riches, and yet wisdom brings riches. Wisdom, in truth, to the gnomic writers implied and included the whole principle of life with all its goods both spiritual and temporal. Folly, on the other hand, represented death with all its evils. Life and righteousness, death and sin are closely connected ideas (x. 16). The love of wisdom is the secret of well being. Great peace and happiness have they who strive after wisdom and possess it. But this wisdom, which is rooted in the fear of God, has a distinctively religious tone, and since it is the pole-star of all the Sages' actions and thoughts, it is untrue to say that they have no religious principle to steer them safely through the difficulties of life. Eudæmonism, it is true, is a part of their creed, but this is not because they have no principle, but because eudæmonism is itself an element in that principle, the eudæmonism which to Sages and Prophets alike was inseparably connected with the justice and mercy of God. The search of that wisdom which is based upon the fear of the Lord, leads, after a willing acceptance of the discipline both of man and God, to prosperity and well being.[1] But will they who seek for wisdom *in order to* reach prosperity really obtain it? Will they be seeking for it in the way the Sages really intended? I feel convinced that if this question had been fairly put to them, they would have answered "No." Can the merely worldly wise feel that stern, uncompromising hatred of evil which is a fundamental element in the fear of God?

It is at first sight a strong and most damaging argument against the high morality of the Sages, that they habitually (in i.-ix.) warn their hearers against vice because of the unfortunate results to which vice may lead. That adultery is a sin, and as such morally hateful, is never so much as mentioned (compare Chavannes, *Ibid.*). Yet it would be surely

[1] This principle was quite sufficient to keep them from "formalism," of which in all Proverbs there is no trace.

absurd to suppose that adultery was only objectionable to them *because* it led to beggary and misfortune. Gnomic teaching can never be the highest teaching. Righteousness has to be regarded as a phase of wisdom, and vice as a phase of folly. But how are you to prove the foolishness of folly except by pointing to the miserable issues to which it leads? Again, gnomic teaching looks at good and evil from a personal point of view; its business is to show that it is to one's (spiritual and material) advantage to be good and wise, and in working upon these lines the author of i.-ix. is but true to the traditions of his class. His fault is not to be laid at the door of the Torah. It is true that he often seems to preach wisdom and goodness by means of bribery. A critic has asked whether the wearisome reiteration of "Saith the Lord" (נאם יי) in the short utterances of Haggai is not due to the fact that the Prophet felt some occasional uncertainty in his own prophetic inspiration, and was thus the more eager to emphasize it continually. Is it possible that through the hard teaching of actual life, the author of Proverbs i.-ix. (like the author of Psalm xxxvii.?) was sometimes a little doubtful as to the unvarying truth of his eudæmonistic principle, but knowing no higher or more satisfactory theodicy, clung to it and repeated it and taught it with all the greater and more insistent vigour? Did he know no better method of winning over the young to ways of probity and religion, than by reiterating half-truths which his auditors or readers had already begun to cavil at and to deny? If this be so, the author is superior to his teaching. I admit that Prof. Oort had more verses to quote for his view than I have had for mine, but I cannot help thinking that even in the most utilitarian passages of i.-ix. we can, or even ought to, read between the lines. He who wrote that noble praise of wisdom found in the search for and the love of it a higher good than riches and honour could win for him. The peace which wisdom gave was, for all his eudæmonism, akin to that peace of religion of which it has been said that it passes understanding.

My defence of Proverbs will scarcely obtain a convert. Proverbs is the sort of book which, as men look at it from one point of view or another, can be judged in very different ways. To Prof. Oort, even the author of i.-ix., the "glorious little treatise at the head of our book" (Cheyne, page 156), is a teacher without a religious principle, whose disciples, if they received no better light elsewhere, would inevitably degenerate even below their master. His view of life is ordinary, his advice commonplace, his motives ignoble. To a gifted Jewish authoress the book of Proverbs "teaches a

theology simple indeed, but all-sufficient for attaining moral strength and single-minded purity," while "it insists upon a life of rectitude and self-denial, not merely on account of the worldly advantages it may secure, but for its own sake and from religious motives."[1] This estimate is, I think, on the whole truer than Prof. Oort's; and mankind may still find something to learn from the Sages who clung so earnestly to the belief in God's just government of the world, and who found in the faithful fulfilment of duty and of the divine will a satisfaction which was not lessened or embittered even by the anticipation of death.[2]

P.S.—A few remarks, by way of postscript, upon the Wisdom of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus may reflect some further light upon Proverbs. That Sirach closely studied and frequently imitated Proverbs is obvious. It is more interesting to note how curiously similar the teaching of the one book is to that of the other. In B.C. 180 (the proximate date of Sirach), the religion and morality of a Wise Man were in many essential points identical with those of the earlier Sages. That is the ground for Holtzmann's opinion that no very considerable number of years can have intervened between Proverbs and Sirach. The range of goodness in Sirach is hardly less extended than in Proverbs, and it extends no further. In either book it is the same virtues and vices that are extolled and deplored. Justice, temperance, chastity, contentment, humility, and charity are the main moral adornments of the ideal Sage in either collection. The weaker sides of the teaching in Proverbs, its utilitarianism and prudential cautiousness, its insistence upon an outward form of retribution, its narrow views on education, are all echoed and re-echoed in Sirach. Sirach seems, indeed, to be designedly and deliberately conservative; many a doctrine, which was current in the Judaism of his day (*e.g.*, that of angels and evil spirits, and of the resurrection), are conspicuously absent from his pages.

Occasionally a favourite doctrine of Proverbs becomes refined in the younger Sage's mouth, as *e.g.*:

> In thy charity add no reproach,
> With thy gifts cause no pain by thy words.
> (xviii. 14, the Authorised Version rendering is inaccurate.)
> Reproach not a man that turns from sin,
> Remember we are all worthy of punishment. (viii. 5.)
> Say not, I will hide myself from God,
> Shall any remember me from above?
> Among a numerous people I shall not be remembered,
> What is my soul in the infinite creation? (xvi. 15.)

On the other hand, the educational maxims of Sirach are feebler than those of Proverbs. Unhappy the children who were taught under his principles! A noble wife is still God's highest gift, but the warnings

---

[1] *The History and Literature of the Israelites*, by C. and A. de Rothschild, Vol. II., p. 257. Compare Delitzsch's high estimate of Proverbs, *Commentary*, p. 35, and Oehler *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 836-865.

[2] Reuss, *La Bible*, pp. 160.

against unchastity take a form that is often repulsive to Europeans. The cautiousness of Proverbs bears sometimes a dangerous resemblance to selfishness in Sirach; thus the bidding to cultivate a merry heart once degenerates into the advice to forget the dead as soon as propriety allows (xxxviii. 16-23). The Sages' sharp division of mankind into two classes, the good and the bad, the wise and the foolish, with but little anticipation of (or desire for) the passing of the second class into the first, recurs frequently in Sirach, and is even idealised by a sort of philosophical justification (xxxvi. 7-15).

The main difference from Proverbs relates to Sirach's attitude towards the Law and the Priesthood, and to his strongly emphasized particularism. Before that is indicated further, there are one or two other points relating to his general moral and religious teaching which deserve notice.

(*a.*) Sirach does not accept the new doctrine of the resurrection. And unlike the authors of Proverbs, he frequently refers to death, not merely as the penalty of the wicked, but as the end of all men, good and bad alike—an end not to be feared or murmured at, and sometimes even to be desired (xli. 1-4, xl. 28, xxx. 5, xxii. 9, 10, xiv. 16, 17, etc.). It is as if the Sages of Proverbs, feeling the religious difficulty, intentionally ignored the death of the righteous, which, because death was an evil, they could not satisfactorily explain; perhaps, too, as with some Psalmists, the fulness and wealth of the higher life in the service of Wisdom and Wisdom's God blotted out for them the vision of death. Then thought advances; on the one hand, Sirach accepts and is satisfied with death, as the natural end of all mankind; on the other hand, as in 2 Macc., heroism is supported under torture by the hope of resurrection.

(*b.*) Prof. Cheyne instances as one of the six classes of sayings in Sirach which "offend the Christian sentiment," the distich,

> Happy the man who has not offended in his speech,
> And is not pricked with grief for sins. (xiv. 1.)

Sirach certainly reckons himself among the pure in heart and wise of speech. But we must not lay too much stress upon this. We saw before that Sirach also wrote, "We are all worthy of punishment." Before God or an absolute standard all are sinners, but among men there are differences. Sirach is conscious that he belongs to the good class, to those who have tried not unsuccessfully to keep the commandments of God. The Pharisaic self-righteousness, of which Prof. Cheyne sees the seeds in Sirach, assumes in some men the form of an almost Homeric *naïveté*. And men may differ widely in theory and expression as to their own sinfulness, and yet at the same time be possessed of an equal amount of virtue or of vice. The odious Pharisaism, so justly held up to scorn in Luke xviii. 11, is not more odious than that of the sanctimonious hypocrite, who, emphasizing his corrupt and sinful state, uses the humility of the lips as a stalking-horse for the pride of his heart; nor is real humility incompatible with a peaceful and happy conviction that life has been spent in the conscious striving after a fulfilment of God's word.

(*c.*) Sirach, in common with other writers of his time, ascribes a peculiar efficacy to charity. Proverbs (x. 2) declares:

> Treasures of wickedness profit nothing;
> But righteousness delivers from death. (x. 2.)
> Riches profit not in the day of wrath;
> But righteousness delivers from death. (xi. 4.)

Its opposition to riches shows that righteousness (צדקה) tends to imply in these passages something akin to charity.

In Daniel (iv. 27), in Tobit, and in Sirach this doctrine is definitely particularised. In them it would seem as if an atoning virtue were ascribed to mere alms-giving, as an *opus operatum*, as if one could buy off the consequence of sin by the payment of money, or at most by the mechanical execution of a stated virtue. The verse in Daniel runs "And now, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee, and break off thy sins by almsgiving (צדקה) and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor; it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity." Here the LXX. renders פרק וג' by *πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι*, which certainly means "redeem, buy off, thine iniquities by alms-giving." So Tobit (xii. 9), "Alms deliver from death and shall purge (*ἀποκαθαριεῖ*) all sin.' And in Sirach the virtue of *ἐλεημοσύνη* is frequently referred to, *e.g.* "Water will quench a flaming fire, and alms-giving will make an atonement for sin." But objectionable as these passages sound, they must yet not be pressed too far. What is meant is that as the highest virtue is charity (in the Talmud the higher charity (גמילת חסדים) is distinguished from mere alms-giving and appraised above it), so is charity the highest expression and proof of genuine repentance. The idea of bartering alms in exchange for pardon was certainly not intended. Sirach says once:

> To depart from wickedness is that which pleases God,
> To give up unrighteousness is atonement. (xxxii. 3.)

Now this is simple and wholesome doctrine, against which no objection can be raised. But to give alms, or better to do charity, is for the later Hebrew Sages the noblest element in goodness, and when it is said that "alms will make an atonement for sin," the part is substituted for the whole, the concrete instance for the abstract quality. The prophetic denunciations in Sirach of the sacrifices of the wicked (xxxi. 19, vii. 9, etc.) show that too mechanical an interpretation of the alms-giving passages is manifestly unfair.

(*d.*) In one important respect Sirach is clearly on a lower level than Proverbs. It is now not merely the Christian sentiment which is justly outraged by passages such as:—Nine men I pronounce happy. . . .

> He that lives to see the fall of his enemies. (xxv. 7.)
> Give to the pious,
> But help not the sinner,
> For God too hates the sinner,
> And will repay vengeance to the wicked.

The sinner is synonymous with the enemy (xii. 14-16), and this identification is in so far a palliation of Sirach's mercilessness, as by the sinner he frequently implies, like the Psalmists, heathen foes or Jewish apostates. Yet if Sirach here accentuates the great religious failing of the Psalmists, from which the Sages of Proverbs through their lack of (or superiority to?) national feeling, were comparatively free, he outdoes the famous forgiveness distichs in Proverbs in the following noble passage, the finest in his book:—

> He who takes revenge shall find vengeance from God,
> And his sins he will keep in remembrance.
> Forgive thy neighbour the wrong he has done to thee,
> So shall thy sins be forgiven when thou prayest.
> One man retains hatred against another,
> Does *he* ask pardon from God?
> To a man, who is like himself, he shows no pity;
> Does *he* ask pardon for his own sins?

If he, who is but flesh, keeps back his hatred,
Who will make atonement for his sins?
Remember thy end, and cease to hate,
Remember corruption and death, and keep the commandments;
Remember the commandments, and bear no malice against thy neighbour,
Remember the covenant with the highest, and neglect the wrong.
(xxviii. 1-7.)

When Sirach wrote, Palestine had become the battle-field between the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae, and the Jews had suffered many a calamity. In such times religious particularism was immediately aroused, and the sinner identified with the author of the wrong. It was only very seldom that the universalism inherent in monotheism could triumph over the intense and burning hatred of the foreign oppressor. Sirach is in this respect no better than the Psalmists, and one whole chapter of his book (xxxiii.) is devoted to a long prayer for the restoration of Israel's independence and for vengeance upon its foes.

Theoretically the author knows better. Theoretically he can say:

The mercy of man extends but to his neighbour;
The mercy of God to all mankind. (xviii. 12.)

But this is an isolated passage.

Particularism in 180 B.C. is necessarily associated with a deep devotion to the Law. Here it is where Sirach most sharply differs from Proverbs. And the Law, which he identifies with wisdom (xxiv. 22) is always the written Law enshrined in the Pentateuch. There are several points in his praise of the Law which are worthy of notice.

(*a.*) The sacrificial portion of the Law is comparatively of small importance to him. It has quite lost its original meaning. It is true that Aaron receives a longer meed of praise than Moses, and that the Temple service is described with enthusiasm, and had obviously made a considerable impression upon his mind; it is also true that in one passage he urges that honour should be paid to God's ministers, the priests, and their due portions faithfully paid to them, but his real feeling is expressed in the following distichs:—

He that keeps the Law brings many offerings;
He who fulfils the commandments sacrifices peace offerings.
He who shows gratitude offers fine flour;
He who is charitable sacrifices a thank offering (xxxii. 1, 2).

Sacrifices are, indeed, to be brought, but not for any end of their own. They are to be brought, as so many other commandments are to be obeyed, of which the *raison d'être* is quite hidden from the believer, merely because they happen to be enjoined in the Law.

All this is to be done because of the commandment: πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα χάριν ἐντολῆς (xxxii. 5). Here we have already the key note of Rabbinism and of orthodox Judaism to this day; the Law for its own sake, the Law as the will of God. What the motive of the command may be is of no importance; if it has no apparent object, it is none the less God's will, and the doing of it is not only the Jew's bounden duty, but also his most precious privilege. If men have parodied the orthodoxy of the Church in the "*credo quia absurdum*," with an "*ago quia absurdum*" one could parody the orthodoxy of the Synagogue.

(*b.*) In Sirach we begin to notice also the dangerous exclusiveness of the Rabbinic ideal. It is true that in his depreciation of trades he was not followed by the Rabbis (xxvi. 20, xxxviii. 24-34). But its parallel is their disparagement of the עם הארץ who can neither be God-fearing or

wise. There is also a curious parallel between the ideal of Sirach and the Rabbis, and that of Aristotle and some of the Greek philosophers. Though the innate practicalness and work-a-day morality of the Jewish character was continually combating the pre-eminence of knowledge, the Rabbinic ideal, like Aristotle's, did not consist so much in doing as in knowing. It is a *θεωρία*, and the *θεωρία* is its own reward. It is a *θεωρία* too which brings men near to the divine; even the famous *νόησις νοήσεως* of the Metaphysics is paralleled by the grotesque idea of the Rabbis that God's main occupation is the study of the Law. To the Greek philosopher, a prime requisite for the attainment of this ideal is the necessary amount of leisure (*σχολή*), and so we find in Sirach :—

The wisdom of a Scribe comes by opportunity of leisure, and he that has little business shall become wise (*σοφία γραμματέως ἐν εὐκαιρίᾳ σχολῆς, καὶ ὁ ἐλασσούμενος πράξει αὐτοῦ σοφισθήσεται*, xxxviii. 24).

(*c.*) The two results of the faithful study and practice of the Law are wisdom and a good life. Sirach never notices any of the externalities of the Law, except offerings and first fruits, and these, as we have seen, receive their value only because they happen to find a place there. Thus the moral elements of the Law, benevolence, chastity, etc., have their independent value apart from forming a portion of the code book. The forms and ceremonies are only valuable because in some mysterious manner they embody the wisdom of God, and are given in his grace as the prerogative of Israel. This is again the true Rabbinic point of view.

(*d.*) Lastly, Sirach, like the author of Psalm cxix., knows nothing, any more than the true disciples of the Rabbis know anything, of the theory which turns the Law into a perpetual bondage. To the foolish and intractable (*ἀκάρδιος καὶ ἀπαίδευτος*) the ways of wisdom (= the Law) may seem rough and its yoke heavy. But he who desires to learn will find but little trouble, and quickly will he enjoy the fruits of his study. Thus the Sage urges his hearers :

> Put thy feet in wisdom's fetters,
> And thy neck into her chain ;
> Draw near to her with all thy heart,
> And keep her ways with all thy power ;
> For at the last thou wilt find her rest,
> And she will be turned for thee into joy.
> Her fetter will become thy strong defence,
> Her chains a robe of glory ;
> Thou wilt put her on as a robe of honour,
> And set her upon thee as a crown of joy. (xvi. 25-31.)

This is the true theory of Judaism about the Law. Outsiders can but see the fetters and the chain ; only to the initiated are they transfigured into the robe of glory and the crown of joy.

C. G. Montefiore.

A UNITARIAN MINISTER'S VIEW OF THE TALMUDIC DOCTRINE OF GOD.

THE zeal of orthodox Christianity, as professed by so-called Christian nations, has shown itself, from time to time, even down to the present day, in fierce hatred and persecution of the Jews. False, not merely to the teaching of Jesus, but to the natural instincts of humanity, the Church has looked upon the scattered and defenceless people of Israel as its lawful prey, and has dealt with them as enemies of God and man. Many a page of European history is stained deep with the records of cruelty towards the Jews, and no Christian can reflect without shame on the deeds which have been committed in the name of Christianity. As a natural consequence of the attitude of Christian orthodoxy towards the Jewish people, their literature has been reviled and derided, scoffed at as foolish or condemned as impious and profane, a tissue of blasphemy mingled with indecency. Where there was no pretence of fairness or impartial study, it is not surprising that Christian opinion of Jewish literature should be hopelessly in error. The means for an adequate investigation of that literature were not at hand, for the knowledge of Rabbinical Hebrew was confined to a few, most of whom used it merely to produce garbled evidence against Jewish writers; while on the other hand, there was naturally no inducement for Jews to translate their works into more familiar languages, and present them to unsympathetic readers. Even at the present day, though much has been written to elucidate the Rabbinical literature, and aid in the study of it those who are not Jews, yet there still remains a good deal of prejudice which seems to many writers to demand an apology for dealing with that literature. Nothing can be more one-sided or partial than some of the published selections from the Talmud; those of Hershon, *e.g.*, are written with a strong Christian bias, and the same is true, to a large extent, of Etheridge's *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*. There seems still to be wanting an unprejudiced courtesy towards the Rabbinical writings; and especially in regard to the Talmud there is needed a more serious attempt to judge it fairly, and without at every step

comparing its teachings with other doctrines that may be preferred. Whether the theology of the Talmud is adapted to the religious wants of the present day is a question which must be left to those who have inherited the Talmud; but, considering the patient and devoted labour which was expended through centuries in compiling it, there ought to be no question of its claim to careful and sympathetic study, with the sole aim of understanding what its authors intended, and without regard to later views on the same objects of thought.

The following pages are offered as a humble contribution towards a fairer appreciation of the Talmud, and in particular towards the understanding of one feature in it which has been singled out for especial attack, viz., its teaching about God. Charges of blasphemy and profanity have been freely brought against the Talmud for the strongly anthropomorphic character of many of its statements about the Almighty, and it will be time well spent to inquire if a more satisfactory explanation cannot be found than in mere abuse.

Explanations of a far higher order have been given and will be referred to below; but as these are contained in learned works not accessible to all, and moreover do not appear to the present writer entirely satisfactory, it may perhaps be permitted to him to venture into a field already trodden.

What, in the first place, are the facts to be explained, and wherein lies the riddle which must be solved? Briefly, the case stands thus, that in the Talmud two conceptions of God are found, to all appearance diametrically opposed to each other; one of them in which God is refined to an almost colourless abstraction, the other giving a humanised representation of God, which puts into the shade the extremest anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament. Of these two the latter is far the more prominent, as could hardly fail to be the case, seeing that the points of contact between humanity and the humanised God are far more numerous than those between humanity and God conceived as infinite and absolute. But both conceptions are present, and it becomes a question what is the relation between the two.

The facts of the case are well given by Weber (*Alt-Synagogale Theologie*, chap. xi., p. 144, *seqq.*). He illustrates the first conception of God (the characteristics of which he defines as "den abstracten Monotheismus, und den abstracten Transcendentismus") chiefly by the names or titles which are used to denote the Supreme Being. Thus, of very frequent occurrence is the title, רבונו של עולם "Lord of the World"; and with this may be compared the phrase, הק״בה מתגאה על

כולן ועל כל העולם (*Chag.* 13*b*), "The Holy One, blessed be he, is exalted over them all, and over all the world." Again, it is said (*B. Bathr.*, 25*a*), שכינה בכל מקום "The Divine Presence is in every place." It is significant that the name יהוה is not used, though various passages in the Talmud refer to its use on certain occasions, and others strongly forbid all mention of it. The obvious meaning of this reluctance to use what had been the personal name of the God of Israel is, that such a personal name was not in harmony with the idea of one Supreme God. Probably its occasional use was due to the desire to give additional solemnity to religious rites, by introducing the ancient sacred name, although the name had really lost its significance. (The name, under the form Jehovah, is still frequently used in Christian services, where, so far as we can see, its only recommendation is that it has a majestic sound.) In place of the ancient name, God was spoken of or addressed as אלהים , אדני , אל , or המקום , השם , הקדוש ברוך הוא , besides the more descriptive epithets mentioned above.

This conception of God as high exalted above the world, far removed from contact with it, is the natural development of the Old Testament doctrine, culminating in the writings of the Second Isaiah. The Prophet of the Exile teaches the highest and most abstract monotheism to be found in the Bible, and clearly points the way for the still further abstraction which characterises the Talmudic idea of God. Weber (*l.c.*, p. 147) maintains that this further abstraction was brought about by opposition to the trinitarian idea of God in Christianity, and no doubt this may have contributed to produce the result which appears in the Talmud. But apart from this there seems sufficient evidence in the Old Testament to account for the Talmudic idea.

The opposite conception of God, that which is anthropomorphic to the highest degree, also has its roots in the Old Testament. The wide gulf which seems to exist in the Talmud between the two conceptions of God may be discerned as a slight rift in the Old Testament, when the writings of Ezekiel are compared with those of the Second Isaiah. For Ezekiel is really the founder of the legal form of the Jewish religion, in spite of the fact that codes of laws existed before his time. Both he and the Second Isaiah attempted to interpret the religious significance of the Exile and its bearing upon the future career of Israel. And while the one founded upon it his grand doctrine of the sole sovereignty of God, the other developed from it the doctrine that laws and regulations were needed to take the place of the free prophetic spirit

which had been tried and found wanting. Though Ezekiel's scheme of legislation was never adopted (it was even proposed to exclude his book from the canon because it contradicted the Pentateuch[1]), yet undoubtedly it led the way to the legislation of Ezra, and thence to the Oral Law, the Tradition of the Elders, and thus finally to the Talmud. The anthropomorphic conception of God is the direct outcome of the legal and traditional form which Judaism assumed in consequence of the teaching of Ezekiel and his successors in the same direction.

To illustrate this side of the Talmudic doctrine of God is easy, for material is as abundant as on the other side it was scanty. It is not needful to search very long in the Talmud before meeting with statements about God which are, to say the least, startling. Perhaps the best general illustration will be the famous story of Rabah bar Nahmani and his translation to heaven (B. Metz. 86a). After relating how this Rabbi fled from the pursuit of a king's officer, and took refuge in a marsh, where he sat down on the trunk of a palm-tree and began to read, the narrator goes on, "Now, there was a dispute in the assembly of heaven whether, if the bright spot comes before the white hair, the person is unclean, and if the white hair comes before the bright spot, he is clean. The Holy One, blessed be he, says he is clean; but all the assembly of heaven say he is unclean. Then they say, 'Who shall decide?' 'Rabah bar Nahmani shall decide' (for R. b. N. had said, 'I am alone [*i.e.*, an unequalled authority] in regard to "plagues;" I am alone in regard to "tents" [*i.e.*, cases of uncleanness caused by the presence of a corpse].' They sent the messenger after him. The angel of death could not manage to approach him, because his mouth never ceased reading, until a breeze blew and rustled among the reeds. He thought it was a troop of horse, and said, 'May I die rather than be delivered up to the government.' While he spoke he died. He said, 'Clean, clean.' There came a voice (*Bath-Qol*), and said, 'Happy art thou, Rabah bar Nahmani, because thy body is clean and thy soul is departed in purity.' A scroll fell down from heaven into Pumbaditha: 'Rabah bar Nahmani was required in the heavenly assembly.'" The story goes on to say how his colleagues mourned for him seven days at the express command of heaven. The genius of anthropomorphic description could hardly attempt a more daring flight than that contained in the above story. But, though that is perhaps the most

[1] Sabb. 13*b*.

extreme case, there are many others which fall not far short of it in humanising (or, as Weber says, "Judaizing") the conception of God. Thus we are told (*A. Zar.*, 3*b*), "Rab Jehudah says that Rab says, 'There are twelve hours in the day. During the first three the Holy One, blessed be he, sits and studies Torah; during the second (three) he sits and judges the whole world, all of it; when he sees that the whole of it is worthy of destruction, he rises from his throne of justice and sits upon his throne of mercy; during the third (three) he sits and feeds the world from the horns of the unicorns (ראמים) to the eggs of the gnats; during the fourth (three) he sits and plays with Leviathan, as it is written, "that Leviathan whom thou formedst to play with" (Ps. civ. 26).'" Further, it is said that God wears a Tallith (*R. ha Sh.* 17*b*)—a fact which, says R. Jochanan, could not be believed unless it were written, but which he obtains by interpreting ויעבור ה' על פניו ויקרא (Exod. xxxiv. 6) to mean "The Lord passed (the Tallith) over his face and read." It is only a slight step further that God should pray, and that the words of his prayer, or rather meditation, should be recorded (*Berach.* 7*a*).

Besides such anthropomorphisms as those contained in the above stories, there are many others of a more generally human and less specifically Jewish character. God is said to laugh, to weep, to roar, to be angry. He can even hate (*Nid.* 16*b*). And on the strength of a forced intrepretation of texts, it is said that he plaited the hair of Eve (*Ber.* 61*a*), and by the help of the ministering angels shaved Sennacherib (*Sanh.* 95*b*). To these, other examples might be added, but our object is not to collect all the anthropomorphisms of the Talmud, but rather to attempt an explanation of their existence there. Sufficient instances have been given to illustrate the two dissimilar conceptions of God presented in the Talmudic literature. We have given them in what appears to us the order of the origin, viz., first the refined and abstract conception, then the Judaized form, and lastly the more generally human representation. We believe there were good reasons why the Judaized conception should arise; and this having arisen, a precedent was thereby set for extending the "humanity" of God into details not specially Jewish.

In attempting to account for the phenomena, of which the facts are now before the reader, we shall notice two explanations which have been offered. The first is that of Hirschfeld, and is contained in his work *Die Haggadische Exegese*, p. 100, onwards. We translate a few sentences which contain his views upon the subject. "Definitely pronounced *dicta* from the doctrines of philosophers, as well as from the belief of

the common life of the people, had penetrated the (Pharisaic) circle of ideas, and were freely welcomed as soon as they found adequate foundation in the Bible, or as soon as they proved acceptable and appeared to be indicated in Scripture. Thus we find even gross, heathen, popular belief about the gods transferred to the God who is revealed to man in Scripture, because they were disseminated by authority." Then follow various instances of anthropomorphisms, such as those already mentioned; after which the author proceeds (p. 102): "All these views, which were taken over into Judaism from the coarse, sensuous heathenism, and to which graphic Oriental speech could offer at most analogies, arose from the lack of scientific culture, and from the dependence on authority in regard to belief which characterized the distant provinces at that time. Political and social conditions, the dreary pressure of circumstances, put a natural restraint upon higher thoughts, and forced the mind down to sensuous conceptions. The mind could not so far raise itself as to look above and beyond the prejudices of the people, and it emancipated popular forms of belief by canonizing the religious ideas of the masses." Finally (p. 106), at the end of the section on Pharisaism, he concludes, "In all sorts of ways the most various ideas were drawn into the circle of belief, which was thereby modified; but, nevertheless, the kernel remained unaltered, and while it drew to itself foreign notions, prevailed over their oppositeness and assimilated them."

Intercourse with Gentiles, political and social adversity and consequent depression of spirits, these are the causes to which Hirschfeld ascribes the anthropomorphic features of the Talmudic doctrine of God. But is this explanation probable? Is it likely that foreign philosophies should have affected Rabbinical thought, at a time too when the lines of demarcation between Jew and Gentile were being more and more strictly drawn? Surely, one great object of the Talmud was to define the true Israelite, to distinguish his religious, moral and social position, from that of all Gentiles and unbelievers. And if this be so, it is hard to understand how Gentile doctrines and superstitions could find an easy entrance into the circle of Pharisaic thought. This difficulty still remains, even if we admit that it was not the primary concern of the Talmud to lay down a doctrine of God, but rather to sketch the "whole duty of man." For still the fundamental idea of the Talmud was a religious one, and the intermingling of Gentile elements in its theology could hardly be a matter of indifference to its authors. It is true there is in the Talmud a most

miscellaneous variety of subjects; the manners and customs of many nations are incidentally mentioned, and furnish abundant proof of intercourse between Jews and Gentiles. But it does not follow that this intercourse led to adoption by the Jews of Gentile belief and doctrines. The Talmud is a creation, not a mere compilation; its authors were not concerned to pick-and-choose what they approved in the religions of neighbouring peoples; they were concerned to develop a principle of their own, and did develop it with marvellous patience and ingenuity, needing no help from the Gentile world.

Besides the adoption of Gentile notions, Hirschfeld alleges as a second cause of the anthropomorphic representation of God in the Talmud, the social and political conditions of the times during which the Mishnah and Gemara grew up. The Jews suffered persecution at the hands of the Romans, at all events during a part of this period, and though they made heroic struggles to retain their political existence during the reigns of Vespasian and Hadrian, they were finally overcome, and the fall of Bethar was the death-blow of the Jewish State. From that time onward the children of Israel have been a scattered and homeless people, and if political calamity has any effect on the mental tone of a people, if it "puts a natural limit on aspiration, and forces the mind down to merely sensuous and material religious thoughts," as Hirschfeld maintains, then certainly we should expect to find abundant traces of this mental degradation in the Talmud. But it seems to us that the case is very different from what Hirschfeld describes. Persecution usually has the effect, not of deadening enthusiasm and lowering the tone of religious and moral thought, but of stimulating and inspiring it. In the early days, before the Romans had finally conquered, religious zeal flamed out strong and bright under the stress of persecution; and the two men who did more than almost all else for the future of Jewish religion were Jochanan ben Zaccai in the war with Titus, and Aqiba in the death-struggle under Bar-Cocheba. To say of these men, and especially of Aqiba, that they were men of low and degraded religious natures is simply to libel them. We might, with more reason, expect to find traces of this mental degradation in the long centuries after the war of Hadrian, during which the Jews never recovered their political status, and when "hope deferred" only too often "made their heart sick." But even then, the unflinching determination with which the great leaders and "masters in Israel" clung to their religion, and worked out its principles into ever minuter details, shows plainly how unspeakably

precious it was to them, and, as we think, forbids us to assert that they sunk to coarse and materialistic religious ideas. Doubtless their religion assumed a very peculiar form; but where there was so much vitality in it, as there certainly was at least in the case of the great Rabbis of the Talmud, it is hard to believe that a religion which grew and made way against such difficulties should be merely a degraded and materialistic belief. We are, therefore, unable to accept Hirschfeld's explanation as an adequate solution of the problem contained in the Talmudic doctrine of God.

Weber, in his book already referred to, *System der Alt-Synagogalen Palästinischen Theologie*, offers a different explanation, and one which seems to be much more satisfactory. He says (p. 153), "The decisiveness with which Legalism (der Nomismus) had asserted the Law to be the absolute revelation of God, both beyond and in time, had this result, that the idea of God was subsequently determined by the principle of Nomocracy, and God was conceived as the God of the Torah; the idea of God was thereby Judaized—a reaction against Transcendentalism, which did not lead any nearer to the goal of truth." The statements made about God thus conceived of, are not, as he says (p. 146), mere absurdities, still less blasphemies, as they were formerly designated. They are the necessary consequences of the nomistic conception of revelation. "How else," he asks, "could the former purely abstract idea of God be filled with life? Of necessity the Torah must appear as the reflex of the inner life of God, Heaven must take the form of a realm of Torah, and God must be Judaized. The older conception is certainly incompatible with this, and thus the result of Legalism upon the Jewish idea of God is a harsh dualism." This explanation appears to meet the case far more completely than that of Hirschfeld; but yet we cannot feel quite satisfied with it. It certainly does account for the anthropomorphic conception of God in the Talmud in a far more probable and reasonable manner than by the suggestion of accretions from Gentile thought, or the depressing effects of hardship and suffering. We admit with Weber the logical necessity according to which the Legal conception of religion developed the belief in God as the God of the Torah. But we think that his interpretation of this belief does not quite do justice to the religious position of those who held it. It is true that Weber protests against the notion that the anthropomorphic statements in the Talmud are absurdities, or actual blasphemies; but yet he seems to treat them as expressions of a much lower idea of God than the older one, and maintains that there is a

harsh dualism in Talmudic Theology. A dualism there certainly is, if no more than the verbal expression be considered, but it may be doubted whether it extends deeper. Is it not rather that such statements as those about God studying the Torah have no meaning apart from the belief in him as the infinite and eternal God? That the one doctrine, not merely logically followed from the other, but was always held in connection with it, in the minds of the Talmudic theologians? The anthropomorphisms seem to me to be rather a species of cypher or symbolic language, liable indeed to be misused and misunderstood, but employed by those who were masters of it solely to denote great truths of their religion. This applies to those expressions which connect God with the Torah; those which have no such reference we take to be simply extensions of the anthropomorphic principle into regions where it has properly no meaning.

Granted that the Torah, both written and oral, was looked upon as the sole and perfect revelation of God, then there is no absurdity in saying that God concerns himself with or studies it. If he studies it, his angels may do so too, hence the Beth-hammidrash of heaven. And if the sum total of divine knowledge and wisdom have been revealed in the Torah, which is committed to his people on earth, then the assertion that a mortal should decide in the controversies of heaven loses most of its apparent impiety. It is, of course, almost, if not quite, impossible for us of modern days to think ourselves back into the mental position of the authors of the Talmud, but yet it seems possible that such peculiar modes of representing the nature and the action of God should go hand in hand with real reverence and piety towards him. To take one of these startling statements and expound it as allegory, when to all appearance it is intended literally, may seem unwarrantable and unsupported by any evidence in the passage itself. We admit this, and give as our chief ground for the view we take, the fact that, judged by its results, the religion which inspired the Talmud was a strong and living faith; and such a faith we hold to stand in no need of either accretions from without, according to Hirschfeld, or forced interpretations intended to give life and colour to an abstract idea, as Weber maintains, and in such a faith there seems to be little room for a "harsh dualism." Of course this applies to the religion of the Talmud, as shown in the most distinguished of the men who made it. Amongst the host of Rabbis whose words are enshrined in its pages are men of very different gifts, very different mental range. Many no doubt there were who did not feel the religious importance of

the task they were engaged in, who were merely pedants of the schools. And by these, very probably, the statements about God were understood in a degraded and literal sense. But when it is borne in mind how the Talmud is the result of centuries of patient work, how the study of Torah was the absorbing task of men like Hillel, Jochanan ben Zaccai, Aqiba Meir, Rab, Abahu, and many others, all of them men of great ability, then it is plain that religion, no matter how strange to modern ideas be the form in which they held it, was a real power in the souls of those who made the Talmud. The form, doubtless, was that of tradition and Legalism, but religion had not lost connection with its living springs in the soul, and thus it could renew itself and enter upon fresh developments, according to the changing needs of the time. The rise of Christianity, instead of being fatal to Judaism, gave it new life; all the latent energy of the old religion was roused to combat the opposition of the new; and even when the loss of the Temple, and later still, the political extinction of the nation, added crushing weight to the blows which had already fallen, still Israel stood firm, and clung to what God had given her to defend. Her sons lived for the Torah, and when that was no longer possible, they died for it. Faithfully each generation of teachers and scholars spent their strength, in face of danger and in spite of scorn, upon the task appointed for them; and to say that the power which inspired them was nothing more than a tradition from ancient days seems to me to fall far short of what truth and justice alike demand. Without this foundation of strong and living religion, the Talmud is inexplicable, for without it there is nothing to show why the best strength of Israel's greatest minds during nearly a thousand years, more or less, should be devoted to such solemn trifling as the Talmud, superficially considered, appears to be. Assuming, then, that the religion which lay at the foundation of the Talmud was strong and real, we maintain that the anthropomorphisms which logically result from the legal principle, are to be understood and interpreted, not literally, but in the light of the more spiritual conception of God, with which they are apparently at variance. Such, we believe, to have been the interpretation of those who framed these peculiar and startling statements of doctrine.

The above explanation applies, as had been said, only to those expressions which directly or indirectly associate God with the Torah. We should account for the others, which are not specially Jewish in form, by saying that the precedent having once been set, of using anthropomorphic language in speaking of God, such language came to be used in cases where it was

really unmeaning. It could only be on the strength of such a precedent that such interpretations of texts could be adopted as those which say that God plays with the Leviathan, that he wears a Tallith, etc. (In the case of the first of these, it is probable that the Talmudic interpretation of Ps. civ. 26 is in accordance with the Psalmist's meaning; but, considering the lapse of time between the Psalmist and his Rabbinical interpreter, the adoption by the latter of the anthropomorphic explanation certainly calls for notice.) In expressions of this kind a hidden religious meaning is not to be sought for, at least it is hard to see what edifying truth is concealed in the statement that the Almighty and his angels shaved Sennacherib. But, nevertheless, it would be unjust to found upon these and similar expressions a charge of profanity against the authors of the Talmud; for amidst and beneath all its display of mingled wit and wisdom, fanciful imagination and close reasoning, there is a deep under-current of grave and solemn earnestness of resolute purpose, and of unassailable loyalty to religion. And although many isolated details of the Talmud may awaken surprise or aversion, yet it is only fair to consider them and judge them in connection with the entire mighty fabric to which they belong. It is our conviction that as the heroes of Israel, in Talmudic times, did well for their countrymen, so also they cherished a high and inspiring belief in God.

R. Travers Herford.

THE SABBATARIANS OF HUNGARY.

I.

THE celebration of the Sabbath is as much a common religious institution, as one of the most obvious marks of distinction between Judaism and Christianity. On the one hand, the whole Christian world observes each seventh day as a hallowed day of rest, thus to some extent pointing from week to week in the most solemn and in the most general and public manner, to the origin of Christianity: on the other hand, it is just by means of this Sabbath celebration—by ordaining that the Sabbath should be observed on a different day from that on which the people of Israel and the founders of Christianity themselves kept it—that Christianity has set itself in conscious and intentional opposition to the first possessors and inheritors of this great institution. Thus what was a mark of uniformity became a mark of diversity, and the separate observance of the seventh day developed into the most effective cause of separation between the Christian community and the adherents of the Jewish faith.

It is well known that the Reform movement that has gone on in Judaism has aimed at removing this cause of separation, and that both in Europe, and, in recent times, in North America, efforts have been made from Jewish quarters to deprive the Christian observance of the day of rest of its separating and disjoining character, by transferring the Jewish Sabbath to Sunday. It is equally well known that these efforts have remained quite isolated, and that the followers of Judaism, almost without exception, have adhered to the old Sabbath, and deserve as before the title of "Sabbath-observers," which, according to the Mishnah [Nedarim iii. 10], belongs equally to the Jews and the Samaritans.

On the side of Christianity, efforts have likewise been made to abolish this separation of the Christian from the Jewish day of rest—a separation violent in its very nature, but hallowed by the ecclesiastical law and practice of many centuries. But while Jewish reform, in advocating the transference of the Sabbath to Sunday, was actuated above all things by the

most coldly practical considerations, the efforts within the Christian Church, which are known by the distinctive term "Sabbatarianism," had their origin in religious fanaticism. Such a fanatical sect of Sabbatarians was founded by Johanna Southcote, who died in 1814. Believing in the approaching advent of the Messiah, and as a fitting preparation for that event, this sect as late as 1831 observed the Jewish law, and especially the celebration of the Sabbath. There exists in England and North America, another sect of Sabbatarians, forming a small society among the Baptists, who keep the Jewish Sabbath side by side with the Christian Sunday.

While, however, the "Sabbath-observers" only deserve notice as a curiosity of ecclesiastical history, like many other outgrowths of the later Christianity which distinguish English sectarianism, a deeper significance attaches to two other religious societies which have sprung up in the east of Europe, and to which the name of "Sabbath-observers" has likewise been given. These bodies demand more comprehensive attention and treatment, not only because their past is rooted in a great religious movement, and because of the ethnographical and historical interest which they are calculated to arouse, but still more because they are not so well known as their namesakes of England and America, who emerged into the light of day under the conditions of western freedom and publicity. More especially still do the Sabbatarians of Eastern Europe claim the interest of contemporary Judaism, inasmuch as they offer the only instance of a religious community, insignificant though it be, spontaneously, and from profound religious motives, going over to the Jewish persuasion.

II.

As regards the *Russian* Sabbath-observers, the so-called Sobotniki or Subbotniki, we have to depend for an account of their origin and present condition, on a few extremely scanty notices. They belong to the Russian sect, Molokani or Milk-drinkers, one of the various sects that arose, during the sixteenth century, in those provinces of Southern Russia which were at that time under the supremacy of the Polish crown, all of which sects displayed a Judaizing tendency, a marked leaning towards the Mosaic law. The Molokani, so runs the account given by a Russian chronicler,[1] observed the Sabbath

[1] Quoted by Hermann Sternberg, *History of the Jews in Poland* (Leipzig, 1878), Ch. 23, from which most of the information here adduced from Russian and Polish sources is taken.

and had their children circumcised. The performance of Divine service, and the execution of other religious practices they entrusted to the oldest and most learned men selected from their own body. They deny the divinity of Christ, reject the belief in the Holy Ghost, recognise no saints, and condemn the reverence paid to images as idolatry. Their worship consists of reading the Bible and singing the Psalms. For purposes of public service they assemble in a dwelling-room, which they call "shool" (schkola). Persecuted in the government of Moscow, the Molokans settled in that of Woronesch, and subsequently spread throughout the neighbouring government of Saratow. In the second half of the eighteenth century, their number in the first-named government had grown to 5,000 souls. By keeping their doctrines secret, they escaped persecution, till they were betrayed in 1769, and made to suffer oppression from the State. They nevertheless continued to make progress in spite of the cruel measures adopted for their suppression. Indeed in the first quarter of this century, encouraged by the tolerant administration of the Czar Alexander I., they ventured to prosecute schemes of open proselytism. Count Alexander Kuschelew-Bezborodko, the owner of immense estates in the Bobrow district of the government of Woronesch, among the inhabitants of which there was an especially large proportion of Molokans, cautioned his steward, in 1826, to observe, in his treatment of the sect, the maxim that it is better to use forbearance towards the guilty than to punish one that is innocent. Nevertheless all possible means were to be taken to prevent the continued practice of the rite of circumcision. The Count just alluded to, exerted himself, to some extent with success, to convert the sectaries to the orthodox Church, while the unconverted he transferred by force to his possessions in the Crimea and in the Caucasus. However, the apostasy of those who were left in their home was only apparent. Forty years later, in the year 1869, the Governor of Woronesch reports that the Molokani had their chief centre in that government in the neighbourhood of Pritschygol, and that they adhered to the precepts of their secret faith, whilst outwardly acting as Christians. And in 1877, the organ of the Bishop of Woronesch writes that the Subbotniki resident in that government, who had until then been good orthodox Christians, and had attended the orthodox churches, were beginning to avoid the orthodox priests, and to cease their attendance at church. They formed small congregations and adopted circumcision. "A peasant, named Ephim Botscharenkow, in the village of Ozerok, in the district of Bobrow,

officiates as their 'Rabbi.' They now call themselves 'Believers in the Bible of Moses,' reject the divinity of Christ, have given away their images, wear no crosses on their necks, and never cross themselves." According to the same source, the largest number of Subbotniki are to be found in the Palow and Bobrow districts. In the adjacent government of Don, however, conversions from the Russian Church to the Sabbatarian faith have occurred. All these Judaizers, concludes the notice, are peasants of genuine Russian descent.

While in these statements, which reach down to the most recent times, there is no mention of any open and unconditional adoption of Judaism on the part of the Russian Sabbath-keepers, though, as I learn from communications lately received from Russia, a movement in that direction is at present in process of development among the Subbotniki,[1] yet, outside the Russian frontier, namely, in the territory of European Turkey, such conversions did take place some 20 to 30 years ago. It appears that during the persecutions of the first half of this century, numerous Subbotniki wended their way westwards and settled on the Bulgarian banks of the Danube. Dr. Bares, Imperial Ottoman Physician for Quarantine, writes from Tultscha, under date 29th May, 1869 (in *Phillippsohn's Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 28th year, p. 398): "In the vicinity of Silistria live many Sobotniki, partly scattered, partly together in considerable numbers; here in Tultscha reside several families, who were formerly Sobotniki, but who have here become Jews. In their homes they use the Russian language, and they speak Jüdish-Deutsch very imperfectly. Most of their wives are born Jewesses (daughters of Jewish Poles), a few are born Sobotniki, who have embraced Judaism. In Russia this sect is said to be numerous, and intermarriages with orthodox Russians rarely occur. I was acquainted here with a woman from Odessa, whose two brothers, Sobotniki, have here become Jews. This woman was married to a very wealthy Russian belonging to the orthodox Christian form of faith. There also resides in Tultscha an industrious Jewish blacksmith, whose father had been a Russian priest. This smith reads and writes Russian well, and has made for his own use a collection of Hebrew words, to which he has added the Russian equivalents. He told me that he had become a convert to Judaism from the most sincere conviction solely

[1] Compare also a communication from B. Schewzik in *The Jewish Chronicle* of 5th April, 1889. In the *Jüdisches Literaturblatt* of Dr. Rahmer (1890, page 22), I found the notice that three hundred Sobotniki families live in Tiflis, capital of Georgia and Caucasus; they possess a beautiful synagogue, administered by a Rabbi named Krawcow.

through the study of the Holy Scriptures." The author of this sketch thought he noticed that almost all the Sobotniki who had embraced Judaism had characteristic Jewish features.

III.

The Hungarian Sabbatarians—Szombatosok—present, both in their origin and in the vicissitudes of their history, many analogies with the Russian Subbotniki. They, too, emerged from a great religious agitation; they, too, as regards nationality, remained strictly children of their people and of their home, and continued in their previous avocations, the chief of which was the cultivation of the soil. Here, as there, the Sabbatarians were exposed to oppressive restrictions and cruel persecutions. Preserving for centuries the secret of their faith, these martyrs for the sake of the teachings handed down to them by their fathers, silently and patiently suffered, until here and there Judaism ventured to receive them into its bosom and they formally embraced the religion of which they had so long and so steadfastly been unrecognised adherents.

Besides these points of resemblance, however, the two sects likewise show points of difference, and in these respects the balance of historical significance inclines in favour of the Hungarian Sabbatarians. The latter, like the Russian Molokani, counted their adherents chiefly among the inferior peasantry, but at the head of the sect there stood, as its founders and leaders, men of a high order and of most remarkable spiritual endowment. They were able to reckon as belonging to them several important men, whose very personalities were sufficient to arouse interest in the sect. In the religious principles of the Hungarian Sabbatarians, there may be traced without difficulty a distinct development, which brought them gradually quite close to Judaism. Finally, the Sabbatarians of Hungary have produced a literature, which, although very small in extent, yet occupies a respectable place in the national literature of Hungary, especially as regards its poetical portion, and which, as we shall immediately proceed to show, possesses a special interest of its own in its relation to the history of Jewish literature.

After what has been said, it will be readily acknowledged that the deepest gratitude should be felt that a Jewish author, eminent for his conscientious research, should have undertaken the task of making the Hungarian Sabbatarians, their history, their doctrines, and their literature, a subject for full historical exposition. Dr. Samuel Kohn, Rabbi of Buda-Pesth, who has

gained a wide reputation for solid scholarship, through his profound works on the literature of the oldest sect which Judaism has produced, viz., the Samaritans, and who some years ago issued the first volume of a *History of the Jews in Hungary* (in the Hungarian language), showing evidences of most extensive investigation into original sources, has published in the Hungarian journal, *Magyar-Zsidó-Szemle* (*Hungarian-Jewish Review*), and subsequently, as a separate work in an expanded form, a monograph on the Sabbatarians,[1] which contains numerous fresh information concerning the history and literature of this sect. In this work many previous views and statements on the subject receive considerable correction, and, for the first time, an exact and exhaustive knowledge of Sabbatarianism and its history is rendered possible, by means of a comprehensive historical treatment of the question, for the purposes of which all available sources of information have been carefully consulted. While the sect as such has ceased to exist, since its meagre remnant now only prolongs the existence of an insignificant and world-forgotten Jewish community, it emerges again through Kohn's labours, to renewed life in history, arousing the sympathy and interest of all who feel a prompting to observe the rise and activity, the struggles and sufferings of a religious community that sprang into existence and marked out its course under most extraordinary conditions—especially the interest and sympathy of the whole united Jewish brotherhood, to which this small sect belonged in spirit, even before it was incorporated therewith outwardly. In the conviction that the Hungarian Sabbatarians deserve to be known not only within the boundaries of their native country, but everywhere where Jewish science numbers adherents and friends, I have attempted in the following to give, by the aid of Kohn's complete treatise, a short sketch of their origin, their history, and their literature, with the object of enabling those to whom it is not permitted to inform themselves on the subject by directly consulting a work written in Hungarian, to include within the range of their interest and historical knowledge, a sect which, outside Hungary, has hitherto aroused so small an amount of attention.

---

[1] The title in Hungarian is as follows: A Szombatosok Történetük, Dogmatikájuk és irodalmuk. Különös tekintettel Péchi Simon fökanczellár életére és munkáira. (The Sabbatarians: their history, theology, and literature, with special allusion to the life and works of the High Chancellor, Simon Péchi). Buda Pesth, 1890 (pp. xvi. 377, 8vo.)

IV.

The home of the Sabbatarians is Transylvania (in Hungarian Endély, in German Siebenbürgen), a portion of Hungary which for the past twenty years has been by statute entirely united to the other portions of the kingdom, but which, previous to that time, maintained for centuries a separate existence, and had been the scene of the most varied historical vicissitudes. Just as Transylvania from an ethnographical point of view is one of the most remarkable countries, harbouring as it does within its narrow frontiers three nationalities differing so materially from each other as the Hungarians (among whom the Székelys make a still further sub-division), the Germans (Saxons) and the Roumanians: so also in the recent history of religion is its position a remarkable one. The boundaries of Transylvania marked the extreme geographical limits to which the Reformation spread in the east of Europe; but within the boundaries of this small country the religious revival of the 16th century passed, in rapid and surely progressive development, through the various stages from Catholicism to extreme Unitarianism. Furthermore, thanks to favourable historical conditions, freedom was conceded to the followers of every creed to practise their religion, so that in the year 1568, under the sway of Prince Johann Siegmund, four religions were placed on an equal footing by law or recognised as "religiones receptæ": the Catholic, the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the Unitarian. The history of the beginnings of Unitarianism in Transylvania attaches itself to the name Francis David. The reformation found this man a Catholic priest; in 1540, together with the whole of the citizens of Kolosvár (Klausenburg), he professed his adherence to Luther's faith; in 1559, however, he went over to the Reformed Church, and maintained their dogmas with the same zeal as he had hitherto defended those of the Lutherans. As court chaplain to Prince Johann Siegmund, who had likewise become a Calvinist, F. David became acquainted with Biandrata, one of the founders of Unitarianism in Poland, who, since 1563, had acted as physician to the court of the princes of Transylvania. This functionary soon converted the court preacher to his own religious views. As early as 1566, F. David founded the Unitarian Church of Transylvania. The new church at first ventured to propagate its anti-Trinitarian doctrines openly, and to expound them in various fugitive writings and disputations. This liberty, however, it did not enjoy long, for already, in the year 1570, that zealous Catholic

Stephen Bathori, subsequently King of Poland, became the successor to Johann Siegmund, who had in the meantime gone over to the Unitarian form of faith, and both he and his successor in the princely dignity, Christopher Bathori, endeavoured to check the growth of Unitarianism by stringent measures. They aimed their attack especially against F. David, whose restless energy led him to ever more daring deductions, and who had been branded as an unscrupulous innovator by a section of his own co-religionists. He clung immoveably, however, to his opinions, and was in consequence condemned in 1578, to life-long imprisonment in the castle of Déva, where he died in the following year.

After David's conviction, a large section of the Unitarian clergy signed at Biandrata's instigation a declaration of faith, in which the teachings of David were repudiated. A small section, however, remained faithful to them, and even before the death of their teacher, but more especially after that event, a religious brotherhood was formed with his articles of faith for their creed. Rejecting the new Unitarian confession of Biandrata and his associates, they clung to the doctrines of Francis David, who was now reverenced as a martyr. It was among these followers of David—to whom their opponents gave the nickname Davidists, and of whom it was said, as it likewise was of their master (though falsely) that they "Judaized"—that a sect arose, which, going far beyond David and his adherents, not only like them rejected the specifically Christian dogmas concerning the divinity and the worship of Christ, but made distinct advances towards Judaism, and held the doctrine that the teachings and laws of the Old Testament were still binding. This was the sect of Sabbatarians; according to a trustworthy tradition, coming down to us from a contemporary chronicler, the founder of the sect was one Andreas Eössi, and the same authority names the year 1588 as the year of his initiating the movement.

V.

Andreas Eössi of Szent-Erzsébet was a rich Székely of noble birth, who owned three villages and a great number of estates in the counties of Udvarhelyszék, Küküllö, and Fehérvar, and who belonged to the earliest adherents of Unitarianism in Transylvania. Having been visited by severe trials, (he was ailing for many years, and had lost his wife and three sons), he sought consolation in religion. "He read the Bible so long"—runs the account of the chronicler already mentioned—"that he evolved therefrom the Sabbatarian form of religion." What

he recognised as truth, he endeavoured to disseminate in the surrounding district; he composed treatises, prayers, and hymns, caused copies of these and other writings to be prepared, and lent them out in all directions. He possessed no knowledge of Hebrew, and had only a slender acquaintance with the Classics. He was, however, well versed in Church history, and was completely master of the Old and New Testament, from both of which he derived his teaching. He was altogether an enemy of the scholastic theology, and said on one occasion: "They ask me in vain where I discovered the true way of salvation, since I sojourned neither at Padua nor at Paris. As if salvation consisted of knowing many heathen writings and many heathen languages." He betook himself with his new propaganda to "the great simple community," as the chronicler says. Soon, too, he had fellow-workers, whose names have only partially been preserved, and the most distinguished of whom, Simon Péchi, will be the subject of more particular mention below. About 1600, there was compiled "the old hymn-book of the Sabbatarians," probably by Eössi himself. This book is the most important source whence a knowledge of the doctrines of the sect may be derived; it is the oldest monument of their literature, and contains paraphrases of the Psalms and other poetical passages of the Bible, metrical renderings of a few extracts from the Jewish prayer-book, older Unitarian hymns either unaltered or adapted to the new religious views, numerous original hymns and festive songs, and lastly, a collection of didactic poems. Of the 110 poetical compositions which are to be found in three manuscripts of this old Sabbatarian hymn-book, no less than 44 relate to the Sabbath, which, on account of the special regard in which its celebration was held, gave the sect the name they bear. Five songs belong to the New Moon, 11 to the Festival of Passover, 6 to the Feast of Weeks, 6 to Tabernacles, 3 to the New Year and 1 to the Day of Atonement. Besides these, there are 3 funeral hymns, 26 hymns of varied contents, and 5 didactic poems.

The foregoing summary shows what position the Jewish festivals occupied in the ritual of the Sabbatarians. They kept, of course, only the festivals enjoined in the Pentateuch, for the Sabbatarians of the first period only recognised the Five Books of Moses as the religious law to which they were pledged. They did not celebrate Purim and Chanukah. But even the Mosaic Laws they did not observe in their entirety, for they kept the dietary laws only up to a certain limit, and circumcision not at all. The Sabbath played the most important part in their religious life, probably for this reason: that

it brought the contrast between them and Christianity most prominently into view. They called the Sabbath celebration a "spiritual marriage," and adorned themselves for it in wedding attire. The Sabbath service consisted of prayers and hymns, introduced and concluded by the sermon or "instruction." One of the Sabbatical hymns mentions among the requisites of a proper observance of the Sabbath, "study of the holy law, feeding the poor, moderation in living, cheerfulness of disposition"; in another it is said: "Let man first hallow himself, then the Sabbath of the Lord." Although the feast of the first of Tishri is not designated the New Year festival in the Pentateuch, yet they celebrated it as the "New Year" with special emphasis, as a contrast to the "papal invention of the Christian new year." In attempting to understand this celebration of the Jewish festivals by the older Sabbatarians, it must be remarked as particularly characteristic, that they maintained that, in adhering to these observances, they were following the example and teaching of Jesus. "He who keeps not the Sabbath will have no portion in the inheritance of Christ"; they celebrated "the Passover of Israel, according to the command of our Christ." They bound up with the Passover festival (in accordance with the views which they entertained regarding the millennium) the hope of the future redemption which Jesus will bring, in order to build up his millennial kingdom.

In other respects, also, it is impossible to overlook the Jewish-Christian character of Sabbatarianism. They regard Jesus as greater than Moses and the prophets; call him "our Christ," "Lord Jesus," "King," even "the son of God"; the last, however, in the sense that all deserve to be called "sons of God" who are free from sin. For the most part they reverence him as the Messiah, as the Deliverer proclaimed by the prophets. On the other hand, however, they accentuated his purely human nature, and laid stress on the belief that his mission had for its object not the destruction but the maintenance of the Law. The Apostles in their teaching turned away from the Old Testament, only because "desiring as much as possible to spare heathens, who were weak and quite unused to the Law, they did not wish to force everything upon them at once." Jesus himself, however, "was a Jew both in nationality and religion; he preached the Jewish law and drew men to Moses and the prophets. His Apostles too were all Jews, taught the Jewish faith and kept it themselves." Whoever, therefore, would be a true follower of Jesus and the Apostles must obey the Mosaic Law in all things, as the Jews have always done and still do.

The one thing for which the Sabbatarians reproached the Jews, was that they refused to recognise Jesus as the Messiah. In spite of this, however, the Jews are still God's chosen people even in their dispersion. "There is no man, no people, no nationality under heaven whom God has chosen like the Jews." The Sabbatarians frequently declared that they joined themselves to Israel, and felt themselves Jews. In a Sabbath hymn occurs the following: "We have chosen the observance of Thy law, we have found delight in the camp of Israel, despite his miserable lot." And in another song: "Not Abraham was our father, neither are we the remnant of his seed; but we are sprung from the house of Japheth, sons of ignorant heathens . . . Yet in Thee, our gracious Father, delight and exult our heart, our soul, and our mouth; though we were heathens, yet hast Thou turned unto us and hast made us sons of great Abraham." In one hymn they express their thanks for their conversion to the Law: "Thou hast brought us forth from this worldly blindness, hast delivered us from the hell of errors, from danger, sin, death, from the torment of fiery hell."

Another way in which the Sabbatarians demonstrated their accession to Judaism was by their strict exclusion of Christian ceremonies. They were most determined in their repudiation of baptism, especially infant baptism, which had been already discarded by F. David, but which the Unitarian Church had re-introduced. They declared the Christian festivals to be inventions of the popes, and even protested against the ringing of church bells. They regarded the Lord's Supper, not as a new institution of Jesus, but as an old Jewish custom. On the first night of Passover they ate unleavened bread, "the bread of the Messiah," calling to mind the Redeemer, who had appeared, and would one day come again. The ethics underlying the old hymn-book of the Sabbatarians reflect the principles of Jewish moral teaching, and of such Christian moral teaching as is closely connected with the Jewish. They paraphrased the command to love one's fellow-men thus: "What is pleasing to thee, that must thou practise towards others," and further, "What I do not wish for myself from others, that I am not bound by in the case of others." On the other hand, concerning the New Testament behest to love one's enemies, we find the following: "Anything impossible which transcends the law, God requires of no one." A hymn contains the exhortation "to pray with pure earnest heart for those who persecute us." Practical humanity and benevolence are commended and glorified in a host of varied sayings. One who might have done good and omitted to do it commits a heinous

sin. On festivals we ought "to rejoice and to give joy to others, to let the poor share in all good." Debauchery and excessive drinking are condemned as capital crimes. Fulfilment of civil duties, respect for authority and for the laws of the country, are enjoined in the name of religion. Yet the limitation expressed in the following strophe is characteristic of the position of the Sabbatarians as a sect who were harassed in the practice of their faith: "Let us fear and honour our princes, let us honour the judges and their names, let us submit to their word according to God's will, but in no wise honour them against God's will."

VI.

The legal enactments, which were designed to crush and prevent the further spread of Sabbatarianism as disseminated by F. David's teachings and confirmed by Andreas Eössi, did not achieve this result. In the year 1595 the Diet of Fehérvár (Karlsburg) passed a law for the suppression of the Sabbatarians; the voyvode Michael, who usurped the princely dignity of Transylvania, ordered their punishment and the confiscation of their possessions in 1600; Sigmund Rakóczy, made a similar regulation in the year 1607. Three years later a Diet, held in Bistritz under Gabriel Báthory, passed a law concerning the punishment of those "numerous persons in the country who follow Jewish beliefs and Jewish rites, and utter blasphemies against God." And in the year 1618—the same year which ushered in the Thirty Years' Religious War—Prince Gabriel Bethlen found himself necessitated to lay before the deputies assembled in Klausenburg a law "against the Sabbatarians or Judaizers." These severe laws and regulations, so often repeated, did not, indeed, remain a dead letter. In the year 1600 the books and writings of the Sabbatarians were confiscated and burnt at Maros-Vásárhely; new persecutions were continually being devised against their property, their liberty and their lives. In the hymn-book the lamentations of the oppressed and tormented sufferers for their faith's sake find frequent vent. In one hymn we find them wailing thus: "What means it that they afflict us thus in the cause of truth? . . . For the sake of our creed we are obliged to forsake father and mother, our sweet home, wife and child, house and heritage, and all on which life hangs. Much misery must we endure, wandering from place to place; much disgrace must we suffer." Yet the fact that in so short a period the laws against the Sabbatarians had to be enacted afresh testifies to their defectiveness as well as to the failure which

attended their execution. It was just at this time that Transylvania passed through one of the most chequered and turbulent periods of its history, and the internal disorders and foreign wars diverted attention from the sectaries. On the other hand, persecution had only the effect of confirming them still more in their religious zeal, and they looked down with pity upon their opponents in faith who oppressed and abused them. The passionate hope that ultimate victory would crown their down-trodden faith, aroused in the Sabbatarians of Maros-Vásárhely the assurance that the Mohammedan Turks were appointed to the task of establishing the true faith in their country. They despatched a letter to Pasha Sinan, who was engaged in war with Prince Sigmund Báthory, in which they declared that they, "who likewise eat no swine's flesh and acknowledge God's unity, have arrived at the conclusion that things cannot longer continue thus, and that the One God will deliver the power into the hands of the mighty Emperor of Turkey and his people." The letter was intercepted, and its senders were punished or were compelled to flee. The Sabbatarians increased, as one of their hymns phrases it, "from day to day." Their creed found an increasing number of adherents among the Székelys, and exclusively among them. For the most part these converts came from the Unitarian Church, but some joined direct from the Reformed community. In Maros-Vásárhely, for instance, almost the whole Reformed body became Sabbatarians. Sabbatarianism naturally gained most of its followers in the neighbourhood of the residence of its founder, Eössi. It established itself chiefly in a number of villages—tradition counts thirty-two of them—but also in towns, such as Maros-Vásárhely, Klausenburg, Torda, Körös-patak, Székely-Keresztúr, and even outside Transylvania—as, for instance, in Makó. Besides agriculturists and artisans, many of the inferior and superior nobility belonged to the Sabbatarian body. Among them, too, were some who occupied exalted offices of State. The Prince Stefan Bocskai, in his will written in the year 1606, appointed three executors, two of whom—Court-preacher Alvinczi and Simon Péchi, then Secretary of State—were Sabbatarians. Of the four deputies representing Gabriel Bethlen, who, in his name, drew up the treaty concluded with the Emperor Matthias II. at Tyrnau in 1615, three were ardent Sabbatarians, viz., Thomas Boros (who had signed the letter to the Pasha Sinan, heading the list with his name); Simon Péchi, at that time already Chief Chancellor of the country; and Francis Balássy, senior, whom the popular tradition of the Székelys names as the founder of the sect.

Notwithstanding their rapid growth, the Sabbatarians of

this epoch formed no congregations, nor had they any recognised clergy. Generally—as was later also the case—the more zealous and well-informed members of the sect discharged the functions of precentor and preacher. In the year 1606 they held their first Synod at Udvarhely, for the purpose of settling common religious rites and forms. As the Synod had been interdicted by Sigmund Rakóczy, the Regent of Transylvania, in the name of Bocskai, the meetings were held in secret. At one of these gatherings the calendar was so adapted as to secure the simultaneous celebration of New Moon and Festivals. To understand this act, it must be remembered that no Jews dwelt in the whole country of the Székelys, and that a Jewish Calendar belonged so literally to the class of rarities, that in 1620 Péchi caused one to be bought in Constantinople for two ducats.

The open breach between the Sabbatarians and Unitarianism, as adherents of which the former still thought they had the right to regard themselves, took place in 1618, when a Synod of Unitarians at Erdö-Sz. György formally excommunicated the heretics from the Unitarian Church. At the same moment, however, the Reformed Bishop, to whom Gabriel Bethlen had granted full power to execute the laws directed against the Sabbatarians, entrusted the clergy of his own church with the task of re-converting them to the Christian faith.

VII.

The man who was to bring Sabbatarianism in Transylvania to its prime—who was to develop its full power and make it approach nearer and nearer to Judaism—was the individual already several times referred to, Simon Péchi; an historical figure of the highest interest, as much on account of his personal changes of fortune as for his public acts as a statesman, to say nothing of his secret activity in the character of of guide and honoured head of the sect founded by Andreas Eössi. As regards his life, which legend has illumined with its lustre, his great grandson Baron Alexius Orbán, left behind him in his will (1740) a few particulars resting upon trustworthy family tradition. Born in Hungary before 1570, Simon Péchi came in early youth to Transylvania. After finishing his studies he became a schoolmaster at the Unitarian School in Szent-Erzsébet, the residence of Andreas Eössi. The latter engaged him as tutor to his children, and at the same time entrusted him with the management of his property. Eössi exerted himself to secure for the highly-

gifted and learned youth a brilliant future, his object being to be able to place in the young man's hands the destiny and doctrines of his sect. He sent him upon journeys, provided with letters of introduction from the Prince. Péchi spent a considerable time in Constantinople, North Africa, Rome, Naples, Spain, Portugal and France. Having increased his already considerable knowledge of Oriental and European languages, he returned to Transylvania in 1599 after an absence of several years, and found that meanwhile Eössi had adopted him as his son, and had appointed him his sole heir. Soon afterwards Eössi died, and Péchi, now as rich as he was learned and shrewd, began a brilliant public career under the various reigning princes who followed each other in rapid succession. In 1608 he married Judith Kornis, becoming thereby related to the most prominent families of the country. Under Gabriel Bethlen he filled the highest public office, for eight years holding the appointment of Chancellor of Transylvania. In this capacity, he was entrusted by the Prince with the most important missions and affairs of State, and rose higher and higher in respect, influence and wealth, so that it was generally thought that he was at that time the greatest man of the Principality. After the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, Péchi also took part in Bethlen's campaigns and conducted the negotiations with the Emperor Ferdinand II. For reasons not clearly explained, this brilliant career, so full of excellent service, was suddenly and violently interrupted. By command of Bethlen he was deprived of his liberty, and for three and a-half years was kept in strict custody at Szamos-ujvár. This event formed a turning-point, pregnant with results affecting not only the life of Péchi, but the development of Sabbatarianism.

Up to this time Péchi had passed before the public eye as a Unitarian and a very good Christian, but his connection with Eössi proves sufficiently that in secret he had long been a Sabbatarian. There are, besides, more direct proofs of this. The most important of these is the fact that the old hymn-book of the Sabbatarians contains two long festival hymns, composed by him long before his downfall; one for the new moon, a free adaptation of a well-known Hebrew prayer, the other for the feast of Passover. During his long imprisonment, he spent his days, as he himself says in his letters, which abound in Biblical reminiscences, "in weeping, prayer, and perusing writings." By the latter term are to be understood the Biblical writings, especially those of the Old Testament. When he again obtained his freedom, he lived in complete retirement until the death of Bethlen which happened in 1529,

devoting his time and abilities to Sabbatarianism—though at first cautiously and in secret. Shortly after his imprisonment, and perhaps even owing to his initiative, the influx of Sephardic Jews from Turkey into Transylvania took place. Bethlen granted them full freedom as regards their worship, and likewise the right of omitting all distinction of dress from Christians. Contact with these followers of Judaism, who neither in respect of appearance nor culture afforded any reason for derision or contempt, and who for the most part occupied respected positions, must have exerted a stimulating influence upon the Jewish aspirations and religious views of those Sabbatarians who were tending towards Judaism. Péchi in particular had now the advantage of putting himself without trouble in possession of works of Jewish literature, and with their help he developed during his retirement a rich literary activity. Among his collection of books were to be found—as may be inferred from his writings—editions and translations of the Bible and of the Talmud and its commentaries, of the more distinguished Jewish exegetists of the Middle Ages, and various works treating of the Jewish ritual and Jewish ethics. Those of his writings which were written for the purpose of propagating Sabbatarianism, he strove to disseminate by means of manuscript copies, since he dared not publish them.

VIII.

It was only after the death of Bethlen that the ex-chancellor, who, in spite of the loss of his public honours and the larger portion of his estates, was still greatly respected, emerged from his cautious reserve. While on the one hand he endeavoured to recover his possessions, which had been taken from him without legal sentence, on the other he boldly manifested his adherence to the Sabbatarian faith. He held open intercourse with the Jews who had settled in Klausenburg, arranged his household in Szent-Erzsébet entirely after the Jewish manner, and kept the Sabbath, together with all his domestics, although he would not allow his dependents to work on Sunday either. He likewise observed the other Jewish ordinances, and constrained his family to practise them. He organised a synagogue in his place of residence, where service was held every Sabbath, and a portion read from the Torah. In other districts, also, the Sabbatarians held public service, and for this purpose claimed the use of the Unitarian churches. This, for instance, was the case in the village Bözöd-Ujfalu, which, indeed, was under Péchi's

"patronage," and in which the Sabbatarians have maintained their position for the longest period. At the same time Péchi continued his literary activity, and, in particular, wrote his main work, viz., his compendium of prayers and ritual compositions, derived from various Jewish sources, by means of which he introduced Jewish prayers, and made his followers acquainted with the less important customs of the Jewish religion also. With this work the religious practice of the Sabbatarians, which hitherto had been undefined and uncertain, received a specific foundation, which, however, had its roots entirely in Judaism. The Sabbatarians were by Péchi, to a certain extent, brought near to Judaism.

With this firmer consolidation of the Sabbatarian faith in the period following Bethlen's death, its spread among the adherents of the various sects in Transylvania went hand in hand. The political circumstances of the country, in part also the authority of Péchi, brought about the result that the severe laws against the sects—one was issued by the Diet of 1635—remained inoperative, and Sabbatarianism stood about this time at the height of the development of its powers.

IX.

Yet the storm was already gathering which brought catastrophe upon Péchi and his followers. Prince George Rákóczy I., after having emerged triumphantly from the struggle with Johann Bethlen and the Turks allied with him, put the laws against the Sabbatarians into execution with great zeal, and with the determined resolve to make the Judaizing schismatics feel this time the full rigour of the law. On the 1st of July (1638), a commission, consisting of members of the four recognised religions, met at Deés, and, having constituted itself into a judicial court—the proceedings of which, being well prepared beforehand, were brief and rapid—sentenced to loss of life and goods the Sabbatarians who had been summoned to appear and who were convicted of Judaism, as well as all who by a certain date, fixed beforehand, would not have declared their adherence to one of the four recognised religions. The majority of the sentences were only executed as regards that portion which decreed the confiscation of property, whether fixed or movable. Only in one single case was the death sentence fulfilled: in the case of all the other condemned persons it was commuted into confinement within a stronghold. Many hundreds—so relates a contemporary—were conveyed to the various castles at Várad,

Székelyhid, Jenö, Déva, Fogaras, Szamos-ujvár, Kövár, and "chains enough could not be forged for them."

Péchi himself had not gone to Déva, owing to illness. An examination of witnesses was, therefore, held in the town where he resided, and as a result judgment was pronounced upon him, which decreed the loss of his life and property. At Kövár the hoary and ailing old man suffered a second time the pangs of imprisonment. However, bail having been furnished by the foremost deputies of the principality, he was allowed to go free. He had to take an oath to renounce Sabbatarianism, and not to pass the frontiers of Transylvania without permission. He lived on for several years, outwardly attached to the Reformed faith, for the most part occupying himself with the management of the small portion of his estate left in his possession, and died in 1642, or 1643, at the age of more than seventy-five years. His burial-place cannot be discovered. The traditional story of the Sabbatarians runs to the effect that Péchi fled with a number of his followers to Moldavia, and afterwards to Constantinople, where he became director of the Government printing department.

After the death of George Rákóczy, the prosecution of the Sabbatarians was continued by his successors. But the strength of the sect was broken by the vigorous measures adopted at Deés. The members of rich and respected families who had belonged to it preferred to be restored to the quiet possession of their estates by returning to one of the recognised religions, chiefly the Reformed. Eössi and Péchi's work, the creed and religious practice of the Sabbatarianism, returned to the obscurity in which it had been fostered and perfected. In the neighbourhood of the residence of its two founders, among the country folk belonging to a few districts of the country of the Székelys, many secretly held fast to a faith rendered still dearer to them by the martyrdom which the best of them had suffered.

X.

A new period of persecution against the remnant of the Sabbatarians begins with the year 1717, when Transylvania came under Austrian domination. Many of these poor oppressed people, punished by the confiscation of their possessions, emigrated to Turkey, while others—especially in the village of Bözöd-Ujfalu—obeying compulsion, became Catholics, at the same time, however, clinging fast to Sabbatarianism

in secret, in spite of all prohibitions and all the measures adopted for keeping them in check. In the course of time many even of these pseudo-Catholics took refuge by means of emigration from the coercion practised against them. During the closing three decades of the last century, there existed at Adrianople a whole colony of Sabbatarians, who had gone over to Judaism, as we learn from a letter written by one of their number, named Joseph Kovács, in 1778. Among other things, he writes to his parents as follows:—"We Hungarians are here all together, we are called Ger Sido (Jewish proselytes) . . . . I received the name of Joseph ben Abraham, and so the priests call me up to the reading of the Holy Law. Every one pays me respect here, even the chief priests. My work, too, is not injurious to my body. . . . . I am a bookbinder, and live well, for the bread is beautifully white, just like linen, and I drink the best red wine to my heart's content." To his brothers he writes: "I beg of you not to trouble our dear father and mother; but if you would come hither do not leave our parents behind." Then he interlards his letter with a quotation from the hymn-book: "I pray to God that he may bring us together even in this life in the land of Israel, that he may send us salvation speedily in our days and gather his sons to Jerusalem; where we, together with our king the holy Messiah, shall dwell in our own land, where, united with the chosen, we shall win a crown with those who are crowned; where we shall settle with our father Abraham." It is curious to observe, how in this simple son of the Székely country, love for his own in the distant home is joined with the satisfaction of having found the means of a comfortable living in the new home; how he dwells with pride on his new Jewish name, and on the respect which he enjoys among the heads of the Synagogue; and how in the quotation from the old hymn-book of his forefathers, he gives expression to the Messianic hope, which from the very beginning had been a living aspiration with the Sabbatarians, and, indeed, formed a fundamental dogma of their faith.

The famous Edict of Tolerance, published by the Emperor Joseph II. (1781), which improved in a liberal spirit the relations of the recognised religions only, made the condition of the Sabbatarians still worse. New adverse judgments were pronounced and further emigration took place. During the first three decades of our century a considerable portion of the Catholic Sabbatarians, in order to escape the annoyance to which they were subjected from the spiritual authorities, went over to the Reformed religion—of course again only outwardly. But while outwardly they professed Christianity,

their connection with Judaism had become closer and closer. The Sabbatarians observed with the greatest strictness not only the Sabbath, but likewise the Jewish dietary laws, and by every possible device they evaded the practice of Christian religious customs. Although after Péchi there was no kind of literary productiveness among them, yet they preserved and copied the old hymn-books of their sect, and especially the writings of Péchi, his prayer-book and book of rites, works resting entirely upon Jewish sources. In the first half of this century the influence of the strictly orthodox Jews residing in their neighbourhood also made itself felt. The Sabbatarians had become Jews before they openly embraced Judaism. A Christian observer, in a description written in the year 1855, mentions, among other things, the following particulars concerning the Sabbatarians of Bözöd-Ujfalu:—"The thirty-eight Sabbatarian families (about 150 souls) outwardly belong for the most part to the Reformed Faith, several, however, are Unitarians, only very few Greek-Catholics. On Sunday they visit the respective churches and listen with wrapt attention whenever the clergymen cite quotations or narrative incidents from the Old Testament. On Christian festivals they keep away from church. On the Sabbath they hold Divine service at home; but on the rest of their Jewish celebrations they meet in the house of a member which is devoted to the purposes of a Synagogue, on which occasions Sabbatarians living elsewhere, especially those of Nagy-Ernye, attend. The service is conducted by one of the members, who is chosen Rabbi, whom, however, they frequently change for another. Much superstition is mixed up with their belief. They can all read and write. They preserve their traditions faithfully, and boys of eight to ten years old can be heard talking about the history, adorned with legend, of Sabbatarianism and of Simon Péchi. Notwithstanding their communicativeness they are very reserved as regards the books of their sect. They give their children for the most part Old Testament names, especially the name Moses. At marriages and burials they perform Jewish customs, before the Christian ones demanded by established religion take place. After marriage in church the Jewish marriage is solemnised. The women have their hair cut off. A Sabbatarian girl never marries a Christian. Christian girls who would enter into matrimony with Sabbatarians must first pass a year of probation."—In the same year (1855), one of the most distinguished ecclesiastical princes of our time endeavoured by his eloquence to convert the Sabbatarians to Catholicism. Ludwig Haynald (at present Cardinal and Archbishop of Kalocsa), at that time

Bishop of Transylvania, betook himself for that purpose to Bözöd-Ujfalu, without, however, obtaining the least result.

In the year 1867 a Unitarian author wrote a historical sketch of the Sabbatarians, and finished by saying that it was an open secret that there were still Sabbatarians in existence in several villages of the Székely country. This fact was soon destined to be a secret no longer. The restoration of the Hungarian constitution in the year just named, and the emancipation of the Jews which followed closely upon that event (22nd December, 1867), resulted in a resolve on the part of the Sabbatarians of Bözöd-Ujfalu and Nagy-Ernye, where, likewise, a few Sabbatarians lived, to openly embrace Judaism. Two old men, Paul Stefan Kovács and Moses Kovács underwent circumcision, and, having received the sign of the covenant, became Jews. Nearly all the remaining members of the sect followed their example. The matter naturally made a great stir, the more so because the Sabbatarians, by going over to Judaism, had acted against the constitutional law of Hungary, which to-day does not even permit conversion from any Christian form of religion to Judaism. The Supreme Court of Transylvania pointed out, in a statement addressed to the Government, that neither was the law prohibiting Sabbatarianism repealed, nor was conversion to Judaism permitted. That noble and liberal-minded Minister of Public Worship and Education, Baron Joseph Eötvös, made answer that in religious questions the application of force from without was as much opposed to the interests of religion as to those of the State. The Sabbatarians thus served to clear up the fact that conversion to Judaism is not allowed by law, but that no coercive measures whatever may be employed to bring back to Christianity those who have become Jews. In pursuance of this decree, dated 12th May, 1869, the proselytes of Bözöd-Ujfalu were able to avow, publicly and without molestation, the faith which they had secretly practised for more than two hundred years. The registers of the newly-formed little Jewish congregation record the first birth on 8th January, 1868, the first marriage on 15th January, 1869, and the first death on 24th January, 1869. A Jewish author (Adolf Dux) who visited them in the year 1875, describes the Jewish Székelys of Bözöd-Ujfalu in the following terms:—"The men went barefooted, and had 'harisnyas' on—narrow trousers made of the coarse woollen stuff which is spun and woven in the houses of the Székelys. As they wore neither vests nor jackets, the ceremonial garment, which is known by the name of 'Ten Commandments'—*i.e.*, the Arba Kanfoth—was visible above their shirts. I was especially struck by a

young fellow with a brown, almost beardless, face; below his felt cap there waved down upon both his temples the ringlets of hair which, among Polish Jews, are called 'Peies,' and although not so artistically twisted as those of the latter, yet they were sufficiently developed to transform, by a single touch, the physiognomy of a Székely into a Jewish one. Allied with this external characteristic was a peculiar expression in the face which I should like to describe as the Jewish revelation of race as expressed by the eyes. At this I called to mind Disraeli, who asserts in one of his novels that the Jewish-Christian idea lends a Semitic character to the physiognomy of all the nations which have accepted Christianity. These Székelys, who have acted up to Judaism for two hundred years partially, and now for several years wholly, have gradually received an impress in their expression of countenance which, if not completely, yet, to a great extent, stamps them as Jews." (Compare with this a similar observation by a doctor as regards the Russian Sabbatarians who adopted Judaism, which has been quoted above.)

Ten years later (1885), during a summer sojourn in Transylvania, Dr. Moritz Beck, Rabbi of Bucharest, visited the proselytes of Bözöd-Ujfalu. He found the congregation in a despondent state. Of the thirty-nine families of which it is composed, thirty-three are of Sabbatarian, and five of Jewish origin. Two families had in the previous year returned to Christianity, an ominous sign of the decay of the long cherished fidelity to the inherited faith. The children of the school-going age partook of no instruction, for the congregation was so impoverished that it could not pay the teacher whom it had formerly had. Their Shochet—a man unsatisfactory in every respect—had not the ability to teach. The Synagogue, which had been built fifteen years before, and the communal bath threatened to fall into decay. The little congregation saw the fundamental conditions of its continuance menaced by the worst enemies—its own poverty, and indifference to the religion which it had joined with so much confidence and zeal. This gloomy narrative of the warm-hearted Rabbi of Bucharest should be the means of effecting a better state of things. The Hungarian-Jewish review (*Magyar-Zsidó Szemle*),[1] in which the account appeared, at once set on foot a fund for the maintenance of the latest and yet already old branch on the tree of Hungarian Judaism. The result of this appeal, though not brilliant,

[1] This journal appeared seven years ago under the editorship of the writer of this article and Dr. Joseph Bánóczi.

was yet in so far satisfactory that the work of help could be begun, whereby the congregation of the erstwhile Sabbatarians could be supported in the maintenance of their institutions. Worthy co-religionists residing in the neighbourhood of Bözöd-Ujfalu assist the proselyte community with valuable advice and practical help, so that when the first difficulties are surmounted they may pursue an existence worthy of their past, and become a religious society loyal to their faith and practising the teachings of Judaism. A number of years, however, must elapse, during which the work of rescue thus begun must be continued. This, in the first instance, is undoubtedly the duty of the Hungarian Jews; yet to contribute towards such an object may well be the aim of others outside Hungary, to whom the cause and honour of Judaism are dear, and who would fain prevent the inglorious martyrdom of penury befalling these descendants of martyrs of the Jewish faith.

XI.

While the descendants of the followers of Eössi and Péchi have emerged from the concealment in which they kept themselves as a secret sect for two hundred years, the literature of the Sabbatarians is still hidden in the obscurity of a number of manuscripts, which have been preserved to the present day. With the exception of a few religious hymns, no portion of this, in many respects, remarkable literature has been made generally accessible through the printing-press. To the historian of the Sabbatarians belongs the great merit that he has cleared up, not only the history of the sect, but also that of their literature, and has made it possible, for the first time, to obtain a clear idea of its contents and compass. With what difficulties he had to contend may be judged from the single circumstance that in regard to a particularly important manuscript he had to depend on extracts only. The use of the manuscript itself was denied him through the religious narrowness and scruples of its then possessors, the heads of a Unitarian educational institution. On the other hand, there stood at his command a considerable mass of material in the form of manuscript, at which he worked with critical circumspection, examining its contents with the utmost minuteness; and with the help of this he has furnished an account of the literary productions of the Sabbatarians, which is remarkably rich in new information. Only those portions of the description which are of greatest importance and command general

interest, are here brought to the knowledge of the readers of this review.

The fact that the productions of the Sabbatarian literature —poetical as well as prose—which belong to the end of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries, remained from the beginning locked up in the narrow sphere of a sect, and that the benefits of the art of printing were denied them, explains satisfactorily why the historians of the Hungarian national literature, which at that precise period had received an upward impulse in all fields of thought, took such little notice, or no notice at all, of these productions. And yet even from the point of view of literary history, they occupy, both on account of the character of their language and their intrinsic merits, a prominent position, and, in fact, the religious songs of the Sabbatarians are already beginning to be thought the most distinguished products of the Hungarian religious poetry of that epoch. Yet it is not this point of view that can here be considered as of chief importance in the consideration of this remarkable literature. What interests us here is rather its relation to Judaism and its literature. It will be easy to gather, even from a short review, such as is offered in the following, how much of significant, one might almost say unique, interest is yielded by these intellectual productions of an insignificant sect.

As regards the poetry of the Sabbatarians, it is, in response to the need which called it into existence, entirely religious in its tenor, being contained in hymn-books which were compiled for a practical purpose, viz., for use in private and public worship on Sabbaths and Festivals. We learn from Kohn what are the contents of the older hymn-book, which has been preserved in a number of codices, written before the turning-point in the development of Sabbatarianism which was marked by Péchi's fall (1621). These codices supplement each other. Among the portions of this older hymn-book, the contents of which have been fully described above (see p. 473), there are a number of didactic poems, among them one in 15 sections, which proceeds from the pen of the founder of the sect, Andreas Eössi, and which contains a polemical exposition of his doctrines. The names of the authors, among whom Péchi must be reckoned, are seldom mentioned. The poems of this older hymn-book mark the first stage in the growth of Sabbatarianism, and in spite of their professed Jewish character (forming as they do a rich poetical anthology suited to the cycle of the Jewish festivals), and in spite also of the influence of the literature of Jewish tradition already perceptible in them, the dogmatic connection of Sabba-

tarianism with Christianity is still manifest from their contents. Complete severance from the soil of Christianity and the infusion of a purely Jewish spirit, are revealed in the Sabbatarian poetry of the second epoch, which is almost entirely possessed by the mighty figure of Péchi. Partly in the prayer-book of Péchi, of which more will be said below, partly in the later hymn-books of the Sabbatarians (of which the oldest known copy dates from the year 1720) are to be found hymns for the various festivals, the greater portion of which (22 in number) consist of poetical translations of parts of the Sephardic Festival book (Machzor), while others are free versions of single pieces from that liturgy. Among the translations is to be found a rendering of the hymn יגדל. It may be here mentioned, as a curiosity of literature no less than as showing the contact of creeds, that this hymn, containing as it does a recital of Maimonides' thirteen articles of faith, has been incorporated, with trifling changes, into the hymn-book, which is still in use, of the Unitarian Church of Transylvania. As another product of Sabbatarian poesy, may be mentioned the Translation of the Psalms by Nicholas Fazakas Bogáthi, the first paraphrase of the Psalms in the Hungarian language. That its author possessed a remarkable knowledge of Hebrew is proved by the fact that in his explanation of the Psalms he made use of the three most celebrated Jewish commentaries, those of Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and David Kimchi.

Compared with the hymn-book of the first Sabbatarian epoch, the prose of that period which has come to our knowledge, occupies but a humble place. A manuscript has been preserved containing a collection of prose pieces by various authors belonging to 1600-1628. They consist of prayers, partly translated from the Hebrew prayer-book, articles of faith, groups and elucidations of Biblical precepts, polemical writings against Christian dogmas. The prose productions of the second epoch, on the other hand,—or rather, since Simon Péchi is their sole author, the prose writings of the learned and zealous chancellor—contain a surprising wealth of material. The most important of them is the prayer-book of the Sabbatarians, which was in use down to the most recent times, and has therefore been preserved in numerous copies. Kohn proves by convincing arguments, and in consonance with the verbal tradition still prevailing in Bözöd-Ujfalu, that this comprehensive work, occupying five to six hundred closely written pages, was composed by Péchi. It contains a translation, or rather an adaptation of the Hebrew prayer-book (Siddur) according to the Sephardic ritual, amplified by numerous passages extracted from the festival prayer-book

(Machzor) of the Sephardic Jews (especially for Passover and the Day of Atonement). Besides this, however, it contains in connection with particular prayers, directions concerning Jewish rites and ceremonies, as well as various religious and moral meditations and admonitions. How Péchi in this reproduction of the prayer-book was continually guided by a regard for its practical object, viz., its use as a prayer-book by his Sabbatarian co-religionists, is shown by the circumstance that in those passages where the praying Israelite speaks of his forefathers, Péchi makes use of turns and paraphrases, which would be intelligible in the mouths of worshippers who belong to Israel by conviction, but not by race. For instance in the blessings of the morning prayers, the words "who crownest Israel with glory," become "who crownest Israel and all faithful believers in thee with glory." Or where in the prayer-book it is said "Thou didst deliver us from Egypt," with Péchi the phrase becomes "Thou didst deliver thy people from Egypt."

Next to the prayer-book, Péchi's most important work is his translation of the Psalms, which has been preserved in a single copy, partly written with his own hand and entirely revised by him. This prose translation of the Psalms, which is distinguished for its pithy language, is accompanied by a commentary, which contains both philological and exegetical elucidations, and also general observations regarding author, occasion, and contents of individual Psalms. In this commentary is included an astounding mass of learning. Except the Vulgate and Sebastian Münster's Commentary on the Psalms, the sources whence Péchi derived the material for his explanations were Jewish — Targum, Talmud, Midrash Shocher-tôb, the Commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Yachya, but especially David Kimchi. A further remarkable fact to be mentioned is that the Commentary contains likewise polemical *excursuses* against Christian dogma. Another codex, 250 leaves in bulk, and likewise written for the most part by Péchi himself, contains a translation of the work *Mille di Aboth*, a commentary to the Ethics of the Fathers (Pirké Aboth), by Joseph Chayûn. This manuscript, like the Commentary on the Psalms, contains here and there specimens of beautiful Hebrew caligraphy, written by his own hand. Péchi had already translated the *Tractate Aboth* itself.

Péchi next devoted himself to making a paraphrase with annotations of the *Great Book of Commandments* (סמ"ג), by R. Moses, of Coucy, which is extant in one fragmentary Codex; a portion of this paraphrase from the 37th to the 124th prohibition has been preserved. This fragment is to

be found in a volume, the remaining contents of which consist of a transcript, written in the year 1705, of various works of Péchi's. These are: A translation of four sections of the work *Menorath Hamaor*, by Israel Alnaqwa, made from an edition of the book in Elias de Vidas's *Reshith Chochmah;* a translation of the ethical compendium *Orchoth Chayim* (also called *Hanhagah*), of R. Asher b. Jechiel; a translation of single passages from the Yalkut Shimeoni, the Tur, Shulchan Aruch, and the Agadic literature, as well as of the Baraitha of the thirteen rules of R. Ishmael, which forms an introduction to the Sifrâ.

Péchi likewise executed a translation of the Pentateuch, divided according to the weekly portions, and containing explanations at the end of each chapter, in which the commentary of Chiskiyah ben Manoach, entitled *Chazkuni*, is especially quoted. Of this translation a considerable fragment has been preserved, extending from the 5th chapter of the first book to the 12th chapter of the second.

The mere extent of the work of translation achieved by Péchi justifies of itself the verdict of Kohn that its author occupies a prominent place among Hebraists of non-Jewish origin, including those not of his own time. In this matter regard must also be had for the fact that Péchi wrote his works under the most difficult conditions—far from the assistance afforded by the Universities of the West, and without the help of learned Jews; dependent entirely and solely on the knowledge of languages he had acquired during his travels, extending over several years, and upon the energy of a mind filled and impelled by religious zeal. Still further stress must be laid on the circumstance that the language into which he translated—the Hungarian—had never been used before that time for the kind of matter which is contained in his translated works (excepting only that translations of the Bible existed). Indeed, in Jewish quarters, it is only in our own day that Jewish science has begun to be cultivated in the Hungarian language. By these works of his, which appeared three and a-half centuries ago, Péchi not only anticipated the latest literary efforts of the Hungarian Jews, but in faultless form, which reaches the highest literary level of his time, he transplanted products of Jewish literature into Hungarian which even now have not been translated into any other European tongue. The universal history of literature will have to register the fact that in the domain of translations from Jewish literature, Péchi has earned the right of priority for the Hungarian language.

Of still greater significance is the general interest attaching

to the poetry of the Sabbatarians. The religious aspirations of the followers of Judaism have at all times found satisfaction and expression in poetry written in Hebrew—exceptionally, also, in Chaldee. The classical poets of the Spanish-Arabian epoch composed their poems, even those not designed for the liturgy, in Hebrew only—never in Arabic. It was reserved for the humble singers among the Sabbatarians in Transylvania to use for the first time a different language from the Hebrew in Jewish worship; for, though their service was not conceived quite after the model of traditional Judaism, it, nevertheless, from the earliest times, gave expression to the ideas of Judaism, and, later on, fashioned itself more and more according to the Jewish form. Long before a German poem was admitted into the liturgy of the Synagogue in Hamburg, Hungarian hymns, designed for the glorification of the Sabbath and other Jewish festive seasons, were written and sung at Divine service with pious devotion. And, long ere the "Mendelssohn of the Machsor" (Heidenheim) translated the Piyut literature into pure German, and then only into prose, simple Székely peasants and artisans in a remote corner of Transylvania were deriving edification from translations out of that literature, which even now have not lost their value. Just as the last remnant of the Sabbatarians, the indigent Jewish congregation of Bözöd-Ujfallu, deserves the sincere and practical sympathy of every Jew, so the intellectual bequest of Sabbatarianism has a claim on the active interest of all friends and students of the literature of Judaism.

XII.

I hope I may be permitted to conclude this sketch of the history and literature of the Sabbatarians with an observation of a general character. Nine hundred years before the rise of the Hungarians, Eössi and Péchi, a nation racially connected with the Hungarians joined the religion of Israel. Bulan, King of the Chazars, embraced Judaism, and a long succession of Jewish kings ruled his people, at that time a powerful nation. It is well known that a literary interest also attaches to the conversion of the Chazars—the correspondence of the King of the Chazars with Chasdai Ibn Shaprut and the philosophic religious work of Jehudah Halevi form an everlasting memorial of that event. But more significant than this conversion of a heathen ruler in the early part of the Middle Ages seems to me to be the rise and continuance of the Sabbatarian sect in an epoch belonging to the modern

era, and in the midst of a purely Christian population. Proceeding from the initiative and the deep religious sentiments of a few spiritually gifted men, speedily finding a lodging among the wide ranks of nobility, in the civic and peasant classes, and then, after violent oppression, faithfully cherished by the religious sense of simple people, Hungarian Sabbatarianism offers the most brilliant example of the spiritual power which the Jewish religion is capable of exerting over the ranks of people of non-Jewish origin. It is true that Judaism does not lend itself to any kind of propagandism, but we acknowledge the glorious assurance which we have inherited from olden times, and to which we give expression in our daily prayers, that Judaism is destined to be the religion of all humanity. And thus we may be allowed to look back with satisfaction to a popular movement, arising without the employment of force, and without even a resort to measures of persuasion, through which respected followers of Christianity were led to seek in Judaism the satisfaction of their religious strivings, and to say to us, "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you" (Zechariah viii. 23).

W. Bacher.

JEWISH IDEALS.[1]

We are all of us artists in life, and very poor daubs most of us make of it. If we were to examine into the causes of this failure, which by universal consent is more general now-a-days than ever before in the world's history, we should find it, I fancy, in the multiplicity of ideals which are being held up before us as exemplars. The truth is, we are carrying the principle of being all things to all men a little too far. We desire to be ascetic with the Buddhists, and natural with the Greeks, law-abiding as the Romans, and free as the French, socialistic like the early Christians, and individualistic as the modern Briton. Doubtless, in the millennium, all these diverse ideals will be reconciled and fused into one perfect ideal of society; but, alas, the millennium is not yet. Meanwhile the presentation of all these ideals in their most attractive colours only produces the effect of making them all seem equally true and equally false, or, at least, one-sided.

I may seem to be only helping to make confusion still more confounded by proposing this evening to bring before your notice another set of ideals for your sympathetic admiration. But I hope to show that this is not the case. For among the principles of ethical action which seem to me to underlie the Jewish conception of life, that of rigid fidelity to the system of ideals into which you are born is, perhaps, the most conspicuous. I say "seem to me," for you must not take anything I am about to say as authoritative statement of Jewish views of life. I doubt, indeed, whether there exists any authority competent to speak in the name of all Jews on the *rational* basis of Jewish ideals. For speaking on such a subject before this Society, I am debarred from all reference to the theological basis on which Jews found their claim to live the Jewish life. I believe that life is, to quote your charter of incorporation, "capable of rational justification," which is tacitly taken to mean: apart from theological suppositions. The justification I shall offer shall not transgress that proviso, but it thereby becomes only a personal one, and is only

[1] A Lecture delivered before the Ethical Society, Sunday, May 12th, 1889.

founded on many years of reflection and observation of the facts of Jewish life, literature, and history. I suppose I share, with most members of this Society, that curious nineteenth century attitude towards our ancestral creed in which we stand as it were outside ourselves and attempt to look at our ideals and aspirations with the eyes of others. But yet we remain ourselves, and true to ourselves, during the process, and if we observe any flaws in our ideals, it is as if we were scanning critically a dear mother, wife or daughter. We may recognise in her some lapse or deviation from our ideal of perfect beauty, but yet we love her—but yet we love her.

After these preliminaries, let us to our theme. I have spoken above of a "system of ideals," and I wish first to develop that conception as a key to what I am to say further. When we examine any specific system of ethics—say the Buddhist or the Homeric, we are struck by the fact that in broad detail it almost exactly resembles our own. It was no discovery of the ancient Hebrews that man must not slay his fellow man, or forswear his faith, or steal what is not his own. No civil society could exist in which those principles were not recognised as binding. And what applies to the broader principles, applies in a large measure to the minor moralities. The content of the ethical code is everywhere among nations who can claim to be civilized practically the same. This is true of Judaism, even in its mediæval phases, when the terrible persecutions which Jews underwent might almost have justified anti-social interpolations. Jewish apologists have culled from Jewish writings of all time ethical maxims of the highest moral import, which vie in loftiness of spirit with those of the most favoured nations or creeds. A useful collection of these utterances has recently been compiled by a Jewish minister, the Rev. Morris Joseph, to whose *brochure, Jewish Ethics*,[1] I may refer those who doubt their existence, or who are otherwise interested in Jewish gnomic wisdom. For myself, I will venture to assume the practical identity of the contents of Jewish ethics with those of all the great religions, and am prepared in turn to grant the same to them.

I am more concerned to claim for Jews that they have been the first to grant this identity of the ethical principles adopted by humanity. I can illustrate this by a quotation from one of the few works written by Jews during the early middle ages in England, before they were expelled. Most of you will have read Browning's powerful poem "Rabbi Ben Ezra." Mr.

---

[1] Published at the office of the *Jewish Chronicle*. It is also included in the volume on *Religions of the World*, published by Messrs. Sonnenschein & Co.

Browning was probably unaware that the hero of his poem, Abraham ibn Ezra, a Spanish Jew of great attainments, an astronomer, grammarian, Biblical critic, mathematician, and traveller, visited England in 1158, and while here wrote a book on the Foundations of Religion (*Yesod Mora*), in which occurs the following passage on the Laws of Moses:—

> There is a fundamental law which commands us to observe all the divine enactments, positive and negative. This precept, "Ye shall serve the Lord your God" (Ex. xxiii. 25), includes all the laws to be kept by heart, word, or deed, whether primary laws or those serving to record them in memory. . . Many commands have lost their force, as that of hyssop (Ex. xii. 22), of the manna (ib. xix. 11). . . . Some commands are imposed on the whole people, as burnt offering, shew-bread, libations: others belong to certain distinct families, as the duties of a prince, of a high priest, and the rest of the priests and Levites, the number of whose duties is very great. Several precepts are given to male and female indiscriminately; some to men alone, as the redemption of the first-born; others to women alone, as concerning vows. . . . There are many laws relating to a certain time . . . but many laws depend neither on time nor anything else, and these are imposed on all, male and female, king, priests, rich and poor, Israelites and proselytes, whole and sick. There is one law for all, and such precepts are primary. These primary laws are ingrained in the mind . . . and were known by the power of the mind before the law was declared by means of Moses, and there are many of this kind as, *e.g.*, those of the decalogue except the Sabbath: these were only repeated by Moses . . . There are also commanded certain pious works by which we are reminded of the primary precepts, as the observance of the Sabbath in memory of the creation of the world, Passover, unleavened bread, tabernacles, inscriptions on our doors, phylacteries of hand and head, fringes of garments. . .
>
> All the precepts are to be referred to three things (1) to piety of the heart, (2) to words, (3) to deeds. And as unity is contained in every number, so the beginning of every pious act by deed or word is internal piety, without which all worship is false and of none avail.

There are two points to which I wish to draw your attention in this passage. The first is the remarkable statement—remarkable, that is, for a mediæval writer—that the primary laws of morality are ingrained in the human heart, and are not due to revelation, so that all human beings are cognisant of them, and they are binding on all. This is put more clearly, perhaps, by Ibn Ezra than any other mediæval Jewish thinker; but it underlies all Jewish thought and practice. Combined with the principle that salvation rests on works, it leads at once and logically to the dictum, "The pious of all nations have a part in the world to come"—a sentence which comes upon most people as a surprise, as emanating from a creed which is supposed to be so exclusive and narrow. It likewise accounts for the absence of all proselytising zeal which is characteristic of Judaism, and comes equally as a surprise to most persons. The second point I will here only advert to, and that is the full recognition of the necessary inwardness of morality. That I will refer to later on; but at present I wish to emphasise the Jewish recognition of the substantial

identity of the ethical code of all nations. But while we allow that the raw materials of ethics are the same in all the great creeds or ethical systems, we are far from asserting that the way in which these materials are built up into the Jewish and into other systems of ethics is by any means identical. In the house of ethics there are many mansions: the bricks may be the same in each, but the order of architecture varies vastly. To any system of ethics we may address numbers of questions which can receive divers answers. To which of the virtues does it give most prominence? What motives does it hold out for the performance of duty? How does it propose to inculcate morality on its adherents? And, lastly, what general principles does it posit by which it welds all the elements of morality into one system of ethics? It is these general principles that I propose to deal with to-night, under the name of "Jewish Ideals," for want of a better.

The first and most striking of these—the one that occurs doubtless to most of you as the characteristic side of Jewish ethics, as you know it in the Old Testament and in the contests of the New—is the conception of *Morality as Law*. This involves the idea that the details of morality can be expressed verbally, and codified somewhat in the form of a legal code, and can be taught as such. The moral life in Jewish conception consists in conformity to such a law: sin consists in transgression of any of its enactments. Now, this is at first sight incongruous with much that you have been accustomed to hear in this Society. Whenever I have had the pleasure of listening to any of your lecturers, whatever the theme has been, the central conception has always been to put forth the ideal of Morality as Freedom. "The Good consists in the Good Will, and the Good Will is the Free Will;" that is the kind of formula with which you are here familiar. Or to put it in another way, it is the intention that makes the morality of the act, not the conformity with any moral law imposed from without. True, to that we are all agreed. You will remember that Abraham ibn Ezra, in the passage quoted above, was as emphatic on this point as the most advanced Kantian can be. But the further question arises: How are you going to create good intentions in the human subject? Jewish ethics replies by inculcating the practice of good actions in conformity with the moral law.

Here we come upon one of those differences of stress which constitute the divergences of various moral systems. Jewish ethics and Christian ethics agree in saying that good acts are desirable and that good intentions are praiseworthy. But each lays stress on a different member of the pair. Jewish

ethics says: Do good acts and you will feel good: Christian ethics says: Feel good and you will do good. The contrast is as old as the breach between the two Churches: you are familiar with it as the contrast between the Letter and the Spirit, a way of putting the distinction which scarcely does justice to the Jewish attitude, as is but natural in polemical pamphlets. I do not feel called upon to decide between the two contrasting principles of moral training. In putting before you the Jewish view I do not defend, I expound. But I would point out that the matter in dispute is a question of pædagogics: in inculcating morality we are *ex hypothesi* dealing with the young, and I fail to see how else we are to proceed with them than by training them to acts. Freedom if you like for adults, but moral law for the growing spirit. And the freedom that is ultimately to be obtained by this means is not absence of all control but willing obedience to a law self-imposed. *Frei und eins mit dem Gesetz*, as Berthold Auerbach put it. And in developing this relation between Morality as Freedom and Morality as Law, I fancy I but interpret that saying of the man who first brought out the contrast: "I come not to annul the Law but to fulfil it." Another great Jew, Spinoza, also founds his conception of man's freedom on the notion of law. So far as I understand the fourth and fifth books of his *Ethics*, perhaps the most difficult of all philosophical reading, he bases Freedom on Law and does not oppose it to Law. Just at present one of the great wants of the age is the recognition of this conception of Morality as Law. A friend of mine even goes so far as to urge that a distinct Moral Code should be drafted, for instruction to children. Without entering into the question how far this is practicable, I would point out that the idea is eminently a Jewish one. I would also point out that a large part of morality is already codified as Law, and there is a distinct tendency to increase this amount. A few years ago it was a moral act to inform purchasers that certain articles were made in Germany; now-a-days it is legally obligatory. I do not mean to infer that all moral acts should become Acts of Parliament: they would cease to be moral acts, pure and simple, then. The truly moral act is that which is not punished by the law if left undone and is thus performed for its own sake; and of this character are the enactments of the so-called Jewish Law, which has no sanction but the approval of conscience. There was a kind of customary morality in England under the old *régime*, which partook of the same character though it was not formally codified. This has almost entirely disappeared, and there is nothing taking its

place. Now customary and conventional morality may not be the highest type of morals, but it is surely better than nothing at all, and that is practically what the urban lower classes are coming to, who attend no Church and have no recognised authority in any moral problem. The Talmud, with all its casuistic minutiæ, would be better than that state of things.

I have here incidentally touched upon the main charge that is brought against the idea of morality as law. There is in it a tendency to degrade moral acts into mere mechanical custom, as when prayer, the free intercourse between man and his Maker, may degenerate into a meaningless gabble or a custom like that of not eating pork may be raised to the same level as the moral principle of not telling lies. I will grant at once that there is this danger attaching to the Jewish conception of morality. But we have to reflect that the majority of men are creatures of habit, and only susceptible for the most part of a morality of conventions. Judaism accepts this fact and legislates for this class without at the same time preventing the rarer spirits from rising, as occasion serves, into the higher region of Morality as Freedom. Christianity battles strenuously against this tendency to convention which it calls the World, and enlists on its side the more enthusiastic spirits who form the noble army of its martyrs and saints. But it is only enabled to do this by crippling the free exercise of men's speculative powers, whereas Judaism leaves these almost entirely unfettered, and by the very exercise of legal controversy in moral matters tends to lay an almost exaggerated stress on intellect and its function in life. Each system, it will be seen, has its own disadvantages; Christianity fetters the intellect and fails to train the masses morally: Judaism tends to confuse morality, law and custom. The morality of the Jew may become merely conventional; the morality of the Christian may only result in gush.

Before I pass on, I would disabuse your minds of at least one misconception which clings about the Jewish idea of morality as law. And that is to regard the Law under the aspect of a burdensome yoke. As a matter of fact this is for the most part utterly erroneous, and is indeed incongruous with the other charge brought against Jewish morality of being conventional or customary. The Jewish child grows accustomed to the yoke, and so it ceases to be burdensome to the Jewish man. And in so far as the Law does demand some sacrifice from Jewish children, it performs a distinctly moral function as a training in self-restraint. At almost every

moment of its life, the Jewish child is taught to consider life a discipline, in which it has to learn to give up some of its selfish inclinations for the sake of a principle. The conception of the Jewish Law as a yoke is thus a distinctly moral principle.

Meanwhile, we may now direct a somewhat closer scrutiny at the Law with which morality is identified in Jewish conceptions. For practical purposes, it was sufficiently characterised and analysed in the extract from Abraham ibn Ezra, which has hitherto formed our text. The Law consists of (1) the primary laws of morality, (2) customs associated with certain seasons, and (3) customs commemorative of certain events. Now we have already seen that it is a characteristic of the Jewish system of ethics to raise these customs to the same level as the primary laws of morals. The grounds adduced for this by Jewish authorities are theological, and with these we are not at liberty to deal. But apart from theology, a fair case may be made out for the worship of

> Old Use and Custom, sisters grey,

as Lord Tennyson calls them in a passage that points to a defence of custom as a foster-sister of morality. The utility of custom in the moral life, it seems to me, is to create a fund of tender emotion which will be at the service of the moralities. The abuse of custom as we all know is its tendency to harden into superstition. The dislocation of custom among the English peasantry illustrates both. They are less superstitious but less considerate for others than they were in older days. Jewish customs also illustrate both, but I desire to regard them as illustrating the second great Jewish ethical principle, which differentiates it from others, and that is what I should term the *Holiness of Home.*

By Holiness I mean something specific and intimately connected with those customs of which we have just been speaking. I mean the association of certain times and seasons in the Jewish home with certain ceremonial customs regarded as sacred. These ceremonies become "object lessons" in religion and in morality. They are interesting historically in many ways, to two of which I wish to call your attention. A wicked wit has called Judaism a "religion of survivals;" and the epigram is the more biting since it contains the proverbial half-truth, though not in this instance the better half of truth. The dietary laws have been plausibly explained as a survival of totemism; the rite of Abraham is still practised by a majority of the non-civilised races; the objection to intermarriage is known elsewhere as the rule of endogamy, and

much of Jewish fidelity to faith and kindred bears a suspicious resemblance to ancestor-worship. The probabilities are that in their origin these were all savage, or as we used to term them, idolatrous customs, and it was the policy of the Mosaic legislators to raise these to a higher power, to use a mathematical expression, by connecting them, as they are now connected, with a purer faith. Just at present, however, I wish to point out that in the Judaic conception of the Holiness of the Home, there has been raised to a higher power the most moral and most touching side of the ancient religions. When we think of the noble and dignified type of character produced in the Greek and Roman world, we may be sure that there was something more in their religion than mere external pageantry and impure idolatry. And that purer side of their religion was represented by the worship of the Penates, or ancestral gods, of which we know but little in detail, but which clearly dominated the whole home life of the ancients, and, as has been shown by M. Fustel de Coulanges, was made the basis of their social organisation. Not a meal, not a family meeting occurred which was not ushered in by a solemn libation to the spirits of the ancestors who were conceived to be present and sanctified the whole of the home. Judaism preserves this noble trait of the ancient world with the difference of regarding the spirit that is present and is invoked as the spirit of all flesh, the Divine Majesty of the Universe. It is impossible to describe to those who have not experienced it, the feeling of holy joy which is diffused throughout the humblest Hebrew home, by the solemn repetition of acts which in themselves may be regarded as mere customs, without vital connection with the souls of men. In speaking thus, I am not thinking of the so-called upper classes of Jews, who aim at an electro-plate imitation of the manners of their neighbours, and think it "cultured" to drop these customs. I refer more particularly to the home-life of the ordinary Jewish artisan, even of the poor Polish Jews, who have in other respects been degraded by ages of persecution, but in this particular, possess a dignity in their homes which is not shared by those of their neighbours which are quite free from "survivals," even of decency.

This aspect of Jewish morality is perhaps more familiar to you than any other, because it is that in which English life has been most deeply affected by Hebraic conceptions as represented by the Bible. And the particular institution in which it is embodied most characteristically, both for Jews and Christians, is that of the Sabbath. I do not know how it has come about—or rather, I do know, but

cannot linger to discuss—that a "Judaic Sabbath" means a day of austere gloom. As a matter of fact, it is the one bright spot in the Jewish life. Heine, to the last a Hebrew of the Hebrews in his severer moods, has written a beautiful poem about the Princess Sabbath, in which Israel has been condemned by a wicked fairy to wander about during the week as a hound, but on Sabbath is transformed once more into human shape, and resumes his natural dignity. All is joy and good humour in the Jewish home on the Friday night, when Sabbath "comes in." I would attribute a good deal of the difference between the Jewish and the Christian Sabbath to the seemingly mechanical difference that the one begins and ends at an hour when its advent or exit can be solemnised by ceremonial, whereas the other comes and goes, if I may use the phrase, "as a thief in the night." Curiously enough, the other work, written by the Rabbi Ibn Ezra while in England, was an elaborate defence of the Eastern method of beginning the day with the eve. It is indeed to the Sabbath primarily, and the other home ceremonials which embody the Hebraic conception of the Holiness of the Home, that we can trace the remarkable persistence of the Jewish race through the ages. This is generally spoken of as due to their fidelity to their faith, and so on; but we have to seek for the social institutions in which that faith was embodied before we can adequately understand the attraction it had for its adherence. Life itself seemed to the Jew little worth having without the Holiness of Home, to which he had been accustomed from his early days, and which kept its attraction even for the arch-scoffer Heine.

We may now pass to a third leading principle that dominates Jewish ethics, which we may call its Messianic tone, due to the idea of the *Mission of Israel.* In speaking of the hallowing of custom, which forms so large a part of the Jewish discipline, I should have said that it not only strengthens family love, the nurse of all the moralities, but it forms a bond of common custom between family and family, and between Jews of one country and those of another. But a bond for what? it may be asked. Is Judaism a mere trades union designed to promote the benefit of its members against the competition of others who are not "on the statement," as the trade phrase runs? It would seem as if the anti-Semites thought so, and so far as their criticisms touch Jews who have lost the Messianic hope, their view might seem to be justified. But these are just the Jews who are not under the influence of the bond of custom, which they have mostly thrown off. The mass of Jews are still influenced by the Messianic hopes, and

keep up their separateness from others and their bonds with one another under the influence of the conviction that there is a Divine mission for Israel to play in the world's history. The conviction is somewhat vague and indefinite; some look forward to a personal Messiah and a political future, others anticipate a Messianic age and a spread of Hebraic conceptions and Jewish ideals. But a hope need not be the less vivid because it cannot be expressed in a formula, or rather I would say the more clear and definite you make it, the nearer it is to its last hour. Judaism is here at one with the last and greatest of the philosophers, Hegel, in regarding "abstraction" as the least vital form of thinking and of aspiration. The moment you can reduce your ideal to a formula, you may prepare for its funeral, or you may as well nail it at once to your barn-door as a scarecrow; it has no more vitality left in it, no further potentialities of development. To come back from this abstract way of looking at the matter, the very thing against which I am inveighing, I would remark that a hope that is vague is one that cannot be disappointed, and can therefore live on through all vicissitudes of fortune, as the Messianic hope has done in Israel.

I feel a difficulty of speaking of this Jewish ideal under the limits I have imposed upon myself of speaking without reference to any theological conceptions. But I would remark that there is no reason why a similar conception could not be adopted by all nations. What, indeed, is involved in the conception of a nationality but the profound conviction of its members that they have developed a special type of character which peculiarly fits them for some special function in the development of humanity? Would that England were more conscious of some Divine mission to perform in the world's history! Once it was Protestantism that gave enthusiasm to the majority of Englishmen, the eradication of slavery has still some of the vitality of an ideal, and even the latter-day apology for a mission, "Peace on earth and Free Trade among men" can still rouse Englishmen's energies on behalf of an ideal. Even if the mission turn out to be an illusion, I say it is better for men to have an illusory ideal than none at all. Puritanism braced up Englishmen's souls, though its ideals have crumbled away under the assaults of modern thought and sentiment. Acute observers are of opinion that the only hope of raising France from the Slough of Despond is in keeping alive the seemingly futile hope of the *Révanche*. And reverting to Israel one feels that the only thing that idealises the too often prosaic figure of the modern Jew is the halo of the Divine promises to which he still clings, and so justifies

his separateness from the rest of mankind. Consider what dignity is given to the function of maternity when every Jewish mother may feel the hope that from her may issue one who will restore moral peace to mankind.

Underlying the whole conception, or presenting another aspect of it, is the fourth Jewish ideal of the *Hallowing of History.* Here again I am hampered by my own bonds, and am prevented from describing this in the shortest way as the recognition of God in History. But looking at the matter merely on psychological grounds, this conception is the recognition of the fact that man is made man by history. It is history that, as represented by its medium language, differentiates man from the brute. It is history that causes the men of the historic nations to be more civilised than the savage. The Jew recognises practically, if not consciously, that he is made what he is by the history of his fathers, and feels he is losing his better self so far as he loses his hold of his past history, for he regards himself as having gone through the vicissitudes of his fathers. Many of the customary ceremonials which make up the holiness of the Jewish home are purely history raised into religion. One of them, the Passover, has passed over into Christianity as its most sacred function, still retaining survivals of its historic origin and connections; the wine and wafer of the Mass (or Communion) representing the wine and unleavened bread still tasted by Jews at the inaugural banquet of the Passover Service. At one part of the ceremonial, which is mainly made up of the story of the Exodus, it is remarked: "Every Jew should regard himself as if he had personally come out of Egypt." That spirit dominates the whole of Jewish life and ceremonial.

Here, again, I see no reason why the Judaic conception of history should not be adopted and adapted by all nations that have a history. The idea of giving history a continued life in ceremonial has altogether died out among modern nations, and especially among Englishmen, where its only survival is "Guy Fawkes' Day." A distinct loss of national dignity results from this, and we may notice that the virtue of patriotism no longer holds the place it once did in the hierarchy of English virtues. Some years ago the question was raised, "Can Jews be patriots?" implying, Could Jews feel themselves at once Jews and Englishmen? The answer is that the very reason that makes an English Jew conscious of his Judaism makes him equally conscious that he is an Englishman. For certain sides of his character and ideals he feels his indebtedness to his Jewish parentage and breeding; other sides, his freedom as a citizen, his language, and the intellectual acquirements

that go with it, he feels he owes to his position as an English citizen.

Before leaving this side of the subject, I would remark on certain corollaries on the Messianic Ideal and the Hallowing of History that have a characteristic bearing on Jewish ethics. These have a distinctly moralising effect by making the ideal of each individual something other than himself—in the first place his co-religionists, and in the final issue humanity. The unit is the family, which is a permanence; hence the pertinacity and patience with which Jews have borne the tribulations of ages, buoyed up by the Messianic hopes. "If not in my time, at least in that of my children," thinks many a Jewish parent. This idea has results not so desirable from an economic point of view in the early marriages of Jews and their all too numerous results. It concentrates, too, attention on this world as the true field of the Divine drama. Jews escape by this means "other-worldliness," it is true; but I doubt whether that is so much inferior to "this-worldliness" to which Jews are thereby restricted. There is finally involved an optimistic conception of the world which is in reality involved in every Theistic conception. That can be no good God who has made, or who rules, a world radically evil. But here again I am trenching on the province of the theologian.

I have now called your attention to the four chief principles on which Judaism deals with the material of ethics, and works them up into a specific Jewish ethics—the ideas of Morality as Law, the Holiness of Home, the Mission of Israel, and the Hallowing of History. If there were time, I might show how these are interconnected together into an organic system, and may be ultimately resolved into the first and last—morality as law and the hallowing of history. But I prefer to look at the subject from another point of view, and exhibit the organic character of Jewish ethics as shown in its subjective aspects. "We live by admiration," says Wordsworth; and by the imitation that expresses our admiration, we may add. By holding up certain ideals before men's eyes you create certain types of character which differ morally, not by any difference in the contents of the moral code, but by emphasis on different parts in it, and by special selection of the various virtues by which morality can be realised. Such a type of character is an organic one; you cannot lop off one ideal and suppose the rest of the character to remain the same. You cannot change the relative importance of the characteristic virtues without modifying the whole system; you cannot get the heart to perform the functions of the brain. Now each nation and each religion tends to develop its special type; there is a

distinct English character, and even an ideal of a specific Christian character, and so there is a special Jewish type of character. I suppose if we were to hit upon the pet virtue of an Englishman, it would be justice; and, similarly, the most prominent characteristic at which the Jewish character seems to aim is fidelity to race and religion. In other words, the Jew stands up for differentiation in character. It is not his ideal that all men should be alike in character just at present, and in the practical expression of that aim he lives and dies.

This is the much abused separateness of the Israelite which brings down upon him the ill-will of nearly the whole world. Strangely enough the opposition comes most strongly from those new-fledged patriots of Germany and Austria, who insist most strenuously on the need of living up to a specific German or Austrian ideal of character. Or rather not strangely, for it is a necessary element of a specific national character that it feels opposition to any rival ideal. The interesting point to observe is that what these gentlemen object to in the Jewish character is not its too great narrowness, but its cosmopolitanism. Indeed, it is generally characteristic of Jews to confound their accusers in this way. While Christians have preached humility and forgiveness of enemies for centuries, Jews have been content to practise those virtues, the former rather laxly, perhaps, but the latter in all its fulness. And so while the Austrian is preaching the necessity of all men becoming brothers ("German cousins" they really mean) the Austrian Jews have no more than taken him at his word, in feeling an interest in the rest of the world, even though it be but a portion of that remainder.

At the beginning of this lecture I promised you a "rational justification" for the Jewish ideals which I was about to present to you, and you may think I shall be hard put to it to find a justification from a universalist standpoint for this one of Jewish separateness. Not at all. That remaining apart of Jews, while still joining in all the world's work that is unsectarian and beneficial, is fully justified by the great danger that begins to loom before us as never before in the world's history. I refer to a process which is best exemplified in the Chinese Empire, and which I would therefore call *Chinesism*. This is the tendency among huge masses of people to crush individuality, and reduce all its members to one dead level of mediocrity. The ideals of such a mass are formed, its type of character fixed, and for it there rests no more hope of progress either in elevation of ideal or ennobling of character. Its individual members may live happy lives, but from that mass the world has nothing to hope for in moral teaching.

Something of this kind is beginning to be noticed in the United States of America. In Europe, too, there are signs of the creation of a European type, to which we shall all conform. One of the outward signs of this, which all artists lament, is the spread of the chimney-pot hat and black cloth coat throughout Europe, and even in joyous Japan, displacing the picturesque and characteristic national dresses. In one hundred years things will be worse; there will then remain only five or six types of human character, out of which the final human character can develop. The nationalist movements of this century have been unconscious protests against this tendency of things. Now, the evil of this is that whenever a distinct ideal or specific type of character is crushed out, the resultant human type that seems so rapidly approaching will be so much the less rich and varied. This then is why the Jews, ay, or the Irish, or the Japanese, should be allowed and encouraged to preserve any characteristic they have which differentiates them from the great masses of humanity whose characters are becoming ossified. Suppose for a moment that the whole 100,000 Jews of Great Britain were made, to-morrow, completely indistinguishable from the rest of Englishmen, what advantage would accrue to humanity from the transformation? Is it not possible that the English character might have thereby lost the chance of being enriched at a favourable moment by one or other of the specific Jewish ideals that I have put before you?

Of course, there are disadvantages connected with the present state of things—disadvantages, mark you, which fall upon Jews for the most part, and not on the peoples among whom they dwell. One of these disadvantages I consider a serious one, though it seems at first sight somewhat ludicrous. I refer to the vanity which is almost necessarily involved in keeping alive the feeling of special mission. I fear, however, that it is necessary in the present state of human nature. If you are to believe in your ideals and in your ideal character, you must believe in yourself, and have the courage of your self-opinion. I have myself blown a somewhat loud fantasia on the Hebraic horn, with variations of my own. Not that I could not have introduced a few discordant notes. There are lapses in every ideal, or we should have reached the end of our tether in idealisation. The cumbrousness of the Jewish code, the obsolete character of some of its customs, the theoretical injustice done to woman, and other points might be adduced. But, with your permission, I prefer putting these, if I have an opportunity, before my own community. To you it would do no good to rehearse them. I have preferred putting before you those points of Jewish ethics which in my opinion

it would be well if they could be adopted into other national systems.

"If, then, you believe so strongly in your ideals, why do you not strive to spread them among the nations?" is the final retort you will have for me. To that the reply is, that character ideals and types can only be spread by living up to them, and thus prompting to admiration and imitation by others. Of course, if Judaism and the Jewish ideals were mere matters of faith, one could spread them by preaching. Truths or untruths of the intellect can be spread abroad by preachments, but not ideals of character. If now and again a Jewish thinker were to give to an Ethical Society a rose-coloured picture of the Jewish ideals, I doubt if the characters of the members, already formed as they are, would be much modified, unless possibly in their home life they aimed at adapting the Jewish ideals for the benefit of those coming after. Character cannot be passed from person to person in neat little parcels wrapped up in brown paper. It is only by working out your own character to the highest pitch of which it is capable that you can influence the characters of others, especially of the young. Jewish practice in this regard has the countenance of two great German thinkers. Kant, who lived the most non-human life of any mortal that ever breathed, and by his very detachment from life was enabled to see most clearly and profoundly into it, declared that you can directly aid a man's happiness, but he must work out his perfection for himself. So, too, Goethe, who lived perhaps one of the most human and natural lives ever passed by men, gives the same moral in the mystical final scene of his *Faust*. The soul of Faust is handed over to the care of the spirit of Margaret, who earnestly asks how she is to conduct him to the highest peaks. "Go up higher; he will follow thee," is the response—simple words, but there is the whole philosophy of human fellowship in them.

No; I see nothing for it but that each should live up to the highest that he himself can grasp, trusting that in the final issue the supreme highest will prevail, and hoping that his ideal will at least form a part of the final aim of humanity. Ideals have their life and development, and, as with all life, development depends on conflict, which subjectively means renunciation. We should not be disheartened while the conflict goes on, since the longer it lasts the higher the final stage of development. Meanwhile, in the strife of creeds and ideals, all we can ask for, and give, is a fair field and no favour. Let each man bear himself as bravely as he may, and let the battle-cry be, as of old, "God for us all!"

JOSEPH JACOBS.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palæography and the Ancient Versions and Facsimiles of Inscriptions. By the Rev. Prof. S. R. DRIVER, D.D. (Clarendon Press, 1890, pp. xcvi. 296.)

PROF. DRIVER has succeeded in the seldom-accomplished task of producing a work adapted to the needs of very different classes of readers. It is hardly intended for beginners, yet it does not necessarily presuppose advanced proficiency in the reader to pronounce the book likely to prove of the utmost use to him. On the other hand, the notes and introductions are in the strictest sense scientific, and abound in critical discussions which the most mature scholar will find full of fruitful suggestion and easily accessible help.

In examining a new edition of a text so admittedly difficult and corrupt as that of the Books of Samuel, one's first thought runs in the direction of verbal emendation. Here, at a first glance, it would appear as though Prof. Driver had done little beyond subjecting the suggestions of his predecessors—more especially of Wellhausen and Klostermann—to careful criticism. Even were this wholly the case, the part of the editor would have been a significant one. On the one hand it would familiarise English readers unacquainted with German—and, alas! these are still the large majority—with some of the most brilliant work of recent times, for nowhere is Wellhausen seen to better advantage than in his commentary on Samuel. Many other commentators, more or less completely unknown in England, are, in a similar way, introduced to the notice and regard of the student by Prof. Driver's copious quotations. But, in the second place, the editor does not merely *quote* these writers; he examines their results with an acute and balanced judgment which is of the very essence of profitable emendation, and applies their method towards a number of original suggestions, the relatively small number of which is by no means a reason for complaint. Amid the multitude of alternatives already proposed, the student feels strongly the need of a guide who will direct his choice rather than one who will lead him deeper into the maze and add to his perplexities by guesses, however ingenious. Prof. Driver rightly, and almost consistently, refuses to *guess*. Often the utmost limit to which one can safely go is merely the negative result that the text is inaccurate, and that "the error is too deep-seated for a restoration to be proposed with confidence." (Cf. also pp. 79 and 117.) It must, on the whole, be said that Wellhausen's *Samuel* is marked by a similar moderation; but it appears to me that, despite the cautious principles enunciated in his preface, this distinguished critic was sometimes too ready to adopt the LXX. readings as preferable to the Massoretic text in cases of difficulty. Yet in many passages he displays an even brilliant discrimination.

Prof. Driver discusses the questions presented by the Septuagint in his

full and valuable Introduction. "On the whole," he maintains, "the purer text was undoubtedly preserved by the Jews" (Introd. xxxix.); but in many individual cases, "purer readings are preserved to us by the Septuagint." So far is clear enough; but the treatment of variations is a matter of great difficulty. "There are *three* precautions which must always be observed: We must reasonably assure ourselves that we possess the Version itself in its original integrity; we must eliminate such variants as have the appearance of originating merely with the translator;" and with the rest we must be guided chiefly by the intrinsic merit of the rival readings.

Origen's labours unfortunately tended towards complicating the matter by his preferring in his *hexapla* those readings of the LXX. that approximated most closely with the Massoretic text. Lagarde has certainly formulated canons for the recovery of the genuine text (xlvii.), but they are not of much practical use; for, as Prof. Driver justly remarks (Introd. xlix.), "It is the judgment and acumen displayed in handling the more difficult cases which arise under these two heads" [viz., whether the reading that differs from the M T. is really based on a divergent text, and if so whether it be a superior reading or not], "that mark a textual critic of the first order, and distinguish, for example, Wellhausen in a conspicuous degree, both from Thenius on the one side and from Keil on the other." Now and then even Prof. Driver seems to me to prefer the LXX. when the M T. is perhaps defensible, as *e.g.*, in i. 28. Here the editor's exposition of the grounds on which the LXX. reading may be regarded as superior, is admirably lucid, but when all is said I am not convinced that the M T. is not as good. The subject of וישתחו may well be Samuel, and, considering the life to which he was to be devoted, it is possible and even natural that, though so very young, he had been taught by his mother the act of prostration. Elkanah's *coming* is not mentioned because Hannah was the chief agent in bringing the child (cf. v. 23); afterwards, on the *return home*, Elkanah resumes his position as of the first importance in his family, and hence his participation in the return is distinctly noted (ii. 11). Again, take iv. 4, where the LXX. omits שם; this mere excision is hardly enough to alter the sense without the addition of some other verb; the meaning still would be "and the sons of Eli were with the Ark" (viz., at Shilo). Against the acceptance of the LXX. reading, I would quote the fact, too, that in vii. 6 שם is again omitted where it is very unlikely that it can have crept into the M T. wrongly. (In the latter case, while Wellhausen notes the LXX. version, Prof. Driver passes it over silently, but evidently rejecting it.)

In i. 23 the LXX. reading דברך for דברו is obviously preferable; but in ii. 33 the suggestion ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἀνδρῶν does not seem very probable, for the word אנשים would be unnecessary. The phrase בחרב אנשים does not elsewhere occur, though the contrasted use in Isaiah xxxi. 8 might be quoted against me. The substitution of לפניכם for לפניך, which Wellhausen proposes in ix. 12, is not in itself necessary, as the change of number is quite explicable. A similar variation, when, as in the present passage, there are several interlocutors, one of whom at times takes the lead, but at others sinks to the general level, may be noted in Genesis xviii. 3, 4. As to x. 22, איש is not indefensible. "Is there any other man come hither (besides those visible before us)?" gives a fair meaning, as Prof. Driver points out, though he seems on the whole to incline to the LXX. האיש. Basing his view partly on the omission of the LXX., the editor explains the difficulty in xiii. 1 by supposing that this was "originally, perhaps, a marginal note, due to one who desiderated in the case of Saul a record similar to that found in the case of subsequent

kings." This hardly explains, however, the *defectiveness* of the marginal addition. I believe that it was S. D. Luzzatto who first suggested that a י had dropped out after בן, making Saul fifty years old at his accession! The text here is hopelessly corrupt. It is not quite clear to me that את in xvii. 34 is a redundancy. The bear and the lion would naturally not come together, but on different occasions; for ואת we should, perhaps, read ואף as in the Targum. Prof. Driver has no hesitation in accepting the LXX. reading in xviii. 28, and a more beautiful variant it would be hard to discover. It quite lights up the whole verse, and gives real point to it. On the other hand, his unrivalled knowledge of Hebrew idiom enables Prof. Driver most emphatically to defend the M T.'s reading למה (xix. 17) as "thoroughly idiomatic" against the impossible אם לא suggested by Thenius. A more interesting variant occurs in xx. 5, where the LXX. reading ישב לא אשב is adopted by Wellhausen and, apparently, by Prof. Driver; the לא not belonging to the M T. I can scarcely agree that this change is an improvement. David does not quote the fact of its being New Moon as the *reason* for his joining the king's table; he merely says: "To-morrow is the New Moon, and I usually sit with the king to eat [how much more ought I to do so on a feast-day like to-morrow], but thou shalt let me go." This, which is substantially Kimchi's view, tends to meet Wellhausen's objection to the M T. Prof. Driver is right in inserting ביום before השני in xx. 27, and, with a keen eye for a good suggestion, prefers Lagarde's rendering of בן נעות המרדות, "son of a woman gone astray from discipline," to the reading of the LXX. In xxiii. 6 the use of ירד might be justified on the ground that the ephod was only accidentally brought down, and not intentionally (הוריד). The LXX., "certainly rightly," reads לדוד for לאיבי דוד (xxv. 22). It is remarkable, however, that in the Talmud such euphemisms are of frequent occurrence, the "enemy of Israel" being used for Israel. In 2 Sam. iii. 15 Prof. Driver is equally positive in preferring the LXX. reading of אישה for איש. When he is so dogmatic, there is no question that his view must be accepted. To show, however, with what consistency Prof. Driver exercises his own independent judgment, he does not accept the LXX. reading in 2 Sam. xi. 11, though the Hebrew is probably wrong, unless we may imagine that the courtly Uriah adds וחי נפשך, as a hint that the king's is no ordinary life. Besides, however, this valuable and careful examination of the suggestions of the LXX. in detail by Prof. Driver, there is another important service in respect of the LXX. variations that the present edition performs, viz., the frequent displaying of the full *Hebrew* equivalent for the Greek reading. It is only by putting the Hebrew and the Hebraized Greek side by side in this way that one can really judge the relative value of the two texts. I regard this point of so much importance that I here note some of the chief of the longer variations in which Prof. Driver has turned the Greek into Hebrew—iv. 1; xiii. 15; xiv. 24 and 41; xx. 15, 16; xxix. 10; Book 2, vii. 23; xi. 22; xiii. 21 and 34; xvii. 3; xxiv. 15; and many others. Several of these readings are irresistibly attractive, and besides these Prof. Driver very rightly prefers the LXX. readings in ix. 25, 26, and the opening of x. A very valuable note is appended to page 105 on the interchange of the Greek γ and the Hebrew ע.

In a Jewish Review some few words will naturally be expected on the subject of Jewish commentaries on Samuel, and the use made of them by Prof. Driver. As was to be anticipated from the editor of a *Rabbinical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*, attributed to Abraham Ibn Ezra

(Clarendon Press, 1880), Prof. Driver frequently alludes, in the course of his work, to Jewish authorities, both modern and mediæval. Professor Graetz, so prolific of brilliant emendations (see pp. 104, 108), Geiger and Reifmann are among others quoted with respect. On 2 Sam. vii. 21, the latter's suggested transposition of את כל־הגדולה הזאת to the end of the verse "is certainly an improvement." Reifmann's claims to recognition are far too little appreciated generally, but Prof. Driver generously speaks of him, in the work already quoted a few lines higher, as of "a born critic, whose native genius enabled him to overcome great disadvantages of birth and position," and "who has made himself known as the author of a series of acute suggestions on the text, both of the Old Testament itself and of later Jewish writings." This appreciation is the more generous since Jewish commentators have on the whole contributed but little in recent times towards the understanding of the Old Testament. Prof. Driver quotes the older Jewish commentators with greater frequency. Saadiah is cited in the longest note in the whole book (p. 227) on the meaning of an Arabic word; and so are Rashi, Kimchi, and of course the Massoretic writings. Though far inferior to his work in commenting upon the Talmud, Rashi offers many good suggestions, and for their small bulk his notes are remarkably fruitful. In xviii. 26, the explanation quoted by Prof. Driver as Keil's of the words ולא מלאו הימים is really due to Rashi. Kimchi's merits are widely known, but I must confess to some disappointment in the case of Abarbanel. Dipping frequently into his discursive pages I have found very little that repaid the labour; and yet his reputation for his commentary on Samuel is high. I must suppose the fault to lie with myself. In 2 Sam. vi. 22, Abarbanel suggests rather than propounds a fair alternative rendering, "With God I would humble myself even more; but before the handmaidens I will look after my honour." Both the rendering of Wellhausen and of the R V., however, give better sense. In 1 Sam. xiv. 47, the view of Kimchi might have been noticed in the present edition. Comparing Job xxxiv. 29 (which on this view would be rendered "When he giveth quietness, who then shall cause disquiet?") Kimchi takes ירשיע in the latter sense, and I think that a comparison with Isaiah lvii. 20 would strengthen his case. Wellhausen's explanation of the difficult רק דגן נשאר עליו (v. 4), "only his *fishy part* was left" is anticipated by the Biur, and so is the attempted reconciliation of vi. 4 and 18, referred to in a foot-note to page 48. In passing I must note the general failure of many of the attempted reconciliations by Jewish commentators of different versions of the same occurrence, such as the narratives of the appointment of Saul as king, and the accounts of his first acquaintanceship with David. The theories propounded will mostly not bear examination. But I must take leave of the older Jewish commentators with the general remark that they usually do not concern themselves with explaining passages whose *meaning* is clear, but where the main difficulty lies in getting that obvious meaning out of the words, while precisely in such cases Prof. Driver's greatest strength is displayed. Thus in xiv. 16 occurs the impossible ויל֫ך והלם. Rashi makes no attempt to explain it, though he tacitly interpolates a verb; Abarbanel is quite silent; Biur reads, it is true, הֵנָּה והלם. Prof. Driver's suggestion of הלם for ויל֫ך (after the LXX.) is very happy. (Several other variants of the LXX. in this chapter are preferable to the M T.) Again, in verse 34,

Rashi is not concerned, like Prof. Driver, at the unique use of the adverb to mean "*that* night," but whether slaying the animals was in accordance with the Levitical law. As regards emendations of the text, the Jewish commentators (I am leaving Ibn Ezra out of account) naturally do not suggest them in so many words, but *practically* they often do so. Thus the reading אבן for אבל (vi. 18), which the LXX. and the Targum give, is accepted by Rashi; so, too, the חמשים אלף איש (verse 19), which, as Prof. Driver says, "moderns generally reject as a gloss," was practically explained away as a Midrashic gloss. On xiii. 8 even Rashi and Kimchi admit that the text is defective. It will usually be noticed that we find the most fanciful theories of the Midrashic order in places where the text is so difficult that no "plausible etymology can be proposed." (Comp. 2 Sam. vi. 19.)

Conformably with the maxim, אחרון אחרון חביב, I have left for the last the mention of the most striking merit of Prof. Driver's book. For myself, I can hardly find terms sufficiently expressive of my gratitude. The study of his Commentary is in itself a liberal training in Hebrew grammar. Here the editor is *facile princeps*. It is not so much that he offers new theories to account for or to explain away rare and exceptional words or difficulties. Sometimes the editor's help is so bountiful in such passages that the student cannot be expected to carry away a very clear result. But Prof. Driver's strength lies in the *logical* explanation of constructions, in the unravelling of the real significance of idioms—at once so simple and yet so perplexing that their adequate investigation calls for the deepest insight into the genius of the language. Prof. Driver's reputation as a grammarian, high as it already was, must be enhanced by his present work. No new edition of Kautzsch, *e.g.*, can afford to omit taking full account of it, and it is a pity that this could not possibly be done in the recently-published and largely-improved twenty-fifth edition of that grammar. Prof. Driver's remarks would have made several corrections easy, especially in the syntactical portions; for, as was only to be expected from the accomplished writer of the *Hebrew Tenses*, the new commentary abounds in helpful notes on that same intricate topic. To give one or two instances—the first that come to hand, not the most important. The use of אחד for "a" would not have been so strongly pronounced as occurring chiefly in late passages had Kautzsch (page 388) taken into consideration Judges ix. 53, xiii. 2, which Prof. Driver very rightly cites. So again with verse 4. Kautzsch (page 318) emphatically declares the text corrupt, but by explaining verses 4b-7a as a parenthetical description of Elkanah's usual procedure, Prof. Driver renders this supposition unnecessary, for ונתן need not refer to the special incident which is being related in the text, and this seems to be the view also of Klostermann.[1] I started by attempting a list of Prof. Driver's happiest grammatical suggestions, but I soon gave up the task, for scarcely a page passed unrecorded on my notes, and my list assumed portentous magnitude. Fortunately, the editor himself has supplied an index, but it by no means conveys a true idea of the wealth of information contained in the body of the Commentary.

In the non-grammatical notes, Prof. Driver's exposition is marked by lucidity and grace. In this respect the treatment of the Second Book is superior to the First, and contextual explanations strike one as

[1] In the same manner, Prof. Driver occasionally corrects Wellhausen on points of grammar (see *e.g.* on 1 Sam. xii. 3).

being rather more abundant in the latter part of the Commentary. To some extent one appears to get a glance behind the veil that hid the labours of the Old Testament Revisers from the public gaze. Shall I be very wrong in attributing to Prof. Driver some of the best of the new translations which distinguish the R V. from the A V. of Samuel? Not that he always agrees with the later version; see *e.g.* on 2 Sam. v. 8, while on page 145 he makes the very just observation—so just that I wish it could be pressed home on those readers who confine themselves to the English translation solely—that "A V. (and occasionally even R V.) sometimes conceals a difficulty by giving a sense that is agreeable with the context, regardless of the fact that the Hebrew words used do not actually express it; *i.e.*, they implicitly adopt an emendation of the text." This remark expresses far more clearly than I have done above what I meant to say of the Jewish commentators. I do not remember missing a note on a single difficulty in the whole of Prof. Driver's book except perhaps in I. Sam. ch. xxviii. 11, 12, where the context seems to me to need some justification. I must conclude this very inadequate notice by expressing the hope that the Clarendon Press will regard Prof. Driver's book merely as the first of a series. It would be a great service to students of Hebrew if all the historical books were dealt with by Prof. Driver himself with the same brilliant scholarship, sound judgment, subtle power of grammatical analysis and terse lucidity, as he has so markedly displayed in his edition of Samuel.

I. ABRAHAMS.

THE RABBIS OF LEMBERG.

Klilath Jofi, enthaltend die Geschichte der Rabbiner der Stadt Lemberg. By C. N. LEMBITZER. (Cracow, 1888.)

THE history of the Jews in Poland is still in a very unsatisfactory state. All that reaches us through the medium of general histories is just enough to excite our curiosity, but too insignificant to gratify our desire for closer knowledge. We hear, for instance, that the Jews in Poland from time to time were wont to hold great synods; but we know little about their procedure and transactions. We read, also, that the whole of Poland was divided into four Provinces (ארבע ארצות), the Chief Rabbis of which exercised jurisdiction over all the Jews in the kingdom, but even after the contributions of Harkavy, Perles and Gurland, there is still much that is obscure in the life and labours of the Chief Rabbis, who, as their position would suggest, must have been great both in learning and in piety. We possess descriptions of the great persecution by Chmelniezky, in which the Polish Jews suffered as much as their brethren in other parts of Europe in the age of the Crusades, but we are told very little about the lives of these sufferers. Were those thousands of Jews who were murdered by the hands of the Cossacks, but who could have saved their lives and fortunes by joining the religion of the conquerors; or those 300 martyrs of Polonnoie, who, guided by their Rabbi and dressed in their shrouds, patiently awaited the supreme moment when they would be able to sanctify the name of God; or that

girl of Nemicrov who, when passing a bridge on her way to the church, to be there wedded to one of the Cossack leaders, plunged down into the river and disappeared for ever—were those Jews really "not of a very high class"; were they, in truth, not "of the heroic stuff to rise superior to the terrible circumstances"? With what splendid colours would this national tragedy have been pictured, if the scene had been laid in Spain, or any other country in the South or the West of Europe. But there is very little sympathy displayed when the actors are Polish Jews.

Still, this unsympathetic treatment of our Polish co-religionists is by no means to be ascribed to any personal animosity from the side of Jewish writers. It rises rather from the insufficiency of the sources from which the student is expected to draw his information. Not that the materials are poorer than those for any other part of Europe. But they are unfortunately scattered over hundreds of volumes of Responsa, and buried as occasional remarks in numberless Halachic treatises, the study of which cannot reasonably be expected, whilst the information to be got from non-Jewish sources is mostly written in the Polish language, with which only a very few scholars are familiar.

The new book by Dembitzer, as far at least as Hebrew sources go, greatly contributes towards diminishing these difficulties, and bringing the necessary materials within the reach of the historian. The learned author, who is *Rabbinats-Assessor* in Cracow, has already acquired the fame of being one of the greatest Halachists by his commentary *Liviath Chen* on the *Ravia*. We are glad to see that Dembitzer, in his studies of Halachic books, did not confine himself to the strictly legal contents, but also paid sufficient attention to the historical and biographical materials that are scattered through them. Of this his present book gives excellent proof.

Though the main body of the book is dedicated to the history of the Chief Rabbis in Lemberg, which the author treats in twenty-one sketches, the student will find in it many other interesting points relating not only to the Jews in Poland, but also in other parts of Europe. Thus the notes to pp. 93-96 furnish most valuable information about the Rabbis of this country. In another place (p. 96 *sq.*) Dembitzer gives a complete list of the Ashkenazic Rabbis in Amsterdam until the year 1710. The introduction again contains, among other important points relating to the Rabbis of Cracow, an excellent biography of R. Moses Isserles the well-known Annotator of the Shulchan Aruch. It is at this place that Dembitzer tries to make us acquainted with the history of this code, which has in the course of time obtained such a high authority. We see there that R. Salomon Loria, the contemporary of R. Joseph Caro, and R. Moses Isserles protested both against the authority of the compiler of the Shulchan Aruch as well as that of his Annotator. But what is more surprising is that even R. Mordechai Yafeh, who was a pupil of Isserles, compiled a new code (the לְבוּשׁ), in which he decided, in many cases, against the Shulchan Aruch. R. Moses of Lublin again (usually known as Maharam) paid little heed to the Shulchan Aruch, or to the Lebush, and decided against both. On a certain occasion he answers a student: "With regard to other proofs from the Shulchan Aruch and the Lebush, I have no occasion to spend many words (in refuting them), since it is not my way to base a decision on such works. They contain only the headings to the chapters (ראשי פרקים) which cannot be understood (without going back to the sources), and many stumble by them" (p. 12). On the other hand, however, we see that many Rabbis accepted the Shulchan Aruch as the last and unquestionable authority, "to deviate from which would mean to deviate from life" (p. 15). And the disciple

of the Maharam thinks that no man is justified in deciding against the Shulchan Aruch (*ibid.*). Surely R. Joshua, of Cracow, the author of the מגיני שלמה, was of the opposite opinion when he declared that opinions must not be suppressed on account of authorities in religious matters, and that every scholar has to act according to his own conviction of the merits of the case in question (p. 14). But this R. Joshua belonged to the minority. The majority of the Rabbis did not follow him, and maintained that since the appearance of this code there remained nothing for them but to follow its words.*

These specimens will suffice to show how many interesting points are scattered over Dembitzer's book. It is true that long digressions and excursions into other parts of Europe, such as Dembitzer makes, are not compatible with the order and systematic treatment required in a historical work. And we strongly advise the author to affix to the second volume a complete index of the localities and names mentioned in his book, otherwise its utility will be considerably lessened. We also think that the long digressions about R. Jonathan Eibeschütz (pp. 120-126) could have been left out without any loss to the book. The history of R. Jonathan is an unpleasant episode in the history of Jewish great men. The mass of evidence put forward by Graetz against R. Jonathan is too strong to be ignored or wholly attributed to the jealousy of his adversaries. However, we must not complain too much. For these rather disturbing digressions are mostly owing to the fact that the celebrities who form the subjects of Dembitzer's work were men by whose activity the whole of Judaism was benefited. They were appealed to and sought after by the Jews in all parts of Europe. Thus R. Zebi Ashkenazi held the office of Chief Rabbi successively in Sera-Bosna, Hamburg, Amsterdam, and Lemberg (p. 91); R. Joshua, the author of the פני יהושע, held the same office in Lisco, Lemberg, Berlin, Metz, and Frankfort-on-the-Main (p. 108); while R. Aryeh Leb was Rabbi in Resha, Hague, Lemberg, and Amsterdam (p. 131). We cannot, therefore, wonder if Dembitzer, in following up the careers of such men, had occasionally to leave Poland for a while and take a view of the communal circumstances amid which his heroes spent a certain part of their lives.

As to the history of the Jews in Poland, the student will find in Dembitzer's book that an unsurpassed self-sacrificing devotion to the study of the Law formed the main feature of their spiritual life. R. Nathan, of Hanover, the author of the יון מצולה, states in this book that there was no Jewish house in Poland which did not offer a shelter to at least one scholar. If it was not a member of the family they considered it as their duty to invite some student to live with them. Thus Lemberg alone could show during the three centuries which preceded ours a larger number of great Rabbinical scholars than London, Vienna, and Berlin put together (see p. 17). This was the case, too, with other large Jewish communities in Northern countries, as for instance Wilna,

* Dembitzer, in accordance with the design of his book, could not treat the question fully. More information would be rendered by a thorough study of the different commentaries on the Shulchan Aruch. The many attempts made towards codifying the law after the 16th century have also to be regarded. Of modern authors who have touched the question, see among others Graetz, vol. ix., p. 321 and 331; Cassel's Joseph Caro, p. 7, 8 and 12; Brüll's Jahrbuch, vol. ix., p. 151; M. Strashon in the appendices to the קריה נאמנה, pp. 330 and 331; and lastly, D. Hoffmann's excellent work, *Der Schulchan Aruch*, pp. 30-36.

Brisk, and Cracow. In this town even the butchers were learned men, and were appealed to in questions of *Shechitah* (p. 4). It was also Cracow whither R. Manasseh ben Israel sent his son with the purpose of studying, so famous were its Talmudical colleges. Now the highest ambition a man could aspire to was to become Chief Rabbi (אב בית דין). But this title was only conferred on those who distinguished themselves as recognised teachers in those colleges. If it happened that there were two men in the community who possessed great merits as regarded public teaching, the title was given to both (p. 6).

This devotion to study by no means ceased after the great persecutions to which we have already alluded. It was only interrupted for a certain time, but as soon as the communities recovered a little the colleges were restored, and the study was resumed with fresh vigour. Indeed the activity of the great Rabbis and teachers with whom Dembitzer's book deals, for the most part fills the period after the catastrophe of 1648. It will suffice to allude here to R. David Segal, whose book, *Turc Zahab*, acquired almost as much authority as the Shulchan Aruch (see pp. 48—77), and the already mentioned R. Zebi Ashkenazi, whose fame was so great that the London Portuguese community called him to be the umpire in the struggle against their Chacham R. David Nietto.

And now a few words with regard to the merits of this attachment to study. We are far from maintaining that this study was always conducted on the right lines. We know that many of the Polish Rabbis were devoted to the Pilpulistic or casuistic method, which led to many aberrations. But the Pilpul was not a special Polish disease. The whole of the Jewish world was infected by it. The German method termed Nuremberger, or Regensberger, and that prevailing among the Sephardim, as we know it from the פרישת דרכים and similar books, were not a whit more scientific than the Polish *Chiluk*, they were only less original and ingenious than the latter. On the other hand it seems that the alternative of that period did not lie between the casuistic and the critical method, but between knowledge of some kind and utter ignorance. We do not hesitate for a moment to say that we prefer the former. "Ignorance begetteth nothing," while intelligence in the end always turns out to be a power for good. To take an example of secular learning, we shall only remind our readers of the fact that it was those countries in which the loudest scholastic discussions were heard which also produced the great modern thinkers who broke the charm of scholasticism. So also Polish Rabbis were among the first to protest against the Pilpul. We shall only mention here R. Samuel Edles, who denounced it in the strongest terms. And in due time this fallacious method was almost entirely abandoned owing to the efforts of the Gaon R. Elijah Wilna. That the Poles Krochmal and Rapoport belonged to the chief founders of the modern historic school is a well-known fact, and as such recognised by our greatest writers on the subject. (See Graetz, xi. 482 *sq.*)

This point might be further developed; but we think it better to postpone the discussion until the appearance of the second volume, in which our author promises to deal with the history of the "Four Provinces." We hope that this important contribution will not be long delayed.

S. SCHECHTER.

A NEW JEWISH NOVEL.

The World and the Cloister. A Novel. By OSWALD JOHN SIMON. (2 vols. 1890.)

MR. OSWALD SIMON is an idealist. This accounts both for the strength and the weakness of his book. As an idealist the goal to be desired is for him nothing less than unity of religion, in which humanity will form one great holy brotherhood, with bye-laws from that code which is the inheritance of Israel; but as such he little reckons with the obstacles preventing the attainment of this goal. "He cometh leaping over the mountains, skipping over the hills," and gets a glance into the promised land, into which neither he nor his contemporaries nor many future generations will come.

But this is only an amiable weakness, and we must not complain too much of it. It is now nearly a generation since Daniel Deronda set out for a wedding trip to the Holy Land, full of hopes and ideals. But not much was heard of him, nor did he find such a great following as his well-wishers expected. We are rather afraid that Deronda's enthusiasm was quenched a little when he saw that the realisation of his hopes is in the first instance very much a matter of shillings and pounds, of which the noble, but unpractical Mordecai knew nothing. He might also have found that "to bind our race together in spite of heresy, for our religion united us before it divided us," is a much more difficult task than he had thought. People are determined to keep up the divisions, and to place each other without the pale of Judaism. And as to the Gwendolens they (the Jewish ones at least) are now worse than ever. To judge from their latest novels they look again at the world from the Monaco point of view, everything being to them—religion, marriage, calling—nothing else but a game, the success in which depends entirely on accomplishment in the art of cheating. And what is still worse is that they want to persuade us that they give us only facts.

But if these be facts they are brutal facts, and Mr. Simon has done well in dispensing with them, and transporting us into a region of the noblest aspirations and purest ideals with which his book is permeated. This he was able to do by a strong appeal to the past, when "there was self-negation" even "on the part of men and women who have not been trained in the monastic life," who have shown "examples of heroism more signal than the accumulated incidents of the whole body of Christian saints," and by placing an unbounded faith in the future, when "the Supreme Being, as the Parent of all, will be recognised as the greatest bond between men and nations, so great a bond, indeed, that all differences sink into a subordinate place."

It is true that Mr. Simon, overpowered by the glorious vision of a remote future, is rather inclined to see the present in much brighter colours than it really is. M.P.'s in the close of our century, for instance, are not supposed to be in search of a religion. Generally they are satisfied in conforming to that of their constituency, and it happens only very seldom that their religious aspirations mount higher than the stairs which lead to their platform. We may also remark that Roderick is a little too much of a rationalist for us. Indeed, it would seem to us that Mr. Simon's hero has too good a lot in this world. Without the least personal animosity to Roderick, we should have liked to see him go through some great spiritual crisis, followed by those mental agonies for which the Psalms form the only cure which Providence has prepared for us. Again,

instead of passing his time in yachts and drawing-rooms, where, as it would seem, both salvation and politics are the subject of intrigue, we should have preferred him to mix a little with some simple-minded people whose religion is a warm and real expression of the heart. In this case Roderick would have shown more sympathy with ceremonies and observances that do quicken spirituality, though we can quite appreciate the notions of those who prefer "religion without form" to "form without religion."

But it must not be supposed that Mr. Simon's ideals are so much in divergence with reality as these minor points would suggest. Irene's exaltation over the "two distinct propositions: first, the historical national sentiments of the Hebrew race, bearing traces of great antiquity; and, secondly, those essential elements of the Jewish faith which represent universality," which may be described as the racial and the missionary elements in Judaism, expresses fully the sentiments of the great majority of those of our generation who still take the trouble to think over our position and destination in the history of mankind. We must say that personally we are not very fond of this over-emphasising of the racial element which degrades Jews into a kind of "Monotheistic breed," and makes religion a mere matter of blind instinct.

However, here again the force of Mr. Simon's idealism asserts itself, and ennobles everything on which he touches. To him this racial element only serves to show that the Jews have the innate ability for their mission, which consists in proclaiming the name of God—and God alone—to the world, for which Mr. Simon pleads with the ardent faith worthy of such a sublime idea, an idea which has animated all our sages, from those who compiled our prayer-book down to the latest historians in the present century. The following passage displays the feelings of Mr. Simon's heroes when they enter the synagogue on their wedding-day:—"They saw before them the two tablets of stone holding up the Ten Commandments, and in them they saw not a tomb nor an image, but the imperishable corner-stone of the world's civilisation." We have no doubt that this faith will prove contagious to the reader, who, after having finished the book, must feel that he has spent an hour with one whose heart is pure, whose mind is noble, and who has something to say to the world worth listening to.

S. SCHECHTER.

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

BERECHIAH NAQDAN.

MR. JACOBS' suggestion that the Berlin Bible (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 331) was written by Berechiah's son, in the year 1233, and not 1333, is strongly confirmed by the day when the copy was finished, mentioned in the colophon as Wednesday, the 21st of Heshwan. This was the case in 1233, and not in 1333 (*Athenæum*, April 19, 1890, No. 3,260). As to the omission of the hundreds in this colophon, which I have not found in any other MS., Mr. Jacobs communicated to me that such is the case in some English *Shetars* (ed. Davis, p. xiii.). I can find it only in one *Shetar*, viz., No. 150, to which probably a Latin document was annexed, with the Christian date. The thousands are wrong anyhow in the Berlin colophon, where we read אלף הרביעי, which ought to be החמישי for 1233, and הששי for 1333. The Vatican colophon offers some difficulties, owing to its being partly obliterated. Assemani, in his Catalogue, No. xiv., wrote as follows :—וסיימתיו ביום ג' בי' חדש אב שנת נ"ט האלף החמישי "finished on Tuesday, the 10th of the month of Ab, in the year 59 of the fifth thousand," *i.e.*, according to Assemani, 5059= 1299. In this year, the 10th of Ab, according to Dr. Mahler's tables, fell on Friday, the 10th of July, not to say that for 5059 the thousand is the sixth (הששי) and not the fifth, as given in the colophon. For 4959=1199, the 10th of Ab fell on a Wednesday, the 6th of July. Professor Guidi and Monsignor Ugolini, who both kindly examined the colophon in question, read as follows :—וסיימתיהו ביום ג' כ"א בחדש אב שנת צ"ט לפרט אלף החמישי ש"ל "finished on Tuesday, the 21st of Ab, the year 99 of the fifth thousand." In the Vatican MS. the hundreds are also omitted, an omission which seems to be characteristic of our scribe : 99 could only be 4999, for 4099 is too early ; in 4999, the 21st of Ab fell on a Sunday, and not on Tuesday, as said in the colophon. Professor Guidi queries the כ, in כ"א and Monsignor Ugolini writes as follows :— "Potrebbe ancora leggersi, ma con minore probabilità 'ביו" which means the 16th of Ab, which, indeed, fell on Tuesday, the 16th of July. We have seen that Assemani also read 'בי, but Professor Guidi does not doubt the א in כ"א. On the other hand he queries the צ in the years, viz., in צ"ט, for which Assemani puts נ"ט; the doubtful letter could also be an ע, *i.e.*, ע"ט; in the three possible dates, viz., 4959=1199, 4979=1219, and 4999=1239, however, the 21st of July did not fall on a Tuesday. We shall have, therefore, to accept the reading 'ביו the 16th of Ab (although usually expressed by ט"ז, and the ב being an unnecessary repetition), of the years 1199 (נ"ט) or 1219 (ע"ט), but not of 1239 (צ"ט), for the following reason : Elijah mentions in the Vatican MS. his father's fables, but not his translations of the treatise of Adelhard of Bath, or of the *Lapidarium* mentioned in the Berlin MS.; the copy of the Berlin MS. must consequently be later made than that of the Vatican, *i.e.*, the Vatican MS. must have been copied before 1233. It is curious to state that the ethical treatise (see below, p. 521) is not mentioned at all in either colophon. Mr. Jacobs suggested to us the reading of י"ט for צ"ט, and הששי for החמישי (in

the case of the Berlin MS. we find, indeed, that the thousands are wrong), and believes that the Vatican MS. was copied in the year 5019= 1259, and in this year the 21st of Ab, indeed, fell on a Tuesday. This is very ingenious, but according to our opinion scarcely possible. In the first instance the points of abbreviation over צ"ט or נ"ט are distinct in the Vatican MS., and could not be mistaken as the head of a צ. Secondly, in 1259, Berechiah must have been over hundred years old, as we shall see later on, a fact which would have been mentioned by his son. Finally the Vatican colophon must be earlier than that in the Berlin MS., which is of the year 1233 (see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 323).

Anyhow, Mr. Jacobs was right in saying that Berechiah flourished towards 1180-1190, but we shall oppose the English naturalisation to Berechiah, and we do not believe that he knew Arabic to such an extent, if he knew it at all, as to be able to translate from rhymed prose. He translated from Latin or from French, but not from Arabic; and his fables, which we shall find adapted from some current texts soon after 1190, he composed in Provence or Normandy, but scarcely in England (see below p. 523).

Before we give the arguments for our statements, we shall discuss the probable date of Berechiah. His notes on Saadiah, which precede in the Parma MS. the ethical treatise he wrote not earlier than 1161, and not later than 1170, for he quotes in it a passage of Solomon Pirhon's Dictionary, which was composed in 1161, and according to the Parma MS. Berechiah dedicated it to R. Meshullam הנדיב; who is very probably identical with Meshullam ben Jacob of Lunel, to whom Judah ibn Thabbon dedicated his translation of the first part of Bahya (or Behai's) treatise, entitled *Hobath hal-Lebaboth*, out of which Berechiah quotes four passages (Zunz in Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, p. 9). Berechiah says as follows, according to a kind communication of Dr. L. Modona, of the Parma Library: הזכרתי בתחלת הספר אלה הד[ברים] ׳ והנהו מנחה שלוחה לאדוני הנדיב ר׳ משלם נר עולם אשר לבש צדק כמדו ׳ והוא ידיעני לכף זכות ב[חסדו]: There is no adequate reason to doubt that this Meshullam was an Italian *Nadib* (Steinschneider, *Hebrew Bibliography*, III., p. 44), when we know for certain that the Provençal Meshullam was indeed a Mæcenas for translations of ethico-philosophical literature. He died in the year 1170. Thus we find Berechiah in communication with the Provence not later than 1170, at the age of twenty years, or little above. He calls himself *Naqdan*—a title which he would scarcely apply to himself at an earlier age than twenty. Accordingly Berechiah would have been in the year 1233 aged eighty-three, and Elijah calls himself rightly, "son of his father's old age" (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 323). That Berechiah was of a French-speaking country cannot be doubted from his translation of the *Lapidarium*, if we should even admit, with Dr. Steinschneider, that the French words which we find in his translation of Adelhard were substituted by a scribe for the Latin words of the original. It is more probable that Berechiah himself introduced the French words instead of the Latin ones, if, indeed, he did not translate from a French version of Adelhard, which has not yet been discovered, for the benefit of his French co-religionists who did not know Latin. From extracts given by Dr. Zunz of the Parma MS., and which we shall, for convenience sake, reproduce in a fuller form, we find that Berechiah mentions there that he had already translated Christian treatises from the Latin. This, consequently, he did when very young, and, perhaps at Dreux, where we find his son in 1233. Berechiah, perhaps, visited Provence since the

reputation of R. Meshullam might have reached Normandy by Abraham Ibn Ezra, who made a long stay at Dreux before visiting England (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, xviii., p. 303), and the ardent youth wished to enter the school of Lunel. How long he remained in Provence, and whether he also made a stay at Narbonne, where the Kamhis (Kimhis) had established the home of grammatical and exegetical studies, we are not sure. What we may say positively is, that Berechiah was certainly not idle during twenty years or more after the composition of his ethical treatise. Most likely he wrote biblical commentaries, which are now lost, unless the MS. 28 of the University Library contains his commentary on Job (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 326), and also grammatical and masoretic treatises, from which we have scanty quotations.

The following passages of the introduction which precede his fables will clearly show that he composed his book on the model of Latin or French fables, to which he added perhaps, some from the *Calilah v'Dimnah*, after a great massacre in England. He does not say that he translated, as he does elsewhere ; but he means to be original. We quote from the MSS. 1421 and 1466 of the Bodleian Library. (See the New Catalogue, coll. 506 and 520.) He says as follows :—

נאום ר׳ ברכיה ב״ר נטרונאי הנקדן • אשר משלים אלו הצמיחן והלידן איככה אוכל וראיתי באבדן • אם לא אכתבם בספר לזכרון [1] בעמלי מה יתרון • ואם [2] אחשב [3] עניו או יהיר • לשוני עט סופר מהיר • מי יתן איפה [4] ויכתבון מילי • וסבת עט מכתב משלי • על אופן גלגל העולם [5] • אשר מעיני שכלי נעלם • המתגלגל באי [6] הים • אלה המית ואלו חיים :

[1] No. 1421, זכרון. [2] 1421, אם. [3] 1466, אחשוב. [4] 1466, omits.
[5] 1421, בעולם. [6] 1421 and ed. princeps, באיי.

"Says Berechiah, son of Natronai the punctator, who made these fables bud and bring forth, How can I endure to see the destruction of them, if I do not write them in a book for a memorial? In my labour what will be the profit? Whether I think to be humble or proud, my tongue is the pen of a ready writer. Oh, that my words were now written! The occasion of writing my fables is the turning wheels (the fate) of the world, which is hidden from the eyes of my intelligence, (the wheel) which turns in the island of the sea (England), for the one to die and the other to live."

And towards the end he says in verse as follows :—

באי הים [1] עדת שכל שכולה ועטר [2] בוז ומשפחה שפלה
ואזן רוב עשירה [3] ערילה לכל שואל ולנותן מהולה
וחפשו [4] בוגדי בגד עלילה שלול בגד ישר דרך ושמלה
עדת חנף שמחה היא וצהלה ותוך מחנה ישרים קול יללה [5]
ואשרו פה אשר דובר נבלה והדובר [6] נכוחות לקללה
ורע כטוב [7] וכלה כבתולה המתוק [8] מר ואורה [9] באפילה
וברכיה זמן קלל ואלה וסבותיו קטנה וגדולה
וטוב לי פת חרבה ועמילה [10] וזולתם ולא עמם בנחלה

[1] 1421, באיים שם. [2] 1421, ועצום. the next two lines are omitted.
[3] Ed. pr., עשירים. [4] Ed. pr., ותפשו. [5] Ed. pr., אלה, against the metre.
[6] 1421, ופה דובר [7] Ed. pr., טוב. [8] 1466, כמתוק ; ed. pr., ומתוק.
[9] 1421, ואורם. [10] 1421, עם עמילה.

It is difficult to translate faithfully the play upon words in these lines of poetry (metre *Hazadj* in Arabic, Hebrew מגיל; see *M'Lechet ha-Shir*, p. 7). The substance is that the community of the island of the sea (England) is in a corrupt state, not assisting to those who ask to be helped. Berechiah curses the time and the fate, and he prefers to live upon dry bread rather than to be with these people. It seems that Berechiah visited England, like Ibn Ezra, but he was not so well received as the Spanish traveller. And when he reached his home (Normandy?) he wrote the Fables. In England he would not have dared to utter such language against the rich and influential Jews. Could he then be identical with Benedictus the punctator in the Charter of 1195? We cannot believe it. Berechiah evidently refers to the massacre of 1190 at the coronation of Richard I, and he would naturally not have written his words later than a year or two after the sad event. The words, "To make bud and bring forth" (above, page 522), and אזן וחקר (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 322) can scarcely be applied to a translation, although it might be the case, for the passage which Berechiah quotes from the הישמעאלי, is from an Arabic author, but it is not likely, for all his other translations are made from Latin or French. This might be concluded from the following passage found in the MS of Munich (Steinschneider in the *Isr. Letterbode*, viii., p. 25).

אני ברכיה בר נטרונאי לחצוני רעיוני ' אשנם מותני להעתיק אלה הדברים בלשון עברית כי מצאתי (so) במכתב של גוים אשר העתיקום מן העבריים [l. הערביים] ובם דברים נעלמים ומחכמי (so) דורנו וחוכמות (so) מפוארות למשכילים לא שזפתם עין סכלים ' ובראותי חכמה מפואר (so) בלי (l. בכלי) מכוער לפניכם מוחזרים (so; l. ופנינים לפני חזירים) טיהרתים מיד בן נכר וכתבם (so) בלשון הקדש אשר נעלה על [כל] לשון :

"I, Berechiah, son of Natronai, urged by my thoughts, will gird my loins to translate these words (the *Quæstiones naturales*) into Hebrew, for I have found in the writings of the nations who translated them from the Arabic, hidden matter and great wisdom, which no eye has perceived: *And when I saw wisdom in an unclean vessel, and pearls before swine* [the whole passage is corrupted; our rendering is according to Dr. Steinschneider's emendation], *I purified them from the hand of the strangers, and wrote them* in Hebrew, a language superior to all other languages." The passages in italics we shall find also in another treatise of our author (see below p. 524). The MS. of Parma, De Rossi, No. 482 (now 2106), contains notes on Saadiah Gaon's well known philosophico-theological work on "Creeds and Opinions," which begins with the following words:—נאם ברכיה בר' נטרונאי בספר צווי ואזהרה והם מ"ע ומצ' ל"ת שחבר הגאון חבר המחבר ואמר, such is the title of the third part of Saadiah's work in the anonymous translation, most likely made before that of Judah ibn Thabbon (Tibbon). We know that translations of Jewish Arabic books existed before Tibbon, such as those of Gebirol, Bahya, or Behai, Abraham ben David, Judah Hayyoodj, Jonah ibn Jannâh, and others, some of which were known not only in Provence, but also in France, and not improbably in Normandy and England. Berechiah quotes other parts of Saadiah's work, viz., עוד חבר ספר וקראו מגלת זכיות ' וחובות וראוי על המשכילים שיתחכמו בזו המגלה וישיתבוננו בה; this is the fifth part. הגאון חבר מגלה וכנה אותה באור חק אמת הנפש; this is the sixth part. Towards the end we find the following quotation,

ובעניין תחיית המתים כלל הגאון עשר שאלות ואכתבם בקוצר ׳ הא׳ מי ומי העומדים בתחיה ··· שאלה י׳ הדור אשר תהיה הגאולה בימיהם ואיך יהיה טבם; this is the treatise, attributed to Saadiah, containing ten questions addressed to Saadiah concerning the resurrection, and his answers, but in an abridged form (see *Hebr. Bibl.*, xiii., p. 82, note 2).

In the course of these notes we read as follows : כל זה שדבקתי הענין מחבור הגאון רב סעדיה ועתה אזכיר מדברי הגאון הדיין הגדול רב בחיי ור׳ שלמה אבן גבירול כתב בענין—Berechiah quotes from Gebirol, saying ואמר ר׳—; and from Abraham ibn Ezra in the following words : אהבת עלום אברהם אבן עזר ; ראש לחכמה ונזר. The name Ibn Ezer, which the rhyme requires, is also found in Berechiah's translation of Adelhard, as well as in the anonymous translation of the *Image du Monde*, but not in *Sepher hash-Shoham*. Pirhon is also mentioned as follows :— ור׳ שלמה אבן פרחון כתב בספרו הנה היוצר ברא שלשה מיני בחיות משונות המלאכים אדם ובהמה למלאך נתן לו דעת בלא יצר הרע (rad. חסר. See Zunz in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, x., p. 9). Dr. Steinschneider (*Hebr. Bibl.*, xiii., p. 83) says that in the Munich MS. a passage of Abraham ben David's בעלי הנפש is quoted, and concludes from this that Berechiah could not have lived so early. Abraham, however, died in 1192 ; why could his book not have been written between 1161 and 1170 ?

Finally the following passage occurs in this note : עם מה שלמדתי אני ברכיה מחכמת ספר שהעתקתי מלשון הגוים ללשוניו... כל אלה בינותי מחכמת היוונים אשר העתיקום הגוים ללשוניהם ואני טהרתים מיד בני נכר ושמתי[ם] בספר. These words in a more extended form are to be found in Berechiah's ס׳ המצרף, MS. of Munich. A second part in the Parma MS., which Dr. Steinschneider considers as an extract from the ס׳ המצרף, begins as follows :—

דברי ברכיה אשר בנקדים דור הולך ודור בא ׳ והשכל אשר בלבות נחבא ׳ אם לא יכתב לזכרון ׳ לא יספר לדור אחרון ... על כן חברו הגאונים את ספרי היחוד שיתבוננו בו הקוראים ושישיבו אל לבם שמוש המוסר וחכמת המצפון כחכמת ס׳ הגאון רבנו סעדיה וס׳ ר׳ שלמה אבן גבירול וס׳ שחבר ר׳ אברהם אבן עזר ... ואמר הגאון אשר חבר תורת [חובת] הלבבות ... ואמר אבן גבירול אם הדברים רעים בענין הנפש ק״ו בענין היוצר ועוד אמר אם נטרח להשיג השמש מצד אורה וניצוציה ורוחק האפל ממנה נעמד על מציאתה ונהנה ממנה ונגיע אל ענין המבוקש ממנה ומי שיטרח למצאה מצד עגולה תכהינה עיניך ולא יהנה ממנה. We know that Gebirol's ethical treatise, with the title of *Choice of Pearls*, was commented upon in France. (See Steinschneider's *Catal. libri impr. Bodl.*, coll. 2323.)

In order to exhaust our subject as much as possible, we shall give the following items :—1st, the quotation from the *Book of the Onyx*, which is the following, root חשך—ור׳ ברכיה נקד׳ אומ׳ שהדלים נקראו חשכים כדמתר׳ ומדלת עמא ׳ ומחשיבי עמא ׳ דל בכה ׳ חשיך. 2nd, Ahron ben Hayyim (MS. in the Bodl. Libr., New Catal., col. 423), who was a nephew of the martyr Jacob of Corbeil, a contemporary of Jacob ben Meir (R. Tam), quotes an explanation of a word from the mouth of R. Berachiah ; if he be identical with our Naqdan, we should have the approximate date of about 1200 for our Berechiah. Other quotations of

a Berechiah are to be found in the *Orient* (1844), cols. 298 and 299. The lamented Professor Franz Delitzsch (Cat. of the Senatorial Library at Leipzig, cod. Hebr. I.), suggested that the scribe, Machir ben Crespia, might be the son of our Naqdan, which is possible. But, if so, the MS. cannot be written three generations after Rashi (about 1180), but rather at the beginning of the 13th century, according to Kennicott, p. 600 of his *Dissertatio Generalis*.

The *Thosaphot* to the Pentateuch (British Mus. MS., add. 22092, fol. 129A, and in the מנחת יהודה Harl. 269, fol. 134, for the copy of which we are indebted to Mr. Schechter) have the following quotation on Deut. xxxii. 39 :— ואין אלהים עמדי אומר הרר ברכיה הנקדן לפי שאמר להם אויביהם (לפי שאמרו האוייבים M. J., יקומו ויעזרכם לשון רבים ישיב הק׳ב׳ה אין אלהים עמדי ׳ ולפי שאמרו האויבים ישתו יין נסיכם אמר הק׳ב׳ה אשכיר חיצי מדם כלומר איני שותה כאשר אמרתם אבל חיצי אשכיר מדם שישתו דמיכם עד שישתברו וכנגד שאמרו (ולפי שאמרו M. J., אשר חלב זבחימו יאכלו אמר הק׳ב׳ה איני אוכל אבל וחרבי תאכל בשר :

As to Moses, son of Isaac, he wrote his *Book of the Onyx* at a matured age (he says in his preface that in his youth he composed another grammatical treatise), certainly not before the year 1161, since he quotes Pirhon's Dictionary, and not after 1200, since he does not quote David Kamhi at all. Although descended from an English family he did not write in England, which is proved by the words אשר באינגלטירא. Showing great acquaintance with Joseph Kamhi's works, we might venture to say that he went from his home to Narbonne, where he acquired some knowledge of Arabic, under the guidance of Joseph Kamhi. We have shown (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 324) that he is scarcely the author of the ס׳ הנקוד and consequently not the glossator of Joseph Kamhi's ס׳ זכרון. Moses ben Yom Tob, whom he quotes, whether his master or not, may be the author of the ס׳ הנקוד, which is attributed to a Moses of London. Indeed, passages are quoted in the *Thosaphot* to the Pentateuch in the name of Moses of Londres (see Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, ix. (1871), p. 231), which are not to be found in the *Sepher hash-Shoham*, and may belong to Moses, son of Yom Tob. Only when passages of "the book of Punctuation" will be identified with sayings quoted in the name of Moses of London, we shall have a right to consider Moses of לוניטרש in the Berlin MS. identical with Moses of London in the glosses on the Pentateuch. Samuel Naqdan, quoted by Moses, is naturally not the same person as the scribe of the Bible of St. John's College, Cambridge. The following quotations from the *Shoham* (of which we hope Mr. Collins will be enabled soon to give us a complete edition) might perhaps lead to further information concerning its author.

1°. (Fol. 58, r. כרה) he says :—(ואכרה) ומו׳ הר׳ ש׳ כי יש לתת טעם לדגשות לי) ויהיה הדגש במקום נון ׳ ומשפט׳ ואנכרה ויהיה פ׳ קל מנכר ׳ מ״מ פ׳ קל ויכרה להם כירה גדולה :

2°. (Fol. 76, r. קדש) he says :—מקדש נפתלי ׳ כי לא יתכן היות השם כמו קדש ברנע ובהסמכו בסגול ׳ כמו קדש הקוף בסגול נפתלי כי לא נמצא שם עיר ושם אדם משתנה בדבקות ׳ גם מצאנו אלון בצעננים אשר את קדש הקוף בסגול ולא בקמץ על ידי הסלוק ׳ ומן קדש יאמר קדשה הקוף בצר

הטעם עמו ׳ ומן קדש שהוא בקמץ וצרי יאמר ויבאו קדשה ׳ הדלת בצרי והטעם עמו ׳ אלה ודאי שתי שמות הן קדש וקדש ׳ כן אמ׳ מורי שיח׳ :

3°. (Fol. 110, r. מערב)—וקצת ׳ ודומה ׳ והמערה אשר בו ׳ מערת המכפלה ׳ לפעולה ע״מ אני מצוה אותך ׳ ולולי הריש גם הוא היה ראוי להדגש ׳ והוא על שמערים ממנו העפר ׳ ולו המם היה עיקר כדברי בעל פרחון ׳ היה אומר מערת המכפלה ע״מ קערת כסף ׳ ומן תער וישלפה מתערה ׳ כי התיו עיקר ׳ ומן תעלה שהתו נוספת אומ׳ תעלת הברכה מפי מורי :

4°. (Fol. 81, r. חשש)—ומאבא מרי שמעתי חשש כמו אשש בחלוף א׳ח׳ה׳ע׳ מן והתאוששו ׳ וכן יסד קלירי ותרשישי חשמל הששי יקר ׳ למד׳ שהוא לשון אש ׳ וכן הוא אומ׳ תהרו חשש תלדו קש ׳ כלומ׳ שני דברים יוצאים מכם שזה מחבל את זה :

If the question about Berechiah and Moses, son of Isaac, may be considered settled, those concerning Moses, son of Yom Tob מלונימרש, of the two Isaacs, of Russia and Tchernigoff, as well as the Berechiah, the author of the commentary on Job in the MS. No. 28 of the University Library of Cambridge, remains for the present unsolved.

A. NEUBAUER.

I am glad to find that Dr. Neubauer assents to my view of the date of Berachyah Nakdan, and hope that he will one day acknowledge the true faith of his identification with Benedict le Puncteur, of Oxford. The introduction to the Fables which, I should add, does not exist in the edition I used, or indeed in any edition later than the *princeps*, fixes Berachyah in England about the time of the massacres of 1190, and we find Benedictus le Puncteur at Oxford in 1194. Barring a certificate from the hand of Berachyah, I do not see what greater proof of identification could be given. He must have got at least part of his Fables from the Arabic, for there is no evidence of such fables as Nos. 28, 36, 68, existing in Latin or French, so early as 1190. The difficulty about Elijah's colophons is that whichever we fix upon as the first, Berachyah's age was then about eighty, and he is scarcely likely to have written much after that age. Berechiah was therefore not living at the date of one of the colophons whichever be the later. The only thing that seems fixed is the Berlin colophon, which my discovery of the day of the week settles as 1233.

I fail to see how Moses ben Isaac's statement that his mother or himself was "in the island Angleterre" proves that he was *not* there. He not alone quotes R. Moses ben Yomtob, whom we know to have been in London, but likewise R. Menachem of London. However I am quite satisfied with the extent of Dr. Neubauer's conversion, and his careful investigation of all the details about Berachyah has earned him the thanks of all interested in the subject.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Samuel Masnuth.—Amongst the recent publications of the society *Mekitse Nirdamim* we are glad to find the commentary on Job, called מעין גנים, by Samuel ben Nisim Masnuth, edited from a Bodleian MS. by the well known Solomon Buber. The author called his com-

mentary Midrash, and applied the same title to that on Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which is to be found in a Vatican MS, Assemani, No. xcvii., because he put together Midrashic passages concerning these books. The editor has shown his usual skill in editing the MS. as well as in the learned preface. He mentions a commentary by Samuel Masnuth on the Book of Kings, existing among the MSS. of the Vatican library, which, we believe, is not the case; from whom Herr Buber had this information he does not say, neither does he give the number of the MS. Another mistake is the date which the editor assigns to the author of the commentary, viz., the thirteenth century, and he makes him an inhabitant of Aleppo. Herr Buber quotes as his authority the late Dr. Zunz, who, on the authority of Judah al-Harizi, says that Samuel is mentioned as being at Aleppo in 1218. Harizi, however, only mentions Samuel ben הראש R. Nisim, without the epithet of מסנות, which our author bears. Besides he is called in the colophons of the Vatican MS., Samuel, son of R. Nisim, of Sicily, dwelling at Toledo. Herr Buber does not know how to explain the words צקילי במדינת טוליטלה, saying "perhaps Nisim was a native of Sicily, dwelling in Toledo, and finally emigrated, he or his son Samuel, to Aleppo"; he suggests also that צקילי may possibly be a family name. The MS., No. 361, of the Vatican Library will, however, show that Samuel's brother Isaac lived in the fifteenth century. It contains an Arabic treatise, beginning with the following words: אלפרק בין אלדלאיל ואלאעראץ; it was copied by David ben Elijah, the physician, for (לכבוד) R. Isaac, the physician, son of R. Nisim הזקן ר׳ית הידוע מסנות. The third *opus* of the same MS., which contains a vocabulary of plants in Arabic and Latin, was written by the same scribe for (לכבוד) Berechiah, the physician, son of R. Moses הזקן הידוע קמחי ספרדי; the copy was finished at Palermo, Tuesday, the 29th of the month Siwan, 5102=1442. Isaac Masnuth accordingly dwelt at Palermo, and his brother Samuel, our author, went to Toledo. Consequently the Samuel al-Barkuli, to whom Harizi dedicated his book called תחכמוני, according to the editions and some MS., cannot be identical with our author. What ברקולי means is not certain, but it is most likely the name of a locality or a district of a locality.

A. N.

Shtars in Merton College, Oxford.—Mr. W. H. Stevenson, who is making a catalogue of the deeds belonging to Merton College, was kind enough to communicate to me three Hebrew deeds.

1st. The one published by Mr. Davis (*Hebrew Deeds*, No. 204, page 369), according to Tovey's *Anglia Judaica*, where the text is not quite correct. It has been reprinted, according to the original in the *Notes on the Jews at Oxford* (Vol. II. of the *Collectanea* of the Oxford Historical Society, p. 303).

2nd. No. 1,099 B. ix. with Thomas Bodley's Latin translation, made the 3rd of August, 1574. The parties concerned are William de Watville, Maestre Walther de Merton, and Aaron, son of Abram, who

acknowledged to have received the 58 pounds from the above-mentioned, date 29 Henry III., 1244. The following is the Hebrew text :—

אני החתום מטה מודה הודאה גמורה שקבלתי מגילמא דגטויל על יד משטרא גוטייר דמירטון חמשים לטרין זאת לדעת מחוב אחד מחמשים ושמונה לט שאותו גילמא היה חייב לי על יד צירוגרייפא אחד מחמשים ושמונה לטרין עשוי על שם אותו גילמא ועל שמי שממנה חלק שהשעוה תלויה בו בתי׳ צי׳ מלונדרש שממנה זמן הפרעה בחמש שנים לאילו הזמנים זאת לדעת לפשק שנת כ״ט למלכות אדונינו המלך הנרי בן המלך יואן ו׳ לט ולשיינט מיקיל קרובה רדופה ו׳ לט וכן לשלש שנים רדופים י״ב לט בשנה לזמנים נקובים ולשנה חמישית עשרה לט לזמנים נקובים ומן השמונה לט הנותרים נאותי לנקוב גילמא וליורשיו שישלמם לי וליורשי בד שנים לכל שיינט מיקל מ דינ זמן ראשון מתחיל לשיינ׳ מיקל שנת שלשים ממלכות הנקובה ויש לדעת שבעבור אותם ח׳ לט נשאר בידי החותם הנקוב מנח׳ לט בכן שכל זמן שהנקוב גילמא או יורשיו יעשו לו או ליורשי חותם משמנה לט לשלם בד שנים כמו שאמור למעלה או מאשר ישאר באיחור מהנקובים ח׳ לט או עלי ועל יורשי [1] למסר לנקוב גילמא או ליורשיו או לבאי מכחם הנקוב צי׳ מנח לט פטורה ומותרת ואם כן יהיה שלא יעשה רצוני מהנקו׳ ח׳ לט לזמנים נקובים כמו שאמור למעלה אז אני ויורשי רשאים להכריח הנקוב גילמא ויורשיו על יד הצירוגרייפא הנקוב מנח׳ לט מכל זמן עבר מהנקוב שמנה לט והשבח שיעלה בהעברת הזמן בכן שרביע שנה אחר זמן עבר לא יעלה שום שבח על הנקובים מ די ויש לדעת שהנקוב גוטייר ולא שום מאבותיו מעולם לא היו חייבים לי מאומה ושאני ויורשי שום דבר לא יוכלו לשאל ולערער על הנקוב גוטייר ולא על יורשיו מבריאת עולם עד שיינט מיקיל שנת ל ממלכות הנקובה ומה שהודיתי חתמתי :

אהרן בן אברם

Aaron, son of Abram, is probably identical with the Aaron who signed with others the Shetar published by Mr. Davis, No. 194 and 195 (pp. 357 and 358). Mr. Davis has another Aaron, son of Abram, in a Nottingham deed, No. 138 (page 279). I read in this deed Aaron, son of Menahem.

3rd. No. 2297, before St. Michel, 31 Henry III. 1247. Demise from Ralph de Amundevill to Walter of Merton, in Latin, signed—

אני אהרן מאורויק מודה שכל מה שכתוב למעלה [2] שהוא אמת :

4th. No. 2423, c. 1260. A grant from Stephen of Chenduit to Walter of Merton, of Manors of Chetydon and Ybbeston (Ibston), Bucks and Oxford.

אנחנו חתומים מטה מודים שפטרנו ומחלנו אל שיר גוטיר דמירטון וליורשיו ולבאים מכחו כל דין ותביעה ועירעור ושיעבוד ויכולת שהיה לי או שיכול להיות לי על מלון איבשטאנא בפלך אוכשנפורט ובוקינגהם עם המחוזות ועל

[1] Follows לשל crossed out

[2] In a duplicate בלטין.

מלון קיטינדונא בפלך בוקינגהם עם כל המחוזות בעלילת שום חוב שהיה שיר אישטיונא דקיאנדוט פרש חייב לנו בחותם או בחתיכה או בשום און אחר מבריאת עולב עד סופו בעבור כי שיר גוטיר הנקו' פטר המלונות הנק' ממנו ומיורשינו מכל חובות ומסים שהיה אישטיונא הנקו' חייב לנו על המלונות הנקובי' מבריאת עולם עד סופו וזאת חתמנו חיים [1] דניקול מנשיר בן אהרן

5th. No. 1,146, Hayyim fil Delcresse gives up all claim of tenements and *homes* at Birbek in Leicestershire and elsewhere to the chief of the house of the scholars of Merton to the scholars and socitores, belonging to Sir Robert de Farci, at the request of Sir Walther de Merton, formerly Chancellor of the King, dated the 8th St. Peter in Cathedra, 56 Henry III., 1272.

There are two copies of the Hebrew text, one of which is more correct than the other. I give the text arranged from the two documents, with the variations.

On the outside we read the following Latin name of Hayyim: "Ock Hagin, Judaeus, London."

אני החתום מטה מודה הודאה גמורה שפטרתי ומחלתי לשומר מבית אשקולייר[2] ממירטונא ולאשקוליירש מאותו מקום ולשושישורש שלהם כל דין תביעה וערעור ויכולת ושעבוד שהיה לי ושיכול להיות לי על כל הקרקע וטינמינט והאפורנוצש[3] ואומייש ואפורטנוצש אחרות בכל מקום שהם מגיעים לאותו טינמינט ז"ל בעיר ברבקי וליציהטר[4] ובמקומות אחרים[5] שהנקובי' שומר והאשקוליירש מחזיקים מכתיבת והנחת שיר רובירט דפרצי בבקשת שיר גוטייר דמירטונא שהיה כבר קונצלייר אדוננו המלך בכן שלא אוכל אני ולא יורשי ולא שום הבא מכחי ובעבורי לתבוע ולערער שום תביעת חוב על אותו קרקע וטינמינט ואומייש והאפורטנוצש[6] בעלילת שום חוב שהנקוב שיר רובירט או אבותיו או יורשיו נתחייבו לי או לאבותי או ליורשי בחותם או בחתיכה או בשום און[7] אחר בשום תיבת צירוגרייפש מארץ האי או לחוץ מבריאת עולם עד סופו ואם שום יהודי או יהודית בעולם או שום אחד מטעם חוב בשם יהודי או בעלילת שום[8] חוב מיהודי יבא וישאל שום חוב על השומר והאשקוליירש הנקו' או על שושישורש שלהם בעלילת הנקו' קרקע וטינמינט ואומייש ואפורטנוצש בעבור שום חוב שהנקו' שיר רובירט או אבותיו או יורשיו נתחייבו לי או לאבותי או ליורשי או לשום יהודי או יהודית אחר בעולם בחותם או בחתיכה או בשום און אחר בתיבת אדוננו המלך או לחוץ קבלתי עלי ועל יורשי להציל ולהגין ולפטור הנקו' שומר והאשקוליירש והשושישורש שלהם נגד כל אותם מכל אותם חובות ותביעות לעולם וכמו כן קבלתי עלי ועל יורשי לעשות ההצלה והגנה והפטור מכל חובות ששום ארמאי אחר נתחייב על אותו קרקע וטינמינט והארפורטנוצש הנקו' נגד כל יהודים ויהודיות שבעולם מבריאת עולם ועד סופו ונגד כל ארמאים שיוכלו לשאל

---

[1] In Latin Haginus.

[2] אישקוליירש, scholars.

[3] ואפורנוצש

[4] ויליציהער

[5] אחרות

[6] ואפורטנוצש

[7] one ?

[8] deest.

מטעם חוב בשם יהודי או בעלילת חוב מיהודי אקטא יום שי פיירא אינקתידרו [1] שנת חמשים ושש למלכות אדוננו המלך הנרי בן המלך יואן ומה שהודיתי חתמתי :

חיים בן דלקרייט

A. NEUBAUER.

Pope Eugenius IV. on the Jews.—The following document was communicated to me by Mr. W. Bliss, employed by the British Government in Vatican Archives, where he found it in the Resgesta Pontificum. As far as I could investigate the volumes of the *Bullarium*, it has never been published. 1433, 8. 1d. Feb. Universis, etc. Sicut Judeiis non debet esse licentia in synagogis suis ultra quam permissum est eis lege presumere, Ita in hiis quæ concessa sunt ipsis nullum debetur prejudicium sustinere. Licet igitur prefati Judei in sua magis velint duritia perdurare quam prophetarum verba et suarum scripturarum Archana cognoscere atque ad Christianæ fidei et salutis notitiam pervenire, quia tamen defensionem nostram et auxilium postulant et Cristianæ pietatis mansuetudinem interpellant. Nos felicis recordationis Calixti Eugenii Alexandri Celestini Innocentii Gregorii Nicolai Honorii et Nicolai quarti Bonifacii noni Romanorum pontificum predecessorum nostrorum vestigiis inherentes ipsorum Judeorum petitionem admittimus eisque protectionis nostræ clipeum impertimur statuentes ut nullus Cristianus Judeos eosdem invitos vel nolentes ad Baptismum per violentiam venire compellat sed si quis eorum sponte ad Cristianos fidei causa confugerit postquam voluntas eis fuerit patefacta efficiatur absque aliqua calumpnia Cristianus, veram enim Cristianitatis fidem habere non creditur qui ad Cristianorum Baptisma non spontaneus sed invitus cognoscitur pervenire. Nullus etiam Cristianus eorundem Judeorum personas sine Judicio Judicis competentis Civitatis seu Terræ in qua inhabitant vulnerare seu occidere vel suas illis pecunias auferre presumat aut bonas quas hactenus in eadem regione Civitate aut Terra habuerint consuetudines impedire seu mutare. Preterea in suarum festivitatum celebratione quisquam fustibus vel lapidibus aut alias eos nullatenus non perturbet nec aliquis ab eis coacta servitia exigat nisi ea quæ preteritis temporibus consueverant facere seu prestare, ad hæc malorum omnium pravitati et avaritiæ obviantes decernimus ut nemo Cimiterium Judæorum mutillare vel minuere audeat sive obtentu pecuniæ effodere corpora jam humata. Et quoniam justa et æqua postulantibus non est denegandus assensus statuimus ut in terris nobis et Romanæ ecclesiæ immediate subjectis omnes ordinarii provinciarum Civitatum Terrarum vel locorum Judices ecclesiastici seu temporales in aliis vero ecclesiastici tantum circa exatione collectarum et onerum per universitatem seu ab universitate deputatos impositorum seu imponendorum exactionem ad instantiam et requisitionem eorum Judeorum qui se ad eam rem deputatos per prefatam ipsorum universitatem docuerint jus dicere et obligatos ad solutionem prefatarum collectarum et onerum dumtaxat cogere et compellere debeant auctoritate presentium Juris communis seu prefatorum locorum Constitutionum vel consuetudinum et aliis remediis oportunis. Cum autem valde sit consonum æquitati ut qui commoda non sentiunt nec debeant ipsis oneribus subjacere decernimus quod in quibus Civitatibus Terris et locis Judæi præfati Civium

[1] אינקצידרו

privilegiis et immunitatibus non gaudeant in eisdem prefatos judeos ad represalias contra cives illarum Civitatum Terrarum vel locorum quæ incolunt institutas nisi prefatæ represaliæ eorundem Judeorum causa et contemplatione fuissent contra illas Civitates Terras vel loca quæ incolunt institutæ prefatos Judeos non teneri nec eorundem vigore conveniri debere. Illos autem Judeos dumtaxat hujusmodi protectionis presidio volumus communiri qui nichil machinari presumpserint in subversione fidei memoratæ. Nulli ergo etc. nostræ constitutionis privilegii decreti statuti et Voluntatis infringere, etc. Si quis, etc. Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum Anno Incarnationis dominicæ millesimo quadrigentesimo tricesimo tertio Octavo Idus Februarii anno secundo.

A. NEUBAUER.

A Fragment of an Account of Persecutions.—Jewish chronicles contain naturally among historical data also those of calamities which befell Jewish congregations only too often. There are special chronicles for this subject, *e.g.*, by Judah ibn Verga (*The Rod of Judah*), by Joseph Cohen, of Avignon (*The Valley of Weeping*), by Samuel ben Nathan (*Mire of Clay*), and other authors. The so-called *Memorbuch* (book of reminiscence) contains lists of martyrs of various congregations. Of these, that of Mayence is the oldest and the most celebrated (see *Revue des Études Juives*, t. iv, page 1 *sq.*), but there are many others preserved in other congregations. Finally, manuscript prayer books, containing smaller or larger lists of names of countries and localities where persecutions degenerated into slaughters took place; these lists are usually followed by a prayer for the victims in general, mostly beginning with יזכור. Those lists are not only of importance for Jewish history, but also for mediæval Jewish geography. The fragment which we are going to publish has a special interest by having the years when the massacres took place. It is to be found in a miscellaneous MS. of the Hamburg Library, No. 70ii, in Dr. Steinschneider's Catalogue of the MSS. of this Library, Hamburg, 1878, page 32. Dr. Steinschneider gives, as is usual in catalogues, the beginning and the end of the fragment; it is preceded by a liturgy, of which the beginning is wanting, and finishing with the words ב׳א׳י חנון המרבה לסלוח. The anonymous copyist made certainly use of David Gans's chronicle (*Sprout of David*), but he also gives some additional data, altogether fifty-three calamities, of which only the last nine are preserved in the MS. Possibly that the anonymous writer made also use of Efodi's lost treatise, entitled זכרון השמדות (*Memorial* of forced conversions), ingeniously recognised in quotations from it by Professor Graetz in his great history of the Jews, t. VIII. note I., page 404 *sqq.*

The incomplete text is the following:—

מאונסי פורטוגאל ודוד הראובני הבא ממדינת עשרת השבטים מעבר לנהר גוזן: הארבעים וארבע שבשנת ש״א לאלף הששי עינו (עינוי .MS) את היהודים שבמדינת פיהם ורבים נשרפו על קידוש שמך וא׳ח׳כ נתגרשו כל היהודים מהמדינה בעבור שעללו על היהודים ששרפו ערים רבים ושקר ענו בם עם שנתברר הרבה (?הדבר) להם ואז חזרו למקומם: וארבעים וחמשה שבשנת שי״ד לאלף הששי נשרפו כל הגמרות הנמצאים בכל ארץ אטליא: וארבעים וששה

שבשנת שי״ט לאלף הששי נטלו כל הספרים מהיהודים בעיר פראג וא׳ח׳כ נשרפו ע״ב בתים מבתיהן: וארבעים ושבעה שבשנה הנ״ל נתגרשו כל היהודים מעיר פראג וממדינת ביהם עד שא׳ח׳כ הוחזרו למקומם: וארבעים ושמונה שבשנת של״ד היה עת צרה ליהודים אשר במדינת מעררין וכמה נפשות מישראל נשרפו על קדושת שמך: וארבעים ותשעה שבשנת שמ״ח תפשו כל היהודים אשר בעיר בון ובזזו כל אשר להם: וחמשים בשנת שנ״ב לאלף הששי נתגרשו כל היהודים אשר בזקשן: וחמשים ואחד שבשנת ת״ח לאלף הששי נהרגו ונשחטו ונאבדו כמה מאה אלפים נפשות מישראל במדינת רייסן והומתו בכל מיני מיתות משונות וקשות ואכזריות לבד מה שנאבדו בין האומות שנתגרשו בארצות רחוקים ומדי שנשבו ונמכרו והוציאו מן הכלל: וחמשים ושנים שבשנת ת״ט לאלף הששי נהרגו ונשחטו כמה אלפים במדינת פולין בגליל חעלם ואגפיה: וחמשים ושלשה שבשנת תט״ז לאלף הששי היה הרג רב וגדול במדינת פולין גדול וקטן והיה בהם דבר חרב ורעב ונאבדו כמה אלפים נפשות מישראל וכמה קהלות קדושים נחרבו: כל אילו הצרות נודעים לי אשר מצאו אותנו ועברו על ראשינו לבד מה שעברו עלינו אשר לא נודעו לי כי הם עצמו מלספר אשר פגעו בעם קודש בכל הארצות בפרט בספרד בציציליא בקסטיליא בברצולינא (so) בטוליטלא בקורטובא בברברייא באסיה בפרס ומדי בצרפת בפורטיגאל באנגלטירא באשכנז בביהם ומעררין באסטרייך ואונגרין בקראין וקרינטי ושטייארמריק טיראל ניוף בורג (?) ובייארן וזיבן בורגין ותוגרמי במצרים וכוש ובבל וארץ פלשתים בפולין ורייסין וביון באיטאליה ורמוס ובשאר מדינות ומלכיות אשר לא נודעו לי:

The forced converts of Portugal and David the Reubenite, who came from the land of the Ten Tribes, which is situated on the other side of the river Gozan. (See this QUARTERLY, Vol. I., page 408.)

44th. In the year 5301 (1541) they tortured the Jews of Bohemia, where many were burnt for the sake of thine holy name; they were then driven out from this country on the ground that they had set fire to many towns, but when it was proved later to be untrue, they were allowed to return.

45th. In the year 5314 (1554) all the copies of the Talmud were burnt in Italy.

46th. In the year 5319 (1559) all the books were taken away from the Jews at Prague, and seventy-two of their houses were burnt.

47th. In the same year the Jews were exiled from Prague and Bohemia, but they were allowed to return there.

48th. In the year 5334 (1574) there was a great calamity to the Jews in Moravia, and many of them were burnt for thine holy name.

49th. In the year 5348 (1588) all the Jews were seized at Bonn, and their property was plundered.

50th. In the year 5352 (1592) all the Jews were driven from Saxony.

51st. In the year 5408 (1648) hundreds and thousands of the Jews perished in the province of Reissen by cruel deaths, besides those who were made captives, and sold to far countries, and others who were converted by force.

52nd. In the year 5409 (1649) many thousands of Jews perished in Chelm and the neighbourhood, in Poland.

53rd. In the year 5415 (1655) slaughters with plague and famine

occurred in Poland, Great and Lesser, when many thousand Jews perished, and many congregations were completely annihilated.

All these calamities are known to me, besides the many unknown in Spain (Andalusia), Sicily, Castilia, Barcelona, Toledo, Cordova, Barbary, Asia, Persia and Media, France, Portugal, England, Germany, Bohemia and Moravia, Austria and Hungary, Krain (Carintia) and Styria, Tyrol and Neuburg ?, Bavaria, Transylvania, Turkey, Egypt, Cush, Babylonia, and the land of the Philistines, in Poland, Reussen, Greece and Rome, and in other lands unknown to me.

A. NEUBAUER.

Hosea xiv. 8.—An interesting rendering of the LXX. is to be found in Hosea, chap. xiv., 8, to the words יְחַיּוּ דָגָן וְיִפְרְחוּ כַגָּפֶן. The words are not easy. Both A. V. and R. V. have: "They shall revive as the corn, and blossom as the vine," which is distinctly against the pointing of the first part of the sentence. Ewald translates: "They shall produce corn."

Now the LXX. renders *ζήσονται καὶ μεθυσθήσονται σίτῳ*. Here *μεθυσθήσονται* is not only not in the Hebrew text, but its use is most curious. What is the meaning of, "They shall live and be drunk with corn." *Μεθύσκω* in Greek has the sense of "being drunk" only. The nearest approach to a similar use is, as Professor Wilkins has noticed to me, that to be found in the rendering of Psalm xxxvi. 9. יְרְוְיוּן מִדֶּשֶׁן בֵּיתֶךָ (LXX., Psalm xxxv. 9), where we read, *μεθυσθήσονται ἀπὸ πιότητος κ.τ.λ*; but here יְרְוְיוּן is literally translated, and the Hebrew verb itself is used in a rather unusual sense. The use of *μεθύσκω* in a metaphorical sense goes further than the use of "intoxicate" in English. We might say of one that he was intoxicated with success; we could hardly speak of his being intoxicated with bread.

L. M. SIMMONS.

An Unknown Hebrew Version of the Sayings of Aesop.—In the library of the Temple Emanu-el, New York, there is preserved a MS.[1] by an otherwise unknown Jewish author of the end of the sixteenth century. Eliyyā ben Menaḥēm Rābhā, at once the author and the scribe, lived in Carpi in the Dukedom of Modena.[2] His father resided in Padua,

---

[1] Press-Mark, vii., c. 42.

[2] Cfr. *Ben Chananja*, Szegedin, 1866, p. 215; *Catalogo dei Manoscritti Ebraici della Biblioteca della Communita Israelitica di Mantova, compilato dal Rabbino Maggiore Marco Mortara.* Livorno, Tipografia I. Costa e C., 1878, p. 58. (For the use of this little book I am indebted to Dr. S. Morais, of Philadelphia.) Mortara says that Rābhā lived in Padua, but he did not know of the existence of our MS., which is distinctly stated to have been written in Carpi. On the title-page we read, תחת ממשלת מעלת אדונינו דוכום דון אלפונסו יב"ה דאיסטה נתנשא אמן אמן כי"ה. Of course, Alfonso II. (1559-1597), the persecutor of Tasso, and the last legitimate offspring of the Italian branch of the *Este* house, is meant. Cfr. Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, x., pp. 365 ff.

where he composed, as far as our knowledge reaches, seven different writings, of which mention is made in Wolf's *Bibliotheca Hebræa*. Only three of these seem to have reached the printer; the one entitled *Bēth Mō'ēdh* being edited by the son in the year 1604-5.[1]

The MS. before us[2] contains several compilatory works by the younger Rābhā: a collection of Talmudic sayings arranged alphabetically, and commented on pithily by the collector; a similarly ordered collection of wise saws culled from Midrash and Talmud, arranged according to the occurrence in them of the numbers one, two, etc., up to ten[3]—likewise commented on, and, together with the first, provided with careful references to the originals. Then comes another list of sayings taken from philosophical and moral works, in alphabetical order, and lengthily commented on by the collector.

The last place in the MS. is taken by the Hebrew translation from an Italian original, also given. The three hundred and fifty-five sayings bear the Hebrew title *Adhēreth Eliyāhū*; Italian title they have none. In a long rhyme-prosed introduction—his own work—Rābhā the younger gives the reason for this his choice of name.[4] The collection itself, in pithy sentences of two *στίχοι* which rhyme with each other, is headed thus: "Behold this; it existed, however, in olden times, in a Gentile speech. The writer composed it who is called by name Aesopo of Phrygia,[5] a Gentile who composed many proverbs, in number without end. By the aid of Heaven, the high, the exalted, I shall translate it into the Assyrian speech.[6] I open my lips, and take up my parable, and I say."

---

[1] And not 1608, as Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii., p. 352, and Benjacob, *Ozar Ha-Sepharim*, p. 75, No. 363, state. Cfr. Steinschneider, *Catalogus*, col. 1,733.

[2] Composed in the year 1590, and not 1500, as is printed by mistake in *Ben Chananja*, loc. cit.

[3] Cfr. a somewhat similar compilation by P. J. Herson, in his *Talmudic Miscellany* (vol. xix. of the *Philosophical Library*).

[4] ולהיות כי חפשתי מצאתי הון לי, יקר מכספי ויתר זהבי
ה"ה דברי תוכחת מוסר ומשלים, למראה נאים וליופי נחמדים
בלשון ובכתיבה נוצרית, אשר חברו מחוסר ברית
אמרתי לא טוב היות דבר של תועלת ומעלה, בלשון ובכתיבה בלתי שלימה
ובזה העתקתי דבריו התועלתיים, בעט סופר ולשון למודים
ובלשון הקדש הנקרא אשורית, כדי שיהיה מובן לכל רב ותלמיד
וקראתי את שמו אדרת אליהו, כי הבאי' אליו ישמעו ויראו
ועל שמי כי בן נקרא, אני הצעיר והנכנע אליה
בן לסמא דכולא בה, כ"ת א"א מנחם רבא
וכמו שהאדרת הוא מעיל ומעטה, וכסות אשר האדם בן יתכסה וכו'

[5] Wiener (*Ben Chananja*, loc. cit.) misread the title, and fashioned out of it one "Aesopo, מארגיו a fruitful Christian author of the Middle Ages," of whose existence I find no proof.

[6] This term is usually applied only to the script, and not to the language of the later Hebrew. I know of only a few cases where it is used for the *language*. Cfr. Yerushalmi, *Sotah* vii. 21*b*; *Z.D.M.G.*, xliii., p. 258; Levi, *Elia Levita und Seine Leistungen als Grammatiker*, Breslau, 1888, p. 35. אשורית=Syriac, cfr. *Osar Nehmādh*, vol. ii. p. 242; Steinschneider, *Catalogus ...Lugd. Batav.*, p. 66; Fürst, *Der Kanon des Alten Testaments*, p. 118.

I know not with what right these sentences are dubbed "of Aesop," for he it is, without doubt, who is here set up as their author.[1] The Italian translations and "Bearbeitungen" of Aesop are many;[2] but in none have I been able to discover—from the title—a likeness to our "sayings" (which word might, in the Hebrew, as well be "proverbs"). The Hebrew does, indeed, possess a recension of the real pseudo-Aesop;[3] and another collection which has been thrice done by the printer—1516, 1544, 1605;[4] but nothing, so far as I can ascertain, like the work of Rābhā.[5]

The translation is very free. The effort to produce clauses of the desired shortness and rhyme has effaced nearly all traces of the original. I doubt whether the translator was well up in his Italian. At times he seems to make some bad mistakes.

I have cause to believe that the MS. is unique. Nor do I doubt that this very one was once in the possession of Dr. M. Wiener, who has described it.[6] In 1866 it became the property of N. Coronel,[7] from whom it passed (presumably through the hands of Giuseppi Almanzi)[8] to the auction-room of Fred. Muller in Amsterdam (1868) and thence to its present resting-place.[9]

I have also among my own books (it may be well to mention) a little MS. volume containing the *Tōl*^{e}*dhōth Aezopu* in a late Italian hand. It seems to have a big gap at the end; but, so far as I can see, there is nothing like it in the libraries whose catalogues I have. It turns out to be a Judaizing adaptation of the Aesopian history, for which the responsibility

---

סורסי is more commonly used in this connection. Cfr. Steinschneider, *Catalogus*, p. 66; *Jewish Lit.*, p. 353; *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, xiv., p. 13; Frankel, *Mntschrift*, ix. 75. Gottheil, *Eliā of Sobhā*, note 4. The same meaning attaches to the Arabic, אלסריאני, which Harkavy has not noticed, *Magazin f. Wissensch. d. Judenthums*, xiv., p. 32.

[1] But cfr. what Jacobs, *The Fables of Æsop*, i. p. 194, says.

[2] Cfr. S. F. W. Hoffmann, *Bibliographisches Lexicon*, i., p. 89.

[3] Landsberger, *Die Fabeln des Sophos*, Posen, 1859, cfr. Geiger, *Z. D. M. G.*, xiv., p. 586ff; Frankel, *Mntschrift*, ix. p. 72; Jacobs, *The Fables of Æsop*, i. p. 216.

[4] These are the dates as given by Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.*, xiv., p. 53. Landsberger, *Fabulæ aliquot Aramææ*, p. 13, gives 1516, 1546, 1697. Paulus Cassel, however, in his critical edition of these fables (*Mischle Sindbad*, Berlin, 1888, p. 307) says the dates are 1517, 1543, and 1608. In the Bodleian there is a MS. containing an Italian and Hebrew translation of Æsop's fables; but I know nothing of its character. See Neubauer, *Catalogue*, p. 1123.

[5] Two Greek MSS. do contain a few *sentences* of Æsop; but they seem in no way related to ours; cfr. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, i., p. 170, Αἰσωπου παροιμίαι; *ibid.*, v., p. 331, in Αἰσωπος ἀπενκοσμικᾶς κωμωδίας κατὰ ἀλφαβητον, for which information I am indebted to Dr. A. Gudeman.

[6] *Ben Chananja*, loc. cit

[7] On whom cfr. Geiger, *Zeitschrift*, 1872, p. 124.

[8] The best part of the Tempel Emanu-El collection has come from his library. For the present see *Hebr. Bibl.*, iii., p. 30. Geiger, *Zeitschrift*, iii., pp. 218, 295.

[9] Cfr. his *Catalog.*, Amsterdam, 1868, p. 346. The MS. also contains the signature, as it seems, of two censors. On fol. 192b, there is that of "Fra Luigi da Bologna, 1599," which name appears often upon Hebrew MSS. and prints of this period; cfr. e.g. *Hebr. Bibl.*, xiv., p. 60; Neubauer, *Catalogue*, col. 1099. On fol. 195b, there appears also "Camillo Jaghel, 1613." In general see *Hebr. Bibl.*, v., pp. 100, 125.

was believed to rest[1] upon the shoulders of the fourteenth century monk Planudes; whom it seems best—since the days of Meziriac's *Vie d'Esope*—to revile as hard as one can, speaking of naught but "the gross forgeries of that lying monk Planudes."[2]

---

[1] But see Jacobs, *The Fables of Æsop*, i. p. 19.

[2] The words of the anonymous author of the *Select Fables of Esob and other Fabulists*, Birmingham, 1764. Preface, p. iii.

ראה זה חדש הוא כבר היה לעולמים בלשון נצרי חברו המחבר הנקרא בשם איסופו מפרגיו נצרי אשר דבר משלים הרבה לאין קץ, ובסעדא דשמייא מרומא עילאה אעתקנו בלשון אשורית אפתח נא שפתי ואשא משלי ואומר

[1] יש לאדם להבין אחרית דבר מראשיתו, טרם במלאכה יתחיל לשלח ידו:

[2] אינו דומה יופי הנשמה השכלית, ליומי הייולית הגוף החומרית:

[3] אם הכסילים שנו מקום דירתם, לא על זה שנו רוע מעלילותם:

[4] כל הדברים באחדות ואחוה יפרו וירבו, ובמחלוקת ואיבה ישחיתו ויחריבו:

[5] העושר והממון הם לאדם סכות, להרחיקו מפעולות הטובות:

[6] אם נסתיר חטאתינו מחברינו, לא נסתירם מהאל כי הוא לבדו רואנו:

[7] רחק מחבורת האוהבי' אשר ירחקו ממך, ובצרתך ינוסו ללא עוזרך:

[8] מי שלעת המצטרך לגבורים ממנו יודה, הנה ימצא תועלת הרבה:

[9] החטא יותר כאב נמריץ, הוא המסית המלך להרע ויעץ:

[10] פעמים הרבה הנזק והחסרון, יהיה לאדם משל ודמיון:

[1] L'huomo deue molto bene considerare il fine prima che nēga a fare cosa alcuna.

[2] E molto piu bella la Bellezza del animo che quella del corpo.

[3] Se gli huomini scelerati mutano ben stato et condecione nō muteno però, i, custumi.

[4] Le cose humani come dice salustio ugualmēte, p̄ la concordia crescono, e p̄ la discordia rouinano.

[5] Gli huomini p̄ lusuria et abondanza si marciscono et ritardono dal ben fare.

[6] Se noi nascōderemo i nr̄i pecati da gli huomini nō gli potremo nascondre da dio il qual sole uede ogni cosa.

[7] Fuggiamo quelli amici che ne pericoli fugano per non darci, haiuto.

[8] Quelli che da, i, piu forti a tempo cedono sonno migliori di quelli che nō li cedono.

[9] Quelli che piu che li altri, peccano, che persuedano, a, i, principi de far male.

[10] Spesse uolti, il, danno esser dotrina al huomo.

11 הזונה והמנאפת, יצטרכו לתוכחת :
12 מי שמניח אומנותו הרגיל בו, ומתחיל דבר אשר לא ידע עשותה, בהלכתו מטיל עצמו בסכנה לרעתו :
13 בני אדם יחכמו וישכילו בינה, עם הנזק ורוב הסכנה :
14 החבורה התמידית מסבב סיבה, שהפעולה גדולה נראת נוחה וקלה :
15 ממדות ודרכי החכמים, לשמוע חרפתם ואינם משיבים, וכאשר לא יהיו להם קרובים כשיראו כי ג״כ איש לרעהו מחרפים :
16 מי שיש לו תמונת הגוף נאה יודע חסרונו בשכל ובנשמה :
17 עם הכסילים ובלתי מדרגה, אין ראוי לילך עמם בחבורה :
18 במקום שיוכיחו מעשים, אין ראוי להרבות דברים :
19 אין דבר מן הבורא נסתר, וגם לראותו מי יוכל :
20 מי שמניח מה שקנה, כדי להרבות ברווחה, סכלותו גדולה וטמא טמא יקרא :
21 המושפע בהון יתחייב להשפיע לאחרים, ומהונו יעזר ויעזור דלים :
22 המרחק מן המדברים אחד בפה ואחד בלב, וגם מאשר יאמר בזה, אולי לא אדע דבר :
23 התרחק מן האנשים אשר יזיקו למיודעיהם, כי גם לך יזיקו ותאבד עמהם :
24 מי שסודו רע כאשר ירבה טוב טעם תאותו, כן ירבה וכן יפרוץ רעתו ורשעתו :

---

11 Li adulatori sonno da essere ripresi.

12 Quelli che lasciano i, loro consueti, esercitij et uogliano fare quel che nō sano sonno deleggiati et spesse uolti, uengono lo pericolo.

13 L'huomini diuentono sauij con il danno et pericolo.

14 La contineua conuersatione fa che quelli cose che noi tememo grandemente ne paiono piaceuole.

15 Un huomo sauio deue comportare l'ingiurij che se li fano da quelli che nō li sonno p̄ sangue congiunti quando uede che quelli si fano ingiuria ancora fra lor medesimi.

16 Quelli che sonno belli di corpo nō ano senso d'animo ne industrio alcuno.

17 Con li tristi et scelerati nō douemo hauer, compagnia.

18 Quel che si puo prouare in fatti nō fano bisogno paroli.

19 A dio niuna cosa è ascosa ne anco esse si puo gabare.

20 E matto colui che p̄ speranza de maggior guadagno lascia andare cio che, a, in mano ben che sia picciolo.

21 I maggiori deuano partire li fatichi con i : minori acio che tutti si saluano :

22 Fuggiamo l'amicicia di quelli huomini la cui uita et dopia et il parlare dubioso.

23 Dobiamo fuggire quelli che tratano malo, li lor famigliare et domestichi.

24 L'huomini chatiui quando anō maggior piacere tanto piu se inam̄ano a far male.

25 סבול הרע והנזק אשר יקרך , כשהמסבבו גם הוא ייצר בצערך
26 פעמי׳ יחשב אדם לצור זולתו , ויהפך המחשבה וילכד הוא ברשתו
27 הכסיל לאולתו לא ידע לכלכל את עצמו , ולפעמים ירצה לעשות את
אשר אינו מוטל לו :
28 כשהמלך והשר יהיה אכזר , ישוממו העם ויהיו כעפר :
29 השוע לגודל מדת כלייותו , יאוה אלוקו אם יהיה ביכולתו
30 מי שבתחילת הרעתו לא נתוכח , תדע כי כן יירע ויאמר האח :
31 אין מי שבחכמתו ינצל ממקוה הזמן והמזל :
32 אין להתעצב על אבדת העושר , כי אין זה קנין הכושר :
33 יש מי שמבטיח דבר לחבירו , והנה אין ידו משגת לעשותו :
34 עושה פעולותיו בלא תבונה , לא תסתייעא מילתא :
35 המשכיל יצפון עצמו מאויביו , ויניחם לעזים וגיבורי׳ ויקלו מעליו :
36 טורח האדם ועמלו , לפעמים יכינם לחברו :
37 כשהתחלת מלאכה לעשות , אל תעזבנה בידם רפות :
38 אין להמליך מלך ביופייו , אך לטוב מעשיו וצמח פניו :
39 החכם ישב תמיד למטרה , לעת המצטרך ויהיה לעזרה :
40 הכסיל כדי להסיג השגה קטנה , ישים עצמו בגודל הסכנה :

---

25 Dobiamo patientemente soportare il male quando uedemo che chi ne, e, causa pate male egli ancorra.

26 Spesse uolti alcuni sperādo prendere altri uiē preso, lui.

27 Quelli che nō sanō gouernare le cose lore et uogliono hauer cura de quelli che nō importano ad essi.

28 Le cose publichi et priuati si distrugieno quādo, i, principi eserceteno la crudelta.

29 L'hauaro p̄ l'auaritia gabbare ancor a Dio.

30 Quelli che nel prencipio de far male nō sonno castigati fano semp̄ magior male.

31 Niuno potere schiuare quel che deue intrauenere.

32 No'ci douemo atristare quando perdemo le Richezze che nō hauemo hauuto dalla natura, che nō pono stare di cōtineuo cō noi.

33 Molti huomini facilmento prometeno quel che con effetto nō possō dare.

34 Le cose nō si deuono fare inconsideratamente.

35 L'huomoni prudenti mandano gli nemici cō astutia, a, i piu forti.

36 Alcuno guadagnare p̄ l'altri fatichi.

37 Noi ricadere in quelle cose alli quali hauemmo ateso.

38 Li rē nō si deueno aleggersi p̄ belezza ma p̄ fortezza è prudēza.

39 L'huomo deue stare in ordine p̄ ogni bisogno che possa sucedre.

40 L'huomo p̄ un picciolo quadagno si metta a grā pericolo.

41 מי שלבושו מעטה בושה, לא יועיל תוכחת לתרופה :
42 מי שיש לו כלי ואינו פועל בו, הוא כאילו לעולם לא בא לידו :
43 בלכידת העיר ובשבייה שללתה, העניים ינוסו והעשרים ילכדו בה :
44 רבים מאשר לא שמעו אל דברי חכמי׳ וחידותם, גללו עליהם רע כגלל הילוך אחרי שרירות לבם הרע :
45 לפעמים הדברים מועילים, ונראים ניזוקים, והניזוקי׳ לפעמים נראים מועילים :

---

41 Un timido p̄ qual si uoglia amonetione nō si puo fortificare.

42 Se tu hai una cosa che nō l'adopri e quanto se tu dō l'hauessi.

43 Quando si piglia una cita l'poueri subito fogano è li Richi sono, presi.

44 Molti p̄ nō hauer obbidito alli sauij e prudenti s' hano fatto, male a lor medesimi.

45 Alcuna uolta quelle cose che paiano nociui sonō utili, e' quelli che paiano utili sonno nociui.

Richard Gottheil.

Columbia College,
New York.