The Jewish Quarterly Review.

EDITED BY

I. ABRAHAMS AND C. G. MONTEFIORE.

VOLUME III.

LONDON: D. NUTT.

1891.

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

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER, LEA & CO.
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.

PAGE

MOSES: RECENT CRITICISM ON MOSES AND THE PENTATEUCHAL NARRATIVES OF THE DECALOGUE. By C. G. MONTEFIORE 251

OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM IN JEWISH PHILOSOPHY. By Rev. JOHN OWEN 182

Origen and Rabbi Hoshaya. By Prof. W. BACHER... 357

PARSIC AND JEWISH LITERATURE OF THE FIRST MAN. By Rev. Dr. KOHUT 231

PREACHING: ABOUT PREACHING. By Rev. MORRIS JOSEPH ... 120

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. By ALFRED HENRIQUES 85

RETRIBUTION: THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

1. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By C. G. MONTEFIORE 1
2. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. J. EDWIN ODGERS 13
3. IN THE RABBINICAL LITERATURE. By S. SCHECHTER... 34

SABBATH LIGHT. By M. FRIEDMANN... 707

Septuagint: The Genesis of the so-called Septuagint. By Prof. GRAETZ 150

Sleep and Death. By Rev. L. M. SIMMONS 366

TALMUDICAL MISCELLANIES. By Rev. Dr. KOHUT.

1. SIFRE HOMEROS, BOOKS OF ENTERTAINMENT 546
2. CRŒSUS 549
3. ZEUS IN MISHNAH, TALMUD, AND MIDRASH 552

WILLS: JEWISH ETHICAL WILLS. By I. ABRAHAMS 436

WISDOM OF SOLOMON: WHAT IS THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON? By Prof. J. FREUDENTHAL 722

YEMEN: THE LITERATURE OF THE JEWS OF YEMEN. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 604

Zohar: Judæo-Christian Polemics in the Zohar. By Prof. W. BACHER... 781

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLUME III.

I. ABRAHAMS.
W. BACHER.
T. K. CHEYNE.
J. CHOTZNER.
S. DEBRÉ.
J. G. DOW.
J. FREUDENTHAL.
M. FRIEDMANN.
H. GRAETZ.
A. HENRIQUES.
J. JACOBS.
M. JOSEPH.
D. KAUFMANN.
A. KOHUT.
C. G. MONTEFIORE.
A. NEUBAUER.
J. E. ODGERS.
J. OWEN.
D. ROSIN.
S. SCHECHTER.
L. M. SIMMONS.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1890.

THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE RETRIBUTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND THE RABBINICAL LITERATURE.

I. The Old Testament.

Rightly to understand the drift of the following notes, it should be realised *in limine*, first, that throughout the Old Testament Divine retribution belongs to Time and not to Eternity. It is brought about by direct intervention in the affairs of this world. It takes the form of what are known as "judgments,"—judgments on the nation and judgments on the individual in the form of national or personal calamities. Secondly, in harmony with the traditional solidarity of the national and family life, there was a universally-accepted theory of joint and several responsibility for sin, and these retributive judgments might fall upon the subject for the sin of the king, on the son for the sin of the father, on the nation for the sin of the individual.

So long as the collectivism of Israel was absolutely unquestioned this theory was unassailed. But with the first glimmerings of individualism and the first seeking after abstract ideals, situations necessarily arose which put the old theory in sharp conflict with elementary notions of justice. Then follows a long series of attempts to reconcile the time-honoured view with the growing conception of true and Divine justice, a period of ingenious compromises and some casuistry, of alternate fitful advances towards higher ideals and of retrogression towards the earlier position.

A belief in a God who punishes and rewards is not wanting in the oldest portions of the Hebrew Scriptures; such a belief implies that the conception of Deity has already been partially moralized, and that God has acquired ethical attributes, though, possibly, not yet an ethical character.[1] For punishment and reward are not equivalent to anger and favour; they are dealt out upon principles, which, though frequently crude and arbitrary in their earliest applications, are capable of moral development and purification.

Let us note some of the characteristics of the earlier methods of Divine retribution in the Old Testament, and then see how far the principles which underlie them were retained or modified in later ages.

(1.) The God of antiquity, more especially of Semitic antiquity, is the God of the tribe or nation, not of the individual. To this rule Yahveh is no exception. He is the upholder of the social order, and the avenger of outraged public sentiment. The prosperity of the people as a whole, not that of its separate units, occupies his concern. Thus upon solemn occasions, when important maxims of social morality have been impudently violated, God is supposed to interfere, and society discerns in any misfortune, which ultimately befalls the wrongdoer or his family, the avenging agency of Supernatural Power (Judges ix. 24, 56, 57).[2] Hence, too, it is that the nascent religious consciousness is not alarmed by the distress of the righteous or the prosperity of the wicked. A lack of individualism excludes such puzzles.

(2.) In pre-prophetic times, Yahveh does not exclusively, or even mainly, avenge the violation of public morality; he is also greatly concerned to punish offences against himself. Such offences he deals with in a summary manner, and his retribution passes into his wrath. For though the post-exilic Psalmist can say, "As a father pities his children,

---

[1] Kuenen, Hibbert Lectures, E.T., p. 115.

[2] Cp. also 2 Sam. xxi. 1; xii. 14 (see Q. P. B.); Gen. iv. 10; xviii. 20, 21.

so Yahveh pities them that fear him," this does not accurately represent the antique conception of Yahveh. To the Psalmist's ancestors Yahveh was a God who punished any insult to himself with extreme severity.[1]

(3.) As the God of the tribe, Yahveh champions Israel to victory against its foes. The purity of the retributive action of God is qualified by his favouritism. In the song of Deborah the righteous deeds of Yahveh seem equivalent to Israel's victories over its enemies (Judges v. 11).

(4.) The identification in responsibility of the individual with his family, both present and to come, or with his race, leads to strange consequences in the doctrine of retribution. It is quite natural that God should visit the virtues and the vices of the fathers upon the children. The mercy of God is shown in allowing goodness to transmit its influence further than sin. To the third and fourth generation, according to the Second Commandment, is the crime of the sinner brought home to his descendants; to the thousandth generation the virtue of the good. It is not the mark of God's injustice, but of his longsuffering mercy, if the punishment of a sinner is deferred till after his death, and allowed to fall upon his son. It is not unjust that the religious crime of an individual should be visited upon the entire community, still less that the virtues and vices of a monarch should be reflected in the prosperity or the affliction of his subjects.[2]

(5.) The methods of divine retribution in antiquity are purely material. Reward and punishment are limited to the earthly life, the former consisting in the long enjoyment of earth's good things, the latter, in the want of them and in a premature death.

---

[1] Cp. 1 Sam. vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 7; 2 Sam. xxiv. 1; *per contra*, 2 Sam. vi. 11.

[2] Gen. xii. 17, xx. 18; Ex. xx. 5, xii. 29; Lev. xx. 5; Joshua vii. 11; xxii. 17-20; 1 Sam. iii. 13; 1 Kings xxi. 29, xi. 12; 2 Sam. xxi. 1. A number of other instances are collected by Gunning in his interesting essay, De goddelijke vergelding, hoofdzakelijk volgens Exod. xx. 5 en. Ezech. xviii. 20 (1881). The Greek parallels are very interesting. See Schmidt, Die Ethik der Alten Griechen, vol. i., chap. 1.

It does not lie within the province of the eighth century Prophets to deal specifically with all these peculiarities. The question of individualism, for instance, is not yet raised. They foretell collective punishment for collective guilt, or appeal to the nation as a whole to repent of its iniquities. Yet Amos draws a distinction between the rich oppressors and the suffering poor, though he does not explain how far the latter would escape from the catastrophe which is approaching. A characteristic doctrine of Isaiah is that of the Remnant, who are to be spared in the judgment, and to form the nucleus of the new or Messianic Israel. He seems to attribute to the judgment process a cleansing and sifting character. When the storm has passed, those who have been spared will turn wholly to God (x. 20, 21; iv. 3, 4). But elsewhere, it is said to be the "humble" and the "needy" (עֲנָוִים, אֶבְיוֹנִים, semi-ethical terms already), who *will be* spared (xxix. 19).

It is Ezekiel who first prominently discusses the religious difficulties of social solidarity. There are (see Postscript) traces of individualism before his time, but he is the first to offer a theoretic solution of the problem.

To the old view that the teeth of the children are necessarily, and without injustice, set on edge by the sour grapes which the fathers have eaten, he opposes a marked and exaggerated individualism. "The soul that sins, it (alone) shall die." The idea of vengeance is abandoned. "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." This is the teaching of Ezekiel, and the death he refers to is not death in the ordinary course of nature, but the death of "the Judgment." In these Judgments, only the sinner shall fall. This teaching was intended to meet immediate contemporary need. The exiled Jews imagined that they were suffering for their fathers' sins, from the consequences of which it was impossible to escape. They seem to have believed that the wrath of God weighed heavily upon the whole house of Israel, and to have looked forward to further exhibitions of God's judgment till the whole nation should be utterly consumed away.

Ezekiel had himself preached against the exiles, and threatened them with punishment. He is, therefore, at pains to point out that this punishment shall only overtake the guilty, while those who, at the moment of the judgment, are acting virtuously shall preserve their souls alive. His doctrine is mechanical, but laid the foundation for further developments. In the post-exilic literature this theory of individual retribution is emphasized, and leads to peculiar difficulties of its own. For if the misfortunes of a nation may be set down to national wrongdoing, it is much more dangerous to apply the same principle to the individual. The ground is laid for the antinomies that perplexed the authors of Job and Ecclesiastes.

The wicked do not always suffer; the righteous are not always prosperous. How does this agree with Divine justice?

As regards the prosperity of the wicked, it is occasionally suggested that through the solidarity of society, evil doers may be sometimes spared by the very existence of their righteous neighbours. Thus, even in a pre-exilic story, ten righteous men would have sufficed to ward off the merited punishment from Sodom, and in Jonah the ignorant children and the very cattle are put forward as a good and sufficient reason why God should not destroy a city (wicked though it was) of the heathen world. But the teaching of Jonah is exceptional, and even so spiritual a mind as the author of Psalm lxxiii. can only account for the prosperity of the wicked on the assumption that sudden and overwhelming calamity awaits them before their death.

The misfortunes of the righteous, when disconnected from the experiences of the nation, are either regarded as inexplicable, or it is supposed that God has sent such sufferings as a trial and a discipline. This educational view of suffering is not much earlier than the Exile. It is already indicated in 2 Sam. vii. 14, and taught more fully in Psalms cxix. 67, 71, xciv. 12, 13; Proverbs iii. 11, 12; Job v. 17, xxxiii. 19.

Midway between the individual and the nation is the

unique picture of the suffering Servant, with its unique explanation of suffering as undergone consciously and of set purpose because of the sins and for the well-being of others. Such a sufferer was Jeremiah; yet the idea that "by his stripes" his people would be healed seems never to have occurred to him. His absolute fidelity to his vocation and his God rests upon the plain conviction that such was his duty, such the will of the Divine Power which he could not choose but obey. That central idea, which the great unknown Prophet of the Exile conceived, of the intercession and suffering of the Servant, which could transfigure human suffering into something akin to joy, was not adopted by any subsequent writer in the Hebrew canon.[1]

But the religious thought and imagination even of the post-exilic period were more often connected and concerned with the nation than with the individual. The tendency of the age was to ascribe the national condition to the direct intervention of God. The history of Israel is a holy history, in which God interferes directly. Thus its past shaped itself to the minds of pious Jews as one constant example of Divine retribution. The scheme of the Book of Judges shows this tendency clearly in its well-known rhythmic repetition of sin, punishment, contrition, and deliverance. In Chronicles every adversity that befalls the nation is ascribed to some particular sin. The priestly or Levitical author of this book almost invariably represents this sin as a deflection from the proper worship of Yahveh. In this respect he outdoes the Deuteronomistic redactor of the books of Samuel and Kings. And if the parallel accounts of Kings and Chronicles are compared, it will be seen that the latter brings in the theory of divine retribution to account for the facts, or modifies the facts to suit the theory, far more frequently than is the case in Kings. Most curious is his explanation of the calamities which befell Hezekiah and Josiah. The death of Josiah had been

[1] That the righteous may have to suffer for the wicked unwillingly is suggested 2 Macc. vi. 12.

an awful blow to pious believers; the Chronicler, however, attempts to account for it upon the usual principle. It is just possible that the words attributed to Necho may have some historical foundation. But purely the Chronicler's invention must be Necho's ascription of his warning to the command of God (2 Ch. xxxv. 21, 22; xxxii. 25, etc., etc.). Thus in Josiah's case, as in all others, the Chronicler insists upon the truth of the old position: no suffering without sin. This theory might be accepted without much embarrassment as regards the past, but present national calamity was often a puzzle to the community which as a whole, and contrasted with the heathen world, obeyed the Law. And this difficulty led both to a recrudescence of earlier ideas, and to a new development.

In the old preprophetic days God's retributive dealing with Israel was, as stated above, limited by his favouritism. But since the famous dictum of Amos, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities," the idea of mere favouritism, without a moral motive, as accounting for the Divine protection of Israel, had been abandoned. On the other hand, religious particularism was never keener than in the post-exilic period. But the favour of God was justified, for Israel was regarded as more righteous than the nations of the world. The national foes are identified with the enemies of God; with them God deals not upon any principle of retributive justice, but with that measureless violence which characterizes his action in any insult offered to himself. If, then, Israel's foes are more prosperous than Israel, this cannot be because they are more righteous; the chastisement of Israel must be a blessing in disguise.

This disciplinarian interpretation of Israel's sufferings passes in some of the Apocryphal books into the theory that God's method of dealing with erring Israel has always been educational. As a father, God has admonished and tried the Israelites; the nations, as a severe king, he has punished and condemned. In a notable passage in the second book of the Maccabees

the punishment of the Israelites is contrasted with the forbearance shown to the heathen nations. "It is a token of God's great goodness, when wicked doers are not suffered any long time, but forthwith punished. And not as with other nations, whom the Lord patiently forbears to punish, till they be come to the fulness of their sins, so dealeth he with us, lest that, being come to the height of sin, afterwards he should take vengeance upon us." (2 Macc. vi. 13-15.) The author of the Wisdom of Solomon, who also adopts this particularist perversion of the doctrine, and does not even hesitate to ascribe the method of the *lex talionis* to God[1] (xi. 16), was happily inconsistent enough to further develope the educational theory of suffering by connecting it with repentance. God chastens offenders "by little and little," and even "winks at" some of their sins that they may amend their ways, and return to God (xi. 23, xii. 2. Cp. also xi. 10, xii. 22; 2 Maccabees vii. 33; Judith viii. 27).

The indefinite postponement of the Messianic age upon the return from Babylon caused a powerful recrudescence of the idea that the former sins of the nation are still being visited upon a comparatively guiltless generation. Men call themselves sinners because of their fathers' iniquities, and confess sins which are not their own, but their ancestors' (Daniel ix. 5, 16, 20; Tobit iii. 3; Baruch iii. 5-8). And, while one noble outburst in a Maccabean psalm expresses the avowed conviction that it was for God's sake that martyrdom had befallen the faithful (Ps. xliv. 22), many more were content to find resignation in the mournful assumption of unknown secret sins, or in the higher view of the universal sinfulness and frailty of the human creature (Ps. cxix. 67, xix. 13, xc. 9; Baruch ii. 8, 12; 2 Macc. vii. 32).

Thus the post-exilic period, so far as it is represented by the Old Testament and the older Apocryphal books, still maintains the doctrine of Divine retribution, and upon the whole still upholds the theory that suffering and mis-

[1] The writer of Wisdom has his better moments (xi. 23, xii. 2, 8, 10).

fortune imply preceding sin. But it is only in the priestly elements of the Pentateuch and in the books of Chronicles that remnants of the old notion of violent and fatal retribution following upon the violation of God's holiness still survive (Ex. xxviii. 35, 43; Lev. x. 2-7, xvi. 2; Num. i. 53, iv. 26, viii. 19, xvi. 46, xvii. 12; 1 Ch. xv. 13; 2 Ch. xxvi. 19). Elsewhere, so far as Israel is concerned, this semi-physical reaction of offended Deity is quite overcome. In God's dealings with Israel the doctrine of measure-for-measure retribution is abandoned. He does *not* deal with us after our sins; he does *not* reward us after our iniquities. The theory of Divine retribution in general was, however, never given up, whether for the community or the individual. Indeed, the desire to explain all the details of life's phenomena by a religious teleology seems to have greatly increased in the post-exilic period, and for many centuries no teacher arose to declare that "God makes his sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust." An absence of general belief in a compensatory future life (till well on in the Maccabean period) tended to strengthen the doctrine of retribution. The native Hebrew character was also likely to confirm the hold which it possessed over men's minds. The Hebrew is little touched by the spirit of asceticism, and the only kind of idealism congenial to him is the idealism of religion. That is why he tends to become markedly material when religion slips from his grasp. And that is also why the doctrine of retribution appears so often in a rather gross external form. For the ordinary, external joys of life have always seemed to him very real and precious; far more real and far more precious must they have been at a time when the belief in a future life, of which the joy is more naturally conceived as spiritual, is wholly wanting.

But even before the doctrine of a future world had become part of the general religious consciousness among the Jews, the reward of the righteous was not always conceived as limited to the material. The Psalter—the highest monument of post-exilic piety—is filled from end to end

with the higher joys of religion, and its noblest passages dwell with fervour upon the bliss of spiritual communion with God. In the Book of Proverbs the wisdom to which the sage exhorts his disciple is supposed to bestow upon her lover something higher than riches, honour or length of days. It is commonly supposed that a religious law must depend for its sanction upon outward rewards. Thus we find Professor Kuenen saying, "Eudæmonism and legalism are inseparable. So long as religion is believed to lie in the execution of legal injunctions, its reward will be conceived as an outward blessing, attached by God himself to the due performance of these precepts, and it will be valued mainly as a means to the attainment of this reward."[1] Now, it is true that Deuteronomy lays enormous stress upon the eudæmonist motive. Over and over again it promises external blessings as a reward for obedience to the law of God. But that we must not draw too general a deduction from this would seem clear when we remember, on the one hand, that eudæmonism as a moral motive is not wholly absent even from the prophets; and, secondly, that the priestly legislation curiously differs from Deuteronomy in this respect. The "legal" Ezekiel, while not ignoring "outward blessings," has a higher inducement to offer as well —the presence of God within the community (xxxvii. 27, xlviii. 35). The author of Lev. xxvi. also combines this double motive (Lev. xxvi. 4-12). In the *Priestercodex* itself the appeal to "outward blessings" seems to be wanting altogether; the higher motive of Ezekiel and Lev. xxvi. alone remaining (Ex. xxix. 45). The priestly legislators do not seem inclined to make concessions to the lower instincts of the people. They are to set the ideal of holiness continually and of fixed purpose before their minds, and they are not to seek after the pleasure of their own eyes. Thus the true means through which the later Judaism effectually triumphed over the externality of the doctrine "virtue is

[1] Schetsen uit de Geschiedenis van Israel. X. De Dood van Josia, Nieuw en Oud, 1866, p. 271.

rewarded; therefore be virtuous," will hardly seem credible to those who have formed their judgments upon the basis of the current theological text-books. That very thing which is commonly believed to have debased the religion of the prophets to a formal and mechanical creed, without *abandon* or spirituality, is in reality the very instrument which secured the permanent overmastery of idealism. That instrument is the Law. The truth of my proposition for the Rabbinical period will probably be shown by another writer; but the beginning of the process is already indicated within the Bible itself. In Psalm cxix. the conception of the fulfilment and the study of the Law for its own sake, and as its own reward, is already discernible. The community, in the midst of trouble, still finds its peculiar joy in the Law of its God (ver. 143). Its deepest prayer is, "Make me to go in the path of thy commandments; for therein do I delight." Impossible as it now may be for many of us to look at the Law from the same ideal point of view or with the same enthusiasm as the Psalmist, it would be wrong not to recognise how great is the debt which Judaism, though indirectly, must always owe to it. And among other results of this Torah-worship, for such the love of the Law practically became, none is more important than that it should have secured for Judaism the triumph of the doctrine that virtue or religion, goodness or the love of God is, and always must be, its own reward.

P.S.—There is no doubt that the individualising of the doctrine of Divine retribution was first seriously attempted in the exile by Ezekiel. But whether there are no *indications* of this doctrine in the pre-exilic literature is another question. Stade's view that there are none is, I think, exaggerated. The passages in Jeremiah, which, if genuine, would settle the matter, are by him regarded as *sekundär*. They are Jer. xii. 1, 2, xvii. 5-10, xxxii. 18, 19. Kuenen upholds the authenticity of these verses. In xxx. 29 the justice of the proverb of the sour grapes is acknowledged for his own age, while in the Messianic age it is to become obsolete. Then we have Isaiah xxxiii. 15. Here Kuenen and Stade are again at issue. While both are agreed that xxxiii., like xxxii., does not belong to Isaiah, Kuenen

against Stade upholds a pre-exilic date. As regards the particular passage xxxiii. 15*f* (which, as Stade points out, *Z.A.W.* 1884, p. 259, contains ideas which point to *eine reine individuelle Vergeltungslehre*) Kuenen only says : "Its individualistic character and the distinction which it draws between the wicked and the just in Zion place it outside the sphere within which Isaiah still moves ; it was only a century after him that the national conception of Yahvism gradually made way for the more personal conception." (*Onderzoek* II., p. 87.) Moreover, outside the prophetical literature (I assume Isaiah iii. 10, 11 to be a gloss) there are traces of this more individual conception. There is David's exclamation, "These sheep, what have they done ?" in which the punishment of sin is thought to justly include a man's family, but not a yet wider circle. There is the Deuteronomic Law, "Every man shall be put to death for his own sin," on which principle Joash acted in punishing the servants, but not the children of the servants, who had slain his father, as the redactor of the book of Kings is at pains to point out to us. In Deut. vii. 10, the Second Commandment is clearly modified intentionally when it is said that "God keeps covenant and mercy with those who love him to a thousand generations, but repays those who hate him to their face." Stade, like Wellhausen, would separate Deut. iv. 44-xi. from the legislative portion of the book, xii.-xxvi., and assign these chapters to the exile, but Kuenen upholds the unity of authorship, and with that the pre-exilic date. Again, in the story of Abraham pleading with Yahveh before the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, a near approach is made to the "*individuelle Vergeltungslehre.*" Not only is the principle laid down that the few righteous should save the lives of the many wicked, which one might call an instance of inverted solidarity, but the strong words are used, "that be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked ; and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee : shall not the judge of the whole earth do right ?"[1] When Moses, after the worship of the golden calf, implores for the people the Divine forgiveness, he asks that God, if he will not pardon their sin, may blot him out of the book he has written. Then God replies : "Whosoever has sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." Here again is a trace of an individualizing doctrine.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

---

[1] In the story of Achan, one man sins, and the wrath of God is heavy upon the whole community ; but in the rebellion of Korah, which belongs to P. and his school, Moses and Aaron protest against this very principle in the words, "O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin and wilt thou be wroth with all the congregation ?"

II. The New Testament.

My first impulse on being asked to contribute a few pages on this subject was to reply that the New Testament presents no single and special doctrine on this subject at all; that it does present a certain positive doctrine of *salvation*, but that the implicit consequences of this are left to be drawn out in manifold and different ways; and that the negative consequences are left especially vague and undetermined. The general result of my subsequent inquiries has been mainly to strengthen my first impression.

I know that there are many liberal theologians who hold that one must derogate, not merely from the *authority* of Jesus, but from his candour and integrity as a teacher, if he maintains that Jesus used the doctrinal expressions of his people and his time without a conscious endorsement of them. To some of these he has given, no doubt, his own interpretations and limitations; others he adopts without any such specialising of the signification in which he uses and transmits them. Are we to suppose that he stamps them alike with his authority, and builds them into the theological fabric of his Church?

The affirmative answer to this question seems to be by no means confined to those who, on the one hand, declare the finality of the Church in matters of faith, or, on the other, trust to the sufficiency of a verbally-inspired record. Far outside these circles there is a prevalent feeling that Jesus, if in no other character than that of the founder of a new religion, must have given to the world a consistent and systematic *body of teaching* on all the subjects of man's perpetually-renewed inquiry as to the facts of religion. Is not this conception founded upon the absence of what, for want of a better expression, may be called the historic

sense, and upon that confusion of the realms of literature and dogma against which Mr. Matthew Arnold so strongly protested? When we consider the real circumstances of the life of Jesus as a teacher, what are the facts? The synoptical Gospels show us a ministry of a year or fifteen months; they record the *incidents* of less than a tenth in aggregate of that space of time. And as to the teaching, they represent Jesus as coming forward only upon the imprisonment of John the Baptist, in order that his word of prophetic warning might not want a spokesman, with no other gospel than "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." His further words are the results of a widening experience; they are struck out of his mind and heart by contact with the actual needs and questionings of men. Nothing can be more misleading than to suppose that the "Rüsttag," as Keim calls it—the long period of preparation for his public work which Jesus spent in the obscurity of his home—was spent in the elaboration of a doctrinal system, though the basis of this conception is not far to seek. It is found, surely, in the fact that the First Gospel opens the distinctive mission of Jesus with "the Sermon on the Mount"—a body of affirmative teaching in which the new precepts are sharply differentiated from those given to "them of old time." Critics have pointed out that Matthew[1] hastens over a period of gradually-widening ministrations in the synagogues and villages of Galilee (Mark i. 21, Luke iv. 14, etc.) in his desire to reach the inaugural sermon; some hold, as Augustine did, that he has taken, as the kernel of this, a later doctrinal address to the disciples; some hold, with Keim, that he has compounded with this an earlier address to the Galilæan people. But surely a special theory applied to this passage or that will not explain the appearance in the midst of narrative of such blocks of discourse as we have in

[1] As questions of authorship cannot be discussed in passing, let me say that I am using the titles of New Testament books in the usual conventional way.

Matt. v. to vii., x., xiii., xxiii. to xxv. People still speak as if they supposed that Jesus delivered set orations, and these were taken down in shorthand and edited from reporters' notes—a thing not to be wondered at, perhaps, when we find Schleiermacher endeavouring to explain the discrepancies between the Sermon on the Mount in Luke (ch. vi.) and the same sermon in Matthew, by such a consideration as this:—"*Our reporter* seems to have had a less favourable point for listening, and, in consequence, not to have heard everything, and occasionally to have lost the thread of the discourse," etc. Let me endeavour to state, in the fewest possible lines, what I believe to be the true view as to the preservation of the sayings of Jesus—a view which must necessarily have an important bearing upon the material furnished by the Gospels for the investigation of any particular doctrine.

It must be granted that the purpose of writing a life of Jesus was not likely to be entertained by his followers of the first age. There was no future to be benefited by the history; before that generation passed away the age would be ended, the Son of Man returned, and the kingdom of God established. Such was the belief of that circle of disciples and friends who alone knew "all that Jesus began both to do and teach." And in this, at least, Paul was at one with them; to have "known Christ after the flesh" was to him as nothing compared with the knowledge of him as a quickening spirit, and the short earthly life of Jesus was but a preparing of the way for that more glorious coming which "we that are alive" should witness. It was only when the "fathers fell asleep"—the men who could be in any way reckoned as belonging to the generation which had seen Jesus, passed away, and still "all things were as they had been from the beginning"—that the necessity of providing a historical record for the future would dawn upon the Christian mind. Credentials must now be furnished for a Church which has to bear a continuous testimony in a world which seems likely to last.

The question, In what form would the biographical material present itself? is a difficult one to answer. What were the διηγήσεις that had appeared from many hands[1] before the compiler of the Third Gospel undertook his work? Had the various currents of tradition set so hopelessly in different directions that after a Matthew-Mark narrative of the life of Jesus has gained respect in one part of the Christian world, it is possible for a re-working of documents at least as valuable to give us all the special matter, narrative and didactic, of Luke—and, after all, leave room for a wholly new presentation of the life of Jesus, with new localities and surroundings, in the Gospel of John? These questions drive us back to another, What had the Church been teaching all this time? or, at least, what was there, beyond a common hope, to furnish a centre of unity, a matter of common faith, to all the scattered Christian communities? Certainly not a narrative uniformly accepted. Rather, a common treasure of religious and moral teaching, orally transmitted, and believed to consist of the "oracles of the Lord," the words of Jesus himself. I need scarcely remind my readers how natural it was that a new law, enunciated on the soil of Palestine, should be treated as a kind of *Mishnah*. Just as the *Mishnah* was not committed to writing until there was ground for fearing that it might be lost altogether in the extirpation of the Jewish schools, so, I should be inclined to suggest, it might be the scattering of the Church of Jerusalem at the period of the siege that prompted the first writing down of the teaching of Jesus. But I would urge that the occurrence in Christian literature of words of Jesus not contained in any Gospel, and yet quite probably his, and Papias's preference of the λόγια he could gather for himself from the "living and surviving voice" to those which might be read in such a collection as he attributes to Matthew, point alike to a primitive feeling that oral transmission was the proper vehicle of the Church's special

[1] Luke i. 1.

teaching. And when we come to examine a Gospel such as that of Matthew, and find that it consists mainly of five large blocks of discourse, after each of which the narrative is resumed with the words: "It came to pass, when Jesus had finished these sayings,"[1] we can hardly resist the conclusion that these λόγια-masses existed much in the shape in which we have them, before they were imbedded in any narrative whatever.

And when, further, we find perpetually that a striking passage occurs *twice* in the Gospel—once in a long discourse, and again in the course of the narrative, with some attribution of *occasion*—we are naturally inclined to suppose that so it was felt that the words, as strung together for purposes of teaching, were subject to an artificial arrangement, there should have been an accompanying, but informal, lore of anecdote, that could restore to a striking passage here and there its time, place, and circumstance, revive the question that called forth the answer, and give life and point to words almost unmeaning. I believe that an examination of Matthew and Luke shows the gradual process of the disintegration of the λόγια-blocks; they break up here and there like ice-floes, and the pieces drift into the narrative; sometimes the piece is too big, scarcely manageable, and consists partly of strange matter that will not fit the occasion with which it finds itself allied. And in the blocks themselves how often do we find that mere convenience or caprice of memory has dominated in the stringing together of their component parts. The subject rules at the outset, perhaps; and then we have, in a new connection, a passage we know in another and a better, and then we have casual *dicta*, apparently drawn together by a catch-word. See, for example, the passage about serving two masters (compare Matt. vi. 24), occurring in Luke xvi. 13, in a new connection, determined merely by the occurrence of the word "mammon"; in Luke xi. 34, the passage as to the "light of the body,"

[1] Matt. vii. 25; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1.

drawn by the simple coincidence of the word λύχνος into connection with the candle and the bushel, with an addition (verse 36, end) to justify the new relation (cf. Matt. v. 15; vi. 22); and the chance connections determined by the words *wine* and *salt* in Luke v. 39; Mark ix. 50. Such examples might be multiplied indefinitely.

It would not much surprise us if, during a period of oral transmission, the words of Jesus had undergone more than occasionally a fanciful and sometimes a casual rearrangement. But of *reworking* in any definitely doctrinal interest there seems to be wonderfully little, in the Synoptic Gospels at least. The tendencies and sympathies, however—all the divergencies of the first century which prepared the way for doctrinal difference, for heresy and schism, in the second—have left their several marks, hues and tones in emphasis, *nuance*, and application—Judæo-Christian and Ebionite, Pauline and Universalist—as the common treasure of Christian instruction reaches us through one channel of transmission or another. Luke—whose Gospel is in many respects so distinctly Pauline that several of the fathers, if I rightly remember, were quite sure that Paul meant "the Gospel according to Luke" when he spoke of "*my* Gospel" in Rom. ii. 16—nevertheless preserves to us in many places the very atmosphere of the Palestinian churches, to whom Paul was known only as a name of fear, soon to be identified in tradition with Simon Magus, as the arch-opponent of Peter and of the truth. Compare the Beatitudes, in Luke vi. 20, etc., with those of Matt. v.; it is impossible to mistake the application, already given, to those who took the name Ebionite from the fact of their poverty, and comforted themselves by such denunciation of the rich as meets us again in the Epistle of James (compare Luke vi. 24—26 with James v. 1—6). Luke also furnishes us with the parable of Dives and Lazarus (ch. xvi. 19—end); where, as Mr. Carpenter remarks,[1] "no *moral* reason is given for the different lots of the rich man

[1] See his recent work *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 311.

and Lazarus in the next world: their positions are reversed on the simple principle that the one received 'his good things' in his earthly life, the other evil; and this inequality must be redressed." This is exactly the "Ye have received your consolation" of Luke vi. 24. I do not hesitate to attribute to Jesus himself the parable of Dives, and to admit that there is an element in the New Testament doctrine of Retribution which is not moral.

The drift of my preliminary remarks has brought me thus to a point at which an attempt must be made to deal with the earliest stratum of doctrine, with a view to some estimate of the distinctive teaching of Jesus himself. I venture to suggest that a principle of material *compensation* may be recognised in certain words of Jesus, which it is by no means necessary to consider either as a special doctrine of his own, or as impressed upon his teaching by a line of Ebionite disciples. That the Ebionites did treasure such words, and let none of them fall to the ground, we may well believe. But because Jesus advised the young ruler to sell all that he had, and give it to the poor, it is not true that he identified poverty with sanctity; because he promised to those who had lost houses and lands for his sake, "manifold more in this present world, and in the world to come life everlasting," it does not follow that he reduced self-sacrifice to an advantageous commercial transaction. As long ago as the day of the Book of Job, the easy theory represented in the words "Acquaint now thyself with God; thereby good shall come unto thee, and thou shalt have plenty of silver" had hopelessly broken down. You might see the wicked flourish, and never have the satisfaction of seeing him wither away.

But the immediate influence of the Messianic element of Hebrew prophecy had turned men's eyes towards a scheme of recompense wider than the life of the individual. The elements of this present world, when looked at from the Divine side, and in the interests of a kingdom of God, undergo some startling inversions. An outcast and oppressed

"remnant" becomes the political centre of the world; all human estimate of value is reversed; the Lord uplifts the poor and needy, and the loftiness of man is bowed down. Because this is a mark of the day of the Lord, because to Christian faith the Messianic hope is fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and the Kingdom is come—therefore, to the disciples' eye, the change is made. "He hath cast down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek," says the early Christian hymn (Luke i. 52); and similarly, Paul rejoices that God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, the weak to confound the mighty, "and base things of the world and things which are despised hath God chosen, yea and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are" (1 Cor. i. 27, 28). The application made by Jesus of the Messianic passages which chiefly influenced his thought, sent him with a gospel to the poor, and the promise of an inheritance to the meek.[1] And I cannot wonder if, under such influence, and before his thought of the Kingdom of God reached its most mature and spiritual form, he spoke as if the best thing the rich man could do were to cast in his lot with the poor, exchange the treasure of the present for the promise of the future, or, at all events, make such a bestowal of the "unrighteous mammon" as may stand him in good stead when the day of the Lord shall come.[2]

Another element which early Christianity naturally inherited as part and parcel of the Messianic idea must, I suppose, be called un-moral; an element which, transformed from literature into dogma, has led to theological results which are certainly immoral. And it is one which plays the largest part in all the New Testament language as to the judgment of the world. What is the fate of those who reject the Messiah? The disciple looked back, and saw the awful question debated by the prophets of old. The men who were careless and at ease in Zion, whose hearts had

[1] Luke iv. 18.

[2] Luke xvi. 9.

waxed gross, and their ears dull of hearing, who had apparently no hope and no fear for the future, believing that "Jehovah will not do good, neither will he do evil;" what was to be said of them? Were they already smitten by a divinely sent dementation as a foretaste of doom—blinded and hardened, that they might not be converted and live? And to one who believed that the Messiah had come, and men had done unto him whatsoever they listed—but that, by the mercy of God, the space of a generation perchance was interposed between the Messiah's appearance as the suffering servant of Jehovah, and his reappearance with power and great glory to set up his kingdom, and that in this space the call to flee from wrath to come was to be carried far and wide, it is no wonder that the issues of the future seemed to hang upon the acceptance or the rejection of the news he had to tell. We are prepared to find in the New Testament a constant recurrence to this one broad issue. It is this, I suppose, which appears to the ordinary Bible reader to make all its teaching turn upon belief or disbelief; and furnishes the authority on which those who should know better construe the mental attitude of one who differs from them into a wilful rejection of salvation.

There is another subject, closely allied to this, on which it seems hopeless to endeavour after precision in the use of language—probably because the language of the New Testament itself was ambiguous at the outset. It is obvious that the Messianic hope, in its earlier forms, had to do with an ending of "the present age," and an inauguration of "the age to come" on earth; with a day of judgment and of wrath, and then the establishment of a pure state, a perfect social life, for the chosen and sanctified, either under the immediate rule of Jehovah himself, or under that of his anointed. It is not necessary to pause and point out how the national and political, and the purely ideal elements in this conception varied and rearranged themselves from time to time; but it is most necessary to note that the whole religious character of this conception

undergoes a complete change before the time of Jesus. The words that referred to "an age to come" are taken to mean "a life to come;" the threatenings of woe, and the promises of bliss are applied to those who have died and who rise again for judgment: and the whole language of salvation no longer refers to a prolongation of life through and beyond "the day of Jehovah," but to attaining to the resurrection of the just. It is impossible to resist the conclusion that the doctrine of a future life, in its Palestinian form, involving and depending upon the resurrection of the body, was at first a corollary to the Messianic hope. Not merely the generation that witnesses the "end of the age" is to share the kingdom of God; in simple justice, those who have watched, and waited, and fought, and "died in faith, not having received the promises," must not utterly forego the inheritance of the righteous. So from the Maccabean period onward we have the confident expectation that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake" (Dan. xii. 2). The Pharisees, the distinctly nationalist and popular party in the next century, represented at once the Messianic hope, and the doctrine of a resurrection. Just as Paul has to supplement his words of immediate expectation of the "coming of the Lord" with words of comfort concerning the departed, and show that we "which are alive and remain shall not prevent (*οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν*) them which are asleep," but, on the contrary, the dead in Christ shall rise first (1 Thess. iv. 13-17)—so in the Pharisaic teaching, we can readily understand that the doctrine of the resurrection soon became much more than an incident and a make-weight; it began to have a distinct importance of itself, and to impress into its service language that had originally quite different significance. When this earth comes to be less and less regarded as a "theatre of God's judgments," passages of Scripture which originally referred to this life are made to speak of a world to come, and the prophets of Israel are made to preach concerning heaven and hell.

This is exactly the state of things revealed to us by the Targums. "To live," is constantly amplified into "live in life eternal," and "to die" into "to die the second death," *e.g.*, Deut. xxxiii. 6, where "Let Reuben live and not die," comes out in Onkelos as "Let Reuben live in life eternal and not die the second death." And Jonathan twists the words of Isaiah xxxiii. 14, "Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?"[1] into "Who of us shall dwell in Jerusalem when the wicked shall be judged, to be delivered to Gehenna, the everlasting burnings?"[2] When we add the evidence of Jewish apocalyptic writings (especially the Books of Daniel and Enoch), we hold the key to most of the language of reward and punishment that meets us in the Synoptic Gospels.

It is, of course, impossible to say how much of the eschatological detail here presented is actually taken by Jesus himself from current beliefs and expressions,—how much is the translation of what he actually said into the thought of those who heard him.[3] Palestinian, and without modification[4]: where it was not accepted it was simply dropped, as in the Fourth Gospel. The warning as to the woes which shall precede the last days, in Matt. xxiv. 15-22 (*cf.* Daniel xii. 1), seems to have had a stamp of intense reality impressed upon it by actual experience of the war of Titus, and is much more moving than anything we find, *e.g.*, in Enoch. The woes (ὠδῖνες) which were to close the old order were the birth-pangs of the new. The

---

[1] Kuenen translates "a hearth always glowing."

[2] Further instances will be found in Dr. Pusey's work, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* pp. 73-77.

[3] "In Bezug auf die Eschatologie vermag im Einzelnen Niemand zu sagen, was von Christus und was von den Jüngern herrührt."—*Harnack Dogmengeschichte*, I., p. 51.

[4] It is interesting to note how words of Jesus are occasionally adapted for a public outside Palestine: Compare Matt. xxiii. 27 and Luke xi. 44. An instance of absolute perversion is found in John xx. 23, based on entire misunderstanding of the Rabbinical meaning of *binding* and *loosing* in Matt. xvi. 19.

συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος is to take place within the lifetime of those to whom Jesus speaks (Matt. x. 23; xvi. 28; Luke xxi. 32). This will be immediately followed by "the revelation of the Son of Man." This is the Son of Man, of Daniel vii. 13, and Enoch iv. 6, who shall set up the everlasting kingdom: he has hitherto been concealed by the Most High in the secret place of his own presence (Enoch lxii. 7). I do not believe that in the original use by Jesus of words like the "days of the Son of Man," etc. (Matt. xvi. 27; xix. 28; xxv. 31; Luke xvii. 22, 30; xxi. 27), he applied the title to himself.[1] The coming of the Son of Man is followed at once by the resurrection of the dead. We are at once in presence of the question, whether the resurrection itself is a reward? whether it is partial or general? and, if partial, limited to the good? Apparently, according to the earlier conception, the resurrection was not general; the faithful rose to share the reward of those who lived to see the days of Messiah.[2] This is under a covenant in which the wicked have no part. Thus one of the persecuted heroes in 2 Macc. vii. 14, says to the tyrant, "As for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life." But, according to the doctrine which gained currency, there was a revival of the wicked for judgment, which could hardly be called a resurrection. The righteous were, so to speak, born again with a new body; the wicked were as they had been in the underworld. So the general phrase, "resurrection of the *dead*" does not occur, I think, in the Synoptics: we have "the resurrection of the *just*" (Luke xiv. 14); their revival is a re-birth (παλιγγενέσια, Matt. xix. 28); "they are the children of God, being children of the resurrection" (υἱοὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, Luke xx. 36). This is, I believe,

[1] See further on this, Mr. Carpenter's appendix on "the use of the term Son of Man," in the work on the Synoptic Gospels, to which reference has already been made.

[2] Compare the *Didache*, ch. xvi.: "the resurrection of the dead—not, however, of all, but as was said, 'The Lord shall come, and *all the saints* with him.'" Here the Resurrection precedes the Parousia.

very much what Josephus[1] meant to state as Pharisaic doctrine: — *ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαυλῶν ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι.*[2] The resurrection proper is, therefore, glory and honour in itself. Paul uses the general term, *ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν*, but as if it were in itself the end of human ambition (Philip. iii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 21), and equivalent to *δόξα καὶ τιμὴ καὶ ἀφθάρσια* (Rom. ii. 7); and he leaves entirely behind him the post-resurrection imagery to which I must briefly advert. The judgment follows, and "the Son of Man rewards every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27; xxv. 31). There is, according to the parables which speak of the judgment, a two-fold division—sheep or goats, wheat or tares—and the issue is life or death, the joy of the Lord or the outer darkness. The righteous "shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43: cf. Dan. xii. 3; Enoch i. 8). The faithful will be welcomed to a banquet at which they will sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the saints of old (Matt. viii. 11). To be next to the president ("in his bosom," *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις, ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος*) is the place of highest honour; so Lazarus the beggar is honoured at Abraham's table.[3] The apostles desire to sit next to Jesus and to share his cup (Matt. xix. 28; xx. 21; Luke xxii. 30), in the day of his "glory" (Mark x. 37). The image of the feast, varied sometimes to that of a wedding banquet, occurs constantly in passages that have to do with admission and exclusion, in the coming kingdom. The wicked are shut out; the brightness within, the sounds of merriment and rejoicing, throw into sad contrast the outer darkness, the wailing and gnashing of teeth,

---

[1] B. J., II., viii. 14.

[2] This passage is, I think needlessly, explained by Stapfer, as an attempt to illustrate to the Gentile mind the doctrine of resurrection by the analogy of the more general notion of transmigration of souls.

[3] In this parable, Luke xvi. 19-31, the joys of the Kingdom and the torments of Gehenna appear to have already befallen the souls in Sheol.

and the fruitless cry, "Lord, open to us." What is the ultimate fate of the rejected? On this point the New Testament again reflects the uncertainty of the popular belief of Palestine; language pointing to an utter destruction, and to punishment of endless duration, seems to be used indifferently. The image of the burning valley, Ge-hinnom (γέεννα), near Jerusalem, which gave its name in popular speech to the entire hell, of which it was believed to be one of the openings—another being in the desert and another in the sea—occurs constantly in the Synoptics, as in the Book of Enoch (liii. 1; lxvii. 4); its name occurs again only in the Epistle of James, which is evidently of Palestinian origin. The fire which consumed the offal of the city, the worms bred of the corruption, furnished additional horrors, wherein Gehenna exactly answered to the prophetic description in Isa. lxvi. 24: "They shall . . . . look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched." "The vengeance of the ungodly is fire and worms," says Sirach (vii. 17); so also Judith (xvi. 17). Here we have the origin of that dirge-like burden, "The fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched"; which, repeated again and again, according to the Received Text, seems to indicate that the passage containing it (Mark ix. 43-48) was once used as a kind of formal commination service in the early Church. "The Gehenna of fire" (Matt. v. 22; xviii. 9); "the furnace of fire" (Matt. xiii. 42, 50); "the eternal fire" (Matt. xviii. 8; xxv. 41), seem, however, by no means to mean always everlasting torment. It seems equally to mean a terrible end, whereby the wicked shall be destroyed. This is the "second death" of the Targums, and of the Apocalypse of John (xix. 6; xxi. 8). Matt. x. 28 speaks of the destruction of both soul and body in Gehenna. It is difficult to settle whether such a phrase as ἀπώλεια αἰώνιος means a "final destruction," or "a destroying process lasting for ever"

(Psalter of Solomon ii. 35, 38; iii. 13, 15). The language of the Book of Enoch is, in spite of its constant reference to eternal fires and torments (*e.g.*, lxvii. 9, 13; lxviii. 5; ciii. 8; cviii. 3), very far from clear on this point. One remarkable passage (xxii. 11-14) seems to say there will be a total destruction of some, a second death; judgment not having overtaken them in their lifetime, they will be punished until the great judgment; some, however, will not be destroyed, but perpetually confined: "They shall not be annihilated, neither shall they rise." Yet on another page (liii. 2) we read: "The sinners will perish before the face of the Lord of Spirits, and will be cleared away unceasingly from the surface of his earth for all eternity." We are irresistibly reminded of the passage 2 Thess. i. 7-10. It is an early writing—Dr. Davidson makes it Paul's first—and his mind still turns entirely upon the terms of a Messianic salvation. Those who perversely turn away from it shall, on the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, "suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord, and from the glory of his might." This is, I think, the most explicit statement in all Paul's writings, as to the fate of the reprobate. To him, as the resurrection is *life*, its opposite is *death;* here the earthly soul is blasted by the light of a divine holiness. The same idea meets us in a Christian Apocalypse, the *Ascension of Isaiah* (iv. 18): "The Beloved will cause a fire to go forth from himself and consume all the wicked, and they shall be as if they had never been created." What little there is as to the last judgment in the Epistles of the New Testament seems to tell against the doctrine of eternal torment which the Church in general accepted. The Epistle to the Hebrews seems to hold the annihilation of the wicked (Heb. x. 27), and evidence is not wanting of the persistence of this view here and there; for example, in the *Clementine Homilies* we read (iii. 6): "The non-repentant, being punished with eternal fire, are consumed."

We are moved to ask, with Reuss: Is the result of this

brief review merely this, that according to the most trustworthy authorities, the teaching of Jesus on the engrossing subject of the final destinies of mankind is simply a repetition of that which the most ordinary rabbi had long been preaching in the synagogue ?[1] I reply that in all this use of language and imagery, there is hardly anything that can be called enforcement or endorsement of doctrine. It is all scenery and background; it is the setting of many a parable; but the thing enforced, the point which is to be made, is not a terror of judgment, or a right view of heaven or hell; but a lesson of patience, love, or duty. The parable of the wheat and the tares finds its centre in "Let both grow together until the harvest"; a lesson to "fret not ourselves because of evil doers," or anticipate the ultimate judgment of God. That of the sheep and the goats reveals the unexpected worth, in the final issues of life, of the simplest kindnesses, and the testing of religion by its power to open the eye to the daily opportunity, and the heart to the most ordinary appeal for aid. When reference is directly made to Jesus, and he is asked his opinion on a matter relating to the life of the world to come, he protests against the extreme materialism of the popular view, and on the general subject of immortality, as against the Sadducees who questioned him, argues on the broadly spiritual basis of "the soul's life in God" (as it would be expressed in modern language): "He is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him."[2]

I would submit that a tolerably exact counterpart to the use by Jesus of the current language with regard to the last judgment is to be found in his references to Satan. Satan appears as the inflictor of physical pains: an afflicted or deformed person is one whom Satan hath bound; he is "The wicked one," the personification of malice: he sows tares among the good seed, and snatches away the good

[1] Reuss: *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne*, 3me ed., Vol. I., p. 249.

[2] Matt. xxii. 23, etc.; Mark xii. 18, etc.; Luke xx. 27, etc. The Rabbinical protest in Beracoth 17*a* affords a close parallel to Jesus' remonstrance.

sown in man's heart: he is a dæmonic Anti-Christ, whom Jesus, in a moment of exultation, sure of the final victory of goodness, saw "fall from heaven." Yet, I maintain, there is no more a doctrine of Satan in the teaching of Jesus than there is a doctrine of Beelzebub. In all passages where we pass distinctly out of metaphor, and come down to the solemn prose of moral experience, nothing intervenes between man and God: man has to keep "the good treasure of his heart;" to accept responsibility for every lustful thought, every evil word. There is no notion here that either Jesus or God can fight a man's fight for him in the abstract—"destroy the works of the devil," or ensure the sanctity of the coming age by chaining up the old serpent; nor is there any room for erring man to plead that being born into this world, it is no wonder that the Prince of this World should have power over him. Such ideas do not belong to the teaching of Jesus. Both the demonology and the eschatology of popular Christianity are misrepresentations and distortions, destroying all proportion and perspective, of the imagery of early Christian thought.

When we consider that, as I suggested at the outset, the teaching of Jesus only gradually differentiated itself from the teaching of the Pharisees and the general opinion of his people, we can understand that elements which would turn out to be inconsistent might be found co-existing at any time, and might only prove their incompatibility when transferred to other minds, or even to another generation. And this, I believe, to have been the case; to many things which Jesus "came not to destroy," he gave a "fulfilment" which either transformed or superseded them; but he, who was least of all a system builder, might never realize that of two things which found place side by side in his discourse, one could only live at the expense of the other. His teaching as to the *moral* judgment of God, the ultimate sanctions of goodness, and its real rewards, enforces the broadest and the deepest faith in the Divine justice and love, and is impatient of all attempts to tie up

the Divine action as to the future of the soul by any previous arrangement. This teaching is constantly found in conjunction with the language which belongs to the Messianic future, to a judgment which is a triumph for the nation (or for that part of the nation which had believed in it), and a dealing of reward and punishment in which all the details are traditional and local. It is not, I think, trivial in this connection to remark that such juxtaposition may be illustrated by our daily practice and feeling: that, in speaking of things concerning which our speech must needs be symbolical, we resent every attempt to introduce a new symbolism. We find something very material, or painfully realistic, in all new attempts to describe the nature of God, or to paint the life of heaven; while language once just as material has come, in course of reverent usage, to be a natural vehicle of our most spiritual conceptions. Which of us would like to be challenged as to his literal belief in the language which he uses or allows concerning the life to come? There are words in the second Isaiah, and in the concluding chapters of the Apocalypse of John, which live in all hearts; however vague our faith, "Jerusalem, which is above, is the mother of us all." The sound of "harpers harping with their harps," blends restfully with the "voice of many waters"; but when the authoress of "The Gates Ajar" proposes to introduce a piano into heaven, we resent the innovation as warmly as if some principle were violated.

I have given up the hope of doing more, within the limits of this short paper, than indicate the contact of New Testament doctrine with the current opinions of Palestinian Judaism on the subject of retribution. I must, therefore, devote the few lines that remain to the endeavour to point out where the teaching of Jesus on the moral side of man's relation to God separates itself and leads to new and distinct issues.

The Pharisees represented at once national spirit and aspiration, and the most rigorous observance of the law.

Their advocacy of the hope of Israel, their teaching as to future life gave them, as Josephus[1] says, "immense influence among the masses of the people"; while they devoted their days to the study and practice of the law, desiring to become perfect and blameless, fulfilling all the positive, transgressing none of the negative precepts, into which the actual injunctions of the Pentateuch had been drawn out. What was the relation of the law to the future life? It was not merely merely an *obligation*, it was a *covenant*.[2] The pious Jew who fulfils the law can claim the promise of life thereby.[3] He takes upon himself a burden of duty, involving a daily and hourly watchfulness, such as no Gentile had ever assumed. But as Israel was alone in the service, it was alone in the reward. As Israel among the nations, so was the Israelite among men: he kept the law, and thereby earned a glory which the ἄνομος could not share. The standard in the two cases is different.[4] There is a character of its own about the virtue of the man who is *just* and *perfect* according to the law, due to its being formed exactly on the lines of God's own ordinances. It is no wonder that such a conception led to externality of observance and impoverishment of heart. The Talmud itself testifies sufficiently as to the dangers which beset the diligent legalist—his fever of moral anxiety about petty things, and his weakness in the direction of seeking glory of men; in one sarcastic passage it describes the Pharisee who runs about asking if any one can tell him anything he has omitted to do, just like the young man who came to Jesus to ask if he had any new views as to the things necessary to eternal life. And there were great teachers who pointed back, as Jesus did, from the mint, anise, and cummin, to the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith;[5] from the ceremonial details to the greatest commandments of all—love to God and love

[1] A. J., XVIII. i. 3.

[2] Schürer, *N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, II. 419.

[3] Lev. xviii. 5; Gal. iii. 12; 2 Macc. vii. 36.

[4] Romans ii. 12.

[5] Matt. xxiii. 23.

to man. Jesus does more. He protests against the whole conception of God's estimate of man's life and service, and of man's attitude towards the Supreme Judge, which was involved in the theory of a series of obligations arranged by God for the purpose of enabling man to acquire merit in his eyes. God was conceived as keeping a kind of ledger-account against each of his servants, who had at any moment a balance on the right or on the wrong side. On this balance his fate is to depend "when the books are opened, and the judgment set." All the language of the parables about accounts, debts, and bills depends upon this idea. It is thus expressed in words attributed to R. Akiba:[1] "Everything is foreseen, and freewill is given. And the world is judged by grace (? goodness); and everything is according to work.[2] The office is open, and the broker gives credit; and the ledger is open, and the hand writes; and whoever will comes and borrows; and the bailiffs go round continually every day, and exact from a man, whether he will or not . . . . and the judgment is a judgment of truth." Jesus is always protesting that God is a loving father, not an exacting creditor. He is, as a fact, always forgiving us. Do we think well of ourselves, and thank God that we are not as other men are? He declines to accept us at our own valuation, but comforts a publican and welcomes a prodigal, at whom we felt perfectly justified in looking askance. We can no more determine the relative merits of men by any standard of our applying, can no more settle our precise place in the kingdom of God, than we can cut and carve the daily providence of God to suit our notions of human desert. He makes his sun to shine and his rain to fall on the evil and on the good, on the just and on the unjust. He is kind to the unthankful

[1] *Pirke Aboth* III., 24, 25, ed. C. Taylor.

[2] M. Derenbourg translates: "Everything depends on the greater number of deeds (which a man has done)." Cf. 4th Esdras vi. 49. "Thou hast a treasure of works laid up with the Highest." This seems to be the Catholic doctrine of merit, against which the early Protestants revived, in an extreme form, the objection of Jesus, in their doctrine of grace.

and evil. If men will follow him in this, their reward is in the love they share; they shall be the "children of the Highest."[1] Recount, if you can, in the light of such a view of God, your merits in his service; have you done more than your duty?[2] and if you have done well, are you aggrieved that God's mercy is wider than the covenant which was your hope? that the wasted lives are gathered up, that the bruised reed is not broken, and the smoking flax not quenched? Because the elder brother has had his years of peaceful assurance, must the door be shut against the spendthrift who comes home at last? Because, in our covenant, "we agreed for a penny a day," must we grumble that God's mercies, far and wide, are always upsetting our theory of proportionate wages?[3] Do we not find ourselves, when once our sympathies are touched, refusing to weigh all action with one scale and one weight —looking, as it were, into the sphere in which the widow's mite outweighs the contributions of the wealthy—where "she hath done what she could" is the sublimest eulogy? where, too, what is evil is not all guilt, and to her that loved much, much is forgiven?

These few words will, perhaps, indicate my view of the protest raised by Jesus against a doctrine of legal merit and covenant-salvation. It turns, in his discourses, chiefly around the words Love and Forgiveness: in Paul, who is here most markedly anticipated by Jesus, it turns around the terms Faith and Grace. Jesus pleads for the penitent, whose case is hopeless, if the daily records and the adverse balances are to determine everything. Paul pleads for the Gentile, the ἄνομος, who has no righteousness according to the Law, and no part nor lot in the covenant. With all differences, both are at one in maintaining that the final award depends on the relation of the individual soul to God, and that "there is no respect of persons with him."

J. Edwin Odgers.

---

[1] Matt. v. 45-48; Luke vii. 35. [2] Luke xvii. 10. [3] Luke xv. 28; Matt. xx. 11.

III. Rabbinical Literature.

"Blessed be he who knows." These are the words with which Nachmanides, in his classical treatise on Retribution ("Shaar Haggemul"), dismisses a certain theory of the Geonim with regard to this question; after which he proceeds to expound another theory, which seems to him more satisfactory. This mode of treatment implies that, unsatisfactory as the one or other theory may appear to us, it would be presumptuous to reject either entirely, there being only one who knows the exact truth about the great mystery. But we may indicate our doubt about one doctrine by putting another by its side, which we may not affirm to be more absolutely true, but more probable. This seems to have been the attitude, too, of the compilers of the ancient Rabbinical literature, in which the most conflicting views about this grave subject were embodied. Nor did the synagogue in general feel called upon to decide between these views. There is indeed no want of theodicies, for almost every important expounder of Job, as well as every Jewish philosopher of note, has one with its own system of retribution. Thus Judaism has no fixed doctrine on the subject. It refused a hearing to no theory, for fear that it should contain some germ of truth, but on the same ground it accepted none to the exclusion of the others.

These theories may, perhaps, be conveniently reduced to the two following main doctrines that are in direct opposition to each other, whilst all other views about the subject will be treated as the more or less logical results of the one or other doctrine.

1. There is no death without (preceding) sin, nor affliction without (preceding) transgression (*Sabbath*, 55*a*). This view is cited in the name of R. Ammi, who quoted in cor-

roboration verses from Ez. xviii. 20, and Ps. lxxxix. 33. Though this Rabbi flourished towards the end of the third century, there is hardly any doubt that his view was held by the authorities of a much earlier date. For it can only be under the sway of such a notion of Retribution that the Tannaim, or doctors of the Mishnah, were so anxious to assign some great crime as the antecedent to every serious calamity by which mankind was visited. The following illustrations of my meaning will suffice:— "Pestilence comes into the world for capital crimes mentioned in the Torah, which are not brought before the earthly Tribunal. . . . Noisome beasts come into the world for vain swearing and for profanation of the Name (of God). Captivity comes upon the world for strange worship and incest, and for shedding of blood and for (not) giving release to the land."[1] As an example of the misfortune befalling the individual I will merely allude to a passage in *Arachin*, 16*a*, according to which leprosy is to be regarded as the penalty for immorality, slander, perjury and similar sins.

If we were now to complement R. Ammi's view by adding that there is no happiness without some preceding merit—and there is no serious objection to making this addition—then it would resolve itself into the theory of measure for measure, which forms a very common standard of reward and punishment in Jewish literature. Here are a few instances:—"Because the Egyptians wanted to destroy Israel by water (Exod. i. 22), they were themselves destroyed by the waters of the Red Sea, as it is said, Therefore I will *measure* their former work into their bosom (Is. lxv. 7)." Whilst, on the other hand, we read, "Because Abraham showed himself hospitable towards strangers, providing them with water (Gen. xviii. 4), God gave to his children a country blessed with plenty of

[1] *Aboth* (ed. C. Taylor), v. 12-15. See also *Sabbath*, 32 *seq.*, and *Mechilta* (ed. Friedmann), 95*b*.

water (Deut. viii. 1)." Sometimes this form of retribution goes so far as to define a special punishment to that part of the body which mostly contributed to the committing of the sin. Thus we read, "Samson rebelled against God by his eyes, as it is said, Get her (the Philistine woman) for me, for she pleases *my eyes* (Jud. xvi. 21); therefore, his *eyes* were put out by the Philistines (*Ibid.* xviii. 9)"; whilst Absalom, whose sinful pride began by his *hair* (2 Sam. xiv. 25) met his fate by his *hair* (*Ibid.* xviii. 9).[1] Nachum of Gamza himself explained his blindness and the maimed condition of his arms and legs as the consequence of a specific offence in having neglected his duty of succouring a poor man. Addressing the dead body of the suppliant who perished while Nachum was delaying his help, he said, "Let my eyes (which had no pity for your pitiful gaze) become blind; may my hands and legs (that did not hasten to help thine) become maimed, and finally my whole body be covered with boils" (*Taanith*, 21*a*). "This was the hand that wrote it," said Cranmer at the stake; "therefore it shall suffer first punishment."

It is worth noticing that this retribution does not always consist in a material reward, but, as Ben Azai expressed it in the Mishnah (*Aboth*, iv. 5): "The reward of a command is a command, and the reward of a transgression is a transgression." So again: "Because Abraham showed himself so magnanimous in his treatment of the King of Sodom, and said, I will not take from thee a thread; therefore, his children enjoyed the privilege of having the command of Zizith, consisting in putting a thread or fringe in the border of their garments" (*Chulin*, 88*b*). In another passage we read, "He who is anxious to do acts of charity will be rewarded by having the means enabling him to do so" (*Baba Bathra*, 9*b*). In more general terms the same thought is expressed when the Rabbis explained the words, Ye shall sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy (Lev. xi.

[1] See *Mechilta*, 259*a*, 32*b*. Gen. Rabbah, ch. 48, and *Tossephta Sotah*, IV. 7 and parallels.

44) to the effect that if man takes the initiative in holiness, even though in a small way, Heaven will help him to reach it to a much higher degree (*Yoma*, 39*a*).

Notwithstanding these passages, to which many more might be added, it cannot be denied that there are in the Rabbinical literature many passages holding out promises of *material* reward to the righteous as well as threatening the wicked with *material* punishment. Nor is there any need of denying it. Simple-minded men—and such the majority of the Rabbis were—will never be persuaded into looking with indifference on pain and pleasure; they will be far from thinking that poverty, loss of children, and sickness are no evil, and that a rich harvest, hope of posterity, and good health, are not desirable things. It *does* lie in our nature to consider the former as curses and the latter as blessings; "and if this be wrong there is no one to be made responsible for it but the Creator of nature." Accordingly the question must arise, How can a just and omnipotent God allow it to happen that men should suffer innocently? The most natural suggestion toward solving the difficulty would be that we are not innocent. Hence R. Ammi's assertion that affliction and death are both the outcome of sin and transgression; or, as R. Chanina ben Dossa expressed it, "It is not the wild beast but sin which kills" (*Berachoth*, 33*a*).

We may thus perceive in this theory an attempt "to justify the ways of God to man." Unfortunately it does not correspond with the real facts. The cry wrung from the prophets against the peace enjoyed by the wicked, and the pains inflicted on the righteous, which finds its echo in so many Psalms, and reaches its climax in the Book of Job, was by no means silenced in the times of the Rabbis. If long experience could be of any use, it only served to deepen perplexity. For all this suffering of the people of God, and the prosperity of their wicked persecutors, which perplexed the prophets and their immediate followers, were repeated during the death-struggle for independence

against Rome, and were not lessened by the establishment of Christianity as the dominant religion. The only comfort which time brought them was, perhaps, that the long continuance of misfortune made them less sensible to suffering than their ancestors were. Indeed, a Rabbi of the first century said that his generation had by continuous experience of misery become as insensible to pain as the dead body is towards a prick of a needle (*Sabbath* 13*b*). The anæsthetic effect of long suffering may, indeed, help one to endure pain with more patience, but it cannot serve as an apology for the deed of the inflictors of the pain. The question, then, how to reconcile hard reality with the justice of God, remained as difficult as ever.

The most important passage in Rabbinical literature relating to the solution of this problem is the following (*Berachoth*, 7*a*):—With reference to Exod. xxxiii. 13, R. Jochanan said, in the name of R. José, that, among other things, Moses also asked God to explain to him the method of his Providence; a request that was granted to him. He asked God, Why are there righteous people who are prosperous, and righteous who are suffering; wicked who are prosperous, and wicked who suffer? The answer given to him was according to the one view that the prosperity of the wicked and the suffering of the righteous are a result of the conduct of their ancestors, the former being the descendants of righteous parents and enjoy their merits, whilst the latter, coming from a bad stock, suffer for the sins of those to whom they owe their existence. This view was suggested by the Scriptural words, "Keeping mercy for thousands (of generations) . . . . visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children" (*Ibid.* xxxiv. 7), which were regarded as the answer to Moses' question in the preceding chapter of Exodus. Prevalent, however, as this view may have been in ancient times, the Rabbis never allowed it to pass without some qualification. It is true that they had no objection to the former part of this doc-

trine, and they speak very frequently of the "Merits of the Fathers" (זכות אבות) for which the remotest posterity is rewarded; for this could be explained on the ground of the boundless goodness of God, which cannot be limited to the short space of a lifetime. But there was no possibility of overcoming the moral objection against punishing people for sins they have not committed.

It will suffice to mention here that with reference to Joshua vii. 24, 25, the Rabbis asked the question, If he (Achan) sinned, what justification could there be for putting his sons and daughters to death? And by the force of this argument they interpreted the words of the Scriptures to mean that the children of the criminal were only compelled to be present at the execution of their father.

Such passages, therefore, as would imply that children have to suffer for the sins of their parents are explained by the Rabbis to refer to such cases where the children perpetuate the crimes of their fathers.[1] The view of R. José, which I have already quoted, had, therefore, to be dropped, and another version in the name of the same Rabbi is accepted. According to this theory the sufferer is a person either entirely wicked (רשע גמור) or not perfectly righteous (צדיק שאינו גמור), whilst the prosperous man is a person either perfectly righteous (צדיק גמור) or not entirely wicked (רשע שאינו גמור).

It is hardly necessary to say that there is still something wanting to supplement this view, for the given classification would place the not entirely wicked on the same level with the perfectly righteous, and on a much higher level than the imperfectly righteous, who are undoubtedly far superior. The following passage may be regarded as supplying this missing something:—"The wicked who have done some good work are as amply rewarded for it in *this*

---

[1] See *Mechilta*, 68*b* and parallels. *Sifra*, 112*b*. *Pessikta* of R. Kahana, 167*b*. Cp. *Sanhedrin*, 44*a*.

world as if they were men who have fulfilled the whole of the Torah, so that they may be punished for their sins in the next world (without interruption); whilst the righteous who have committed some sin have to suffer for it (in this world) as if they were men who burned the Law, so that they may enjoy their reward in the world to come (without interruption)." [1] Thus the real retribution takes place in the next world, the fleeting existence on earth not being the fit time either to compensate righteousness or to punish sin. But as, on the one hand, God never allows "that the merit of any creature should be cut short," whilst, on the other hand, he deals very severely with the righteous, punishing them for the slightest transgression; since, too, this reward and punishment are only of short duration, they must take place in this short terrestrial existence. There is thus established a sort of divine economy, lest the harmony of the next world should be disturbed.

Yet another objection to the doctrine under discussion remains to be noticed. It is that it justifies God by accusing man, declaring every sufferer as more or less of a sinner. But such a notion, if carried to its last consequences, must result in tempting us to withhold our sympathies from him. And, indeed, it would seem that there were some non-Jewish philosophers who argued in this way. Thus a certain Roman official is reported to have said to R. Akiba, "How can you be so eager in helping the poor? Suppose only a king, who, in his wrath against his slave, were to set him in the gaol, and give orders to withhold from him food and drink; if, then, one dared to act to the contrary, would not the king be angry with him?" [2] There is some appearance of logic in this notion put into the mouth of a heathen. The Rabbis, however, were inconsistent people, and responded to the appeal which suffering makes to every

[1] *Aboth* de R. Nathan, 40*a*, 59*b*, and 62*b*. *Pessikta* of R. Kahana, 73*a*, and parallels.

[2] *Baba Bathra*, 10*a*. See Bacher, *Hagada der Tannaiten*, I., 295.

human heart without asking too many questions. Without entering here into the topic of charity in the Rabbinic literature, which would form a very interesting chapter, I shall only allude now to the following incident, which would show that the Rabbis did not abandon even those afflicted with leprosy, which, according to their own notion, given above, followed only as a punishment for the worst crimes. One Friday, we are told, when the day was about to darken, the Chassid Abba Tachnah was returning home, bearing on his shoulders the baggage that contained all his fortune; he saw a leprous man lying on the road, who addressed him; "Rabbi, do with me a deed of charity and take me into the town." The Rabbi now thought, "If I leave my baggage, where shall I find the means of obtaining subsistence for myself and my family? But if I forsake this leprous man I shall commit a mortal sin." In the end, he made the good inclination predominant over the evil one, and first carried the sufferer to the town (*Kohelet Rabba*, ix. 7). The only practical conclusion that the Rabbis drew from such theories as identify suffering with sin were for the sufferer himself, who otherwise might be inclined to blame Providence, or even to blaspheme,[1] but would now look upon his affliction as a memento from heaven that there is something wrong in his moral state. Thus we read in *Berachoth* (5*a*): "If a man sees that affliction comes upon him, he ought to inquire into his actions, as it is said, Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord (Lam. iii. 40)." This means to say that the sufferer will find that he has been guilty of some offence. As an illustration of this statement we may perhaps consider the story about R. Huna, occurring in the same tractate (p. 7*b*). Of this Rabbi it is said that he once experienced heavy pecuniary losses, whereupon his friends came to his house and said to him, "Let the master but examine his conduct a little closer." On this R. Huna

[1] See *Aboth* de R. Nathan, 65*b* and notes.

answered, "Do you suspect me of having committed some misdeed?" His friends rejoined, "And do you think that God would pass judgment without justice?" R. Huna then followed their hint, and found that he did not treat his tenant farmer as generously as he ought. He offered redress, and all turned out well in the end. Something similar is to be found in the story of the martyrdom of R. Simon ben Gamliel and R. Ishmael ben Elisha. Of these Rabbis we are told that on their way to be executed the one said to the other, "My heart leaves me, for I am not aware of a sin deserving such a death"; on which the other answered, "It might have happened that in your function as judge you sometimes—for your own convenience—were slow in administering justice."[1]

But even if the personal actions of the righteous were blameless, there might still be sufficient ground for his being afflicted and miserable. This may be found in his relations to his kind and surroundings, or, to use the term now more popular, by reason of human solidarity. Now, after the above remarks on the objections entertained by the Rabbis against a man's being punished for the sins of others, it is hardly necessary to say that their idea of solidarity has little in common with the crude notions of it current in very ancient times. Still, it can hardly be doubted that the relation of the individual to the community was more keenly felt by the Rabbis than by the leaders in any other society, modern or ancient. According to the *Mechilta* (63*a*) it would, indeed, seem that to them the individual was not simply a member of the Jewish commonwealth, or a co-religionist, but a limb of the great and single body "Israel," and that as such he communicated both for good and evil the sensations of the one part to the whole. In *Leviticus Rabba* (ch. 4), where a parallel is to be found to this idea, the responsibility of the individual towards the community is further illustrated

[1] See *Mechilta*, 57*b*, and parallels.

by R. Simon ben Yochai, in the following way: "It is," we read there, "to be compared to people sitting on board a ship, one of the passengers of which took an awl and began to bore holes in the bottom of the vessel. Asked to desist from his dangerous occupation, he answered, 'Why, I am only making holes on my own seat,' forgetting that when the water came in it would sink the whole ship." Thus the sin of a single man might endanger the whole of humanity. It was in conformity with the view of his father that R. Eliezer, the son of R. Simon (ben Yochai) said, "The world is judged after the merits or demerits of the majority, so that a single individual by his good or bad actions can decide the fate of his fellow-creatures, as it may happen that he is just the one who constitutes this majority."[1] Nor does this responsibility cease with the man's own actions. According to the Rabbis man is responsible even for the conduct of others—and as such liable to punishment—if he is indifferent to the wrong that is being perpetrated about him, whilst an energetic protest from his side could have prevented it. And the greater the man the greater is his responsibility. He may suffer for the sins of his family which is first reached by his influence; he may suffer for the sins of the whole community if he could hope to find a willing ear among them, and he may even suffer for the sins of the whole world if his influence extend so far, and he forbear from exerting it for good.[2] Thus the possibility is given that the righteous man may suffer with justice, though he himself has never committed any transgression.

As a much higher aspect of this solidarity—and as may have already suggested itself to the reader from the passage cited above from the *Mechilta* — we may regard the suffering of the righteous as an atonement for the sins of their contemporaries. "When there will be neither Tabernacle nor the Holy Temple," Moses is said to have

---

[1] See *Kedushin*, 40*b*. [2] See *Sabbath*, 54*a*.

asked God, "What will become of Israel?" Whereupon God answers, "I will take from among them the righteous man whom I shall consider as pledged for them, and will forgive all their sins;" the death of the perfect man, or even his suffering being looked upon as an expiation for the shortcoming of his generation.[1]

It is hardly necessary to remind the reader of the affinity of this idea with that of sacrifices in general, as in both cases it is the innocent being which has to suffer for the sins of another creature. But there is one vital point which makes all the difference. It is that in our case the suffering is not enforced, but is a voluntary act on the part of the sacrifice, and is even desired by him. Without entering here on the often-discussed theme of the suffering of the Messiah, I need only mention the words of R. Ishmael who, on a very slight provocation, exclaimed, "I am the atonement for the Jews," which means that he took upon him all their sins to suffer for them.[2] This desire seems to have its origin in nothing else but a deep sympathy and compassion with Israel. To suffer *for*, or, at least, *with* Israel was, according to the Rabbis, already the ideal of Moses. He is said, indeed, to have broken the Two Tables with the purpose of committing some sin, so that he would have either to be condemned together with Israel (for the sin of the golden calf), or to be pardoned together with them.[3] And this conduct was not only expected from the leaders of Israel, but almost from every Jew. Thus we read in *Taanith* (11*a*), "When Israel is in a state of affliction (as, for instance, famine) one must not say, I will rather live by myself, and eat and drink, and peace be unto thee, my soul. To those who do so the words of the Scriptures are to be applied: And in that day did the Lord God of Hosts call to weeping and to mourning, . . . and

---

[1] See *Exodus Rabbah*, c. 35 and parallels.

[2] See *Negaim*, ii. 1, and compare *Aruch*, *s.v.* כד

[3] *Exod. Rabbah*, c. 46.

behold joy and gladness. . . . Surely this iniquity shall not be purged out from you till ye die (Is. xxii. 12-14)." Another passage is to the effect that when a man shows himself indifferent to the suffering of the community there come the two angels (who accompany every Jew) put their hands on his head, and say, "This man who has separated himself shall be excluded from their consolations." (*Taanith, ibid.*)

We might now characterise this sort of suffering as the chastisement of love (of the righteous) to mankind, or rather to Israel. But we must not confuse it with the chastisement of love (יסורין של אהבה) often mentioned in the Talmud, though this idea also seems calculated to account for the suffering of the righteous. Here the love is not on the side of the sufferer, but proceeds from him who inflicts this suffering. "Him," says R. Huna, "in whom God delights he crushes with suffering." As a proof of this theory the verse from Is. liii. 10 is given, which words are interpreted to mean: Him whom the Lord delights in he puts to grief. Another passage, by the same authority, is to the effect that where there is no sufficient cause for punishment (the man being entirely free from sin), we have to regard his suffering as a chastisement of love, for it is said: "Whom the Lord loveth he correcteth" (Proverbs iii. 11).[1] To what purpose he corrects him may, perhaps, be seen from the following passage: "R. Eleazar ben Jacob says: If a man is visited by affliction he has to be thankful to God for it: for suffering draws man to, and reconciles him with God, as it said: For whom God loveth he correcteth."[2]

It is in conformity with such a high conception that affliction, far from being dreaded, becomes almost a desirable end, and we hear many Rabbis exclaim, "Beloved is suffering," for by it fatherly love is shown to man by God; by it man obtains purification and atonement, by it Israel

[1] See *Berachoth*, 5*a*. [2] *Tanchuma*, כי תצא, § 2. Cp. *Mechilta*, 72*b*.

came in possession of the best gifts, such as the Torah, the Holy Land, and eternal life.[1] And so also the sufferer, far from being considered as a man with a suspected past, becomes an object of veneration, on whom the glory of God rests, and he brings salvation to the world if he bears his affliction with joyful submission to the will of God.[2] Continuous prosperity is by no means to be longed after, for, as R. Ishmael taught, "He who has passed forty days without meeting adversity has already received his (share of the) world (to come) in this life."[3] Nay, the standing rule is that the really righteous suffer, whilst the wicked are supposed to be in a prosperous state. Thus, R. Jannai said, "We (average people) enjoy neither the prosperity of the wicked nor the afflictions of the righteous,"[4] whilst his contemporary, Rab, declared that he who experiences no affliction and persecution does not belong to them (the Jews).[5]

2. The second main view on Retribution is that recorded in the Tractate *Sabbath* (56*b*) as in direct opposition to that of R. Ammi. It is that there is suffering as well as death without sin and transgression. We may now just as well infer that there is prosperity and happiness without preceding merits. And this is, indeed, the view held by R. Meir. For in contradiction to the view cited above, R. Meir declares that the request of Moses to have explained to him the mysterious ways of Providence was *not* granted, and the answer he received was, "And I will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy" (Exod. xxxiii. 19), which means to say, even though he to whom the mercy is shown be unworthy of it. The old question arises how such a procedure is to be reconciled with the justice and omnipotence

---

[1] See *Sifré*, 73*b*, and parallels. [2] See *Taanith*, 8*b*. [3] See Arachin, 16*b*.

[4] *Aboth*, iv. 15. I have accepted here the explanation of R. Jonah, which is supported by the parallel in *Aboth* de R. Nathan, 33*b*, and also *Berachoth*, 61*b*. See R. Simon Duran's Commentary מגן אבות to this passage. Cp. Graetz's *History*, vol. iv., 231. [5] See *Chagigah*, 5*a*.

of God. The commentaries try to evade the difficulty by suggesting some of the views given above, as that the real reward and punishment are only in the world to come, or that the affliction of the righteous is only chastisement of love, and so on. From the passages we are about to quote, however, one gains the impression that some Rabbis rather thought that this great problem will indeed not bear discussion or solution at all. Thus we read in a Boraitha: "The angels said to God, Why have you punished Adam with death? He answered, On account of his having transgressed my commandment (with regard to the eating of the tree of knowledge). But why had Moses and Aaron to die? The reply given to them is in the words, Eccl. ix. 2: 'All things come alike to all, there is one event to the righteous and the wicked, to the good and clean and unclean'" (*Sabbath*, 55*b*). In Tractate *Menachoth*, 29*b*, we again find a passage in which we are told how, "when Moses ascended to heaven, God showed him also the great men of futurity. R. Akiba was sitting and interpreting the law in a most wonderful way. Moses said to God: Thou hast shown me his worth, show me also his reward; on which he is bidden to look back. There he perceives him dying the most cruel of deaths, and his flesh being sold by weight. Moses now asks: Is this the reward of such a life? whereupon God answers him: Be silent; this I have determined."

It is impossible not to think of the beautiful lines of the German poet:—

> Warum schleppt sich blutend, elend,
> Unter Kreuzlast der Gerechte,
> Während glücklich als ein Sieger
> Trabt auf hohem Ross der Schlechte?
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Also fragen wir beständig,
> Bis man uns mit einer Handvoll
> Erde endlich stopft die Mäuler—
> Aber ist das eine Antwort?

Still, when examined a little closer, one might perhaps

suggest that these passages not only contain a rebuke to man's importunity in wanting to intrude into the secrets of God, but also hint at the possibility that even God's omnipotence is submitted to a certain law—though designed by his own holy will—which he could not alter without detriment to the whole creation. Indeed, in one of the mystical accounts of the martyrdom of R. Akiba and other great Rabbis, God is represented as asking the sufferers to accept his hard decree without protest, unless they wish him to destroy the whole world. In *Taanith* (25*a*) again we read of a certain renowned Rabbi, who lived in great poverty, that once in a dream he asked the divine Shechinah how long he would have still to endure this bitter privation? The answer given to him was: "My son, will it please you that I destroy the world for your sake?" It is only in this light that we shall be able to understand such passages in the Rabbinic literature as that God almost suffers himself when he has to inflict punishment either on the individual or whole communities. Thus God is represented as mourning for seven days (as in the case when one loses a child) before he brought the Deluge on the world (*Gen. Rabbah*, c. 27); he bemoans the fall of Israel and the destruction of the Temple (see *Pessikta* 136*b*), and the Shechinah laments even when the criminal suffers his just punishment (*Mishnah Sanhedrin*, vi., 5). And it is not by rebelling against these laws that he tries to redeem his suffering. He himself has recourse to prayer, and says: "May it be my will that my mercy conquer my wrath, that my love over-rule my strict justice, so that I may treat my children with love" (see *Berachoth*, 7*a*). If now man is equal to God, he has nevertheless, or rather on that account, to submit to the law of God without any outlook for reward or punishment; or, as Antigonos expressed it, "Be not as slaves that minister to the Lord with a view to receive recompence."[1] Certainly it would

[1] *Aboth*, i., 3., p. 27, ed. Taylor. See also note 8.

be hazardous to maintain that Antigonos' saying was a consequence of this doctrine; but, at any rate, we see a clear tendency to keep the thought of reward (in spite of the prominent part it holds in the Bible) out of view. Still more clearly it is seen when, with reference to Ps. cxii., "Blessed is the man . . . that delighteth greatly in his commandments," R. Joshua ben Levi remarks that the meaning is that the man desires only to do his commandments, but he does not want the rewards connected with them.[1] This is the more remarkable, as the whole content of this chapter is nothing else than a long series of promises of various rewards, so that the explanation of R. Joshua ben Levi is in almost direct contradiction to the simple meaning of the words. On the other hand, also, every complaint about suffering must cease. Not only is affliction no direct chastisement by God in the way of revenge, for, as R. Eleazar teaches: "With the moment of Revelation (that is to say, since moral conduct became law) neither bliss nor adversity came from God, but the bliss comes by itself to those who act rightly, and conversely (*Deut. Rabba*, c. 42); but even when it would seem to us that we suffer innocently, we have no right to murmur, as God himself is also suffering, and, as the Talmud expresses it, 'It is enough for the slave to be in the position of his master' (*Berachoth*, 58*b*)."

This thought of the compassion—in its strictest sense of suffering-with—of God with his creatures becomes a new motive for avoiding sin. "Woe to the wicked," exclaims a Rabbi, "who by their bad actions turn the mercy of God into strict justice." And the later mystics explain distinctly that the great crime of sin consists in causing pain, so to speak, to the Shechinah. One of them compared it with the slave who abuses the goodness of his master so far as to buy for his money arms to wound him.[2] But, on the other hand, it becomes, rather incon-

[1] *Abodah Zarah*, 19*a*. See also *Sifré*, 79*b*. [2] See ראשית חכמה I., 9.

sistently, also a new source of comfort; for, in the end, God will have to redeem himself from this suffering, which cannot be accomplished so long as Israel is still under punishment.[1] Most interesting is the noble prayer by a Rabbi of a very late mystical school: "O God, speedily bring about the redemption. I am not in the least thinking of what I may gain by it. I am willing to be condemned to all tortures in hell, if only the Shechinah will cease to suffer."[2]

If we were now to ask for the attitude of the Synagogue towards these two main views, we would have to answer that—as already hinted at the opening of this paper—it never decided for the one or the other. R. David מרטיקא dared even to write a whole book in defence of Adam (זכות אדם) proving that he committed no sin in eating the fruits of the tree of knowledge against the literal sense of the Scriptures, which were also taken by the Rabbis literally.[3] By this he destroyed the prospects of many a theodicy, but it is not known to us that he was severely rebuked for it. It has been said by a great writer that the best theology is that which is not consistent, and this advantage the theology of the Synagogue possesses to its utmost extent. It accepted with R. Ammi, the stern principle of divine retribution, in as far as it makes man feel the responsibility of his actions, and makes suffering a discipline. But it never allowed this principle to be carried so far as to deny the sufferer our sympathy, and by a series of conscious and unconscious modifications, he passed from the state of a sinner into the zenith of the saint and the perfectly righteous man. But, on the other hand, the Synagogue also gave entrance to the very opposite view which, abandoning every attempt to account for suffering, bids man do his duty without any hope of reward, even as God also does his. Hence the

---

[1] See *Exod. R.*, 30, and parallels.

[2] See רמתים צופים 33*b*.

[3] See *Sabbath*, 55*b* and *Sifra*, 27*a*.

remarkable phenomenon in the works of later Jewish moralists that whilst they never weary of the most detailed accounts of the punishments awaiting the sinner, and the rewards in store for the righteous, they warn us most emphatically that our actions must not be guided by these unworthy considerations, and that our only motive should be the love of God and submission to his holy will.[1]

Nor must it be thought that the views of the Rabbis are so widely divergent from those enunciated in the Bible. The germ of almost all the later ideas is already to be found in the Scriptures. It only needed the progress of time to bring into prominence those features which proved at a later period most acceptable. Indeed, it would seem that there is also a sort of domestication of religious ideas. On their first association with man there is a certain rude violence about them which, when left to the management of untutored minds would certainly do great harm. But, let only this association last for centuries, during which these ideas have to be subdued by practical use, and they will, in due time, lose their former roughness, will become theologically workable, and turn out the greatest blessing to inconsistent humanity.

S. SCHECHTER.

---

[1] See for instance, מנורת המאור (Amsterdam, 1720), p. 4, *seq.*, and 94 *seq.*, and much more in the ראשית חכמה, in the two chapters שער היראה ושער האהבה, where also the views of other authors are given.

HEBREW AND PURITAN.

ANALOGIES are like metaphors: if driven too hard they over-shoot their mark. This holds good of historical analogies as of all others; for though nothing can be *primâ facie* more obvious than that history repeats itself, the historical analogist is at once confronted with the fact that history never repeats itself entirely or exactly. Amid the sinuosities of its movements we may here and there find the lines running in a parallel course, but they immediately cross or diverge, and the parallelism itself is never absolutely true. Still, the fabric of the present is all reared upon the past, and old materials inevitably reappear, old experiences recur, old forms are renovated. More than this, the old *spirit* re-arises to animate other and strange substance, and from time to time, just as in our individual lives, we are continually presented with something which has an appearance already familiar to us of old. The deeper the springs we touch or approach, the more profoundly is this true. Wordsworth's *Intimations of Immortality* reached down to the very fountains of his being; so, similarly, wherever the phenomena of history represent stirrings of its procreant and primeval source, we may be sure that kindred manifestations will arise elsewhere, or else-when, bearing no uncertain marks of likeness and affinity. For though the life-tree Igdrasil has many boughs, it has only one root.

The historical analogy between Hebrew and Puritan is one of this kind, and is one of the most remarkable which history can produce. Both as regards their outward vicissitudes and the inward spirit of which these vicissitudes were the fruit, we may observe how curiously akin

the English Puritans were to that other Israel of God with whom they delighted to compare themselves. In tracing this analogy I shall observe that, like all analogies, it is not complete, that it is incomplete in a most significant respect, and an attempt will be made to discover why this was so. But, meanwhile, as to the analogy.

In the Puritan, as in the Hebrew, we find a people animated by an intense spirituality, filled with the same consciousness of the ever-present guidance of a Divine Hand, irresistibly swift to behold the finger of God in everything, from the pride of kings to the sparrow's fall. Like the Hebrews, the Puritans felt themselves to be a peculiar people, bound together by a Divine strength, favoured of God as none others were, and possessing the only true spiritual light.[1] They may even be said, in a sense, to have had their House of Bondage, their Pharaohs, and their long years of servitude in the persecutions they endured under James and Charles. Under an oppression which recalls the condemnation to make bricks without straw, they developed a seclusive spirit, in which, like the persecuted Hebrews, they sought in their sect and party the solace of a bereaved patriotism, or, for safety, fled beyond the borders of the land into "howling wildernesses." They had their Moses, too, and their deliverance, their Red Sea, their Desert, their Promised Land; for what but these to them was their leader and lawgiver, Cromwell, their passage of blood through the Civil Wars, their political estrangement among peoples, their triumphant realisation of a commonwealth of saints? They had also their reduction of the Philistines and the idolaters, which they accomplished with the unsparing Sword of the Lord and of Gideon. They slew the false kings, drove out Baal and

---

[1] On the presentation of Manasseh ben Israel's petition that the Jews should be allowed to settle in England, Cromwell, in reply to the English clergy, "flourished a good deal on religion prevailing in this nation, the only place in the world in which religion was taught in its full purity."—*Spence's Anecdotes.*

the false prophets from their sanctuaries, and set themselves to purge the land until the abominable thing was beyond their borders.

If these comparisons appear too far-fetched and fantastic to carry any weight, let us examine this historical parallel with closer regard for particulars. A different and far truer parallel will be discovered when we compare the inspiration and temper of the two peoples; but meanwhile let us remark for a little the striking resemblance between the Puritan rising in England and the Maccabean revolt of Israel. When Alexander overran and conquered Persia and Egypt, only to leave his vast dominions at his death a prey to anarchy under his generals and successors, a bitter future was in store for Judæa, and the alarming prodigies said to have accompanied the death of Simon the Just were only too ominous of the dire calamities that were to ensue. Between Egypt on the one hand, and the Seleucid monarchy founded at Antioch on the other, Judæa lay exposed a helpless prey to both sides, and fell the alternate victim of Antiochus or of the Ptolemies. It little needed the treachery, the intrigues and civil dissensions, the legal exactions and illegal pillage of her native rulers, to complete the misery of a small and powerless nation, so overpowered and oppressed from without. Such a nation little needed the whips of Jason and of Menelaus, when it already had the scorpions of Antiochus, surnamed Epimanes. One result productive of good, which accrued from the conquests of Alexander, was the world-wide dissemination of the humanising influence of Greece; and one form in which the madness of Antiochus manifested itself was to enforce this influence upon the Hebrews by persecution. His maddest act was his attempt to extirpate the religion of Judæa, and to enforce as a substitute the religion of Greece. After a successful reduction of Egypt, a party-rising in Jerusalem, under Jason, gave him a plea for turning upon the rebellious city. He marched in without resistance gutted every court of the Temple, and to confirm his insane

contempt for the religion of the people, he sacrificed a sow upon the altar, and caused every corner of the holy place to be sprinkled with swine-broth.

But this only nerved the Jews to more concentrated energy, and drove them to combine their political with their religious feelings. When, two years later, he aimed at the total extermination of Judaism, he had to encounter a people embittered by humiliation, strengthened by suffering, more passionately devoted than ever to their land, and creed, and customs. Seeing in brutal force the only way to break the spirit of this proud and lonely people, the madman did not scruple to use that weapon. Upon a Sabbath, when the people were peacefully engaged in their devotions, he sent a large body of soldiers to Jerusalem with free orders to murder every man, seize every woman, and pillage and dismantle the city. His will was mercilessly executed. After the first atrocities had been completed, a fort was built upon Mount Zion, and furnished with a garrison to over-awe and compel the citizens. All public services were at an end. No song of praise or call of prayer was heard save that of Pagan invocation. The Temple itself was formally dedicated to Zeus of Olympus. The rite of circumcision was prohibited. The eating of forbidden flesh was enforced. Every characteristic Judaic rite was rigidly interdicted, and an edict for religious conformity was as rigidly carried into execution. The compulsion was terrible, but the resistance was stern; and the cruelties and martyrdoms which the victims would endure rather than bring their faith to shame, equal in severity the worst persecutions under the Christian Church. So severe was it, that the Jewish faith seemed near extermination.

The Puritan persecution under Laud was a trifle compared with this; but the origin, the purpose, and even the circumstances of the persecution were similar. A people, under a civil power which they legally acknowledged, desired to worship God in their own way. The civil power said, "No; you shall forego your mode of worship which

we hold to be rebellious, and you shall worship after ours, which you hold to be idolatrous. If you refuse, we shall compel you, and punish you." The origin of both persecutions was a difference in creed and worship. The aim of both was to destroy a form of religion which did not accord with that favoured by the superior authorities. The attendant circumstances in both cases were insult, outrage, degradation, and cruelty of the most atrocious kind, confronted in both cases with the same stern refusal and bitter suffering. Laud, with his High Commission, could excommunicate, imprison, set in the stocks, whip, brand, mutilate, as his method of "making the Church's discipline felt as well as spoken of;" Antiochus had similar modes of correction, only less modern and more barbarous. The details are unimportant. Where he could hang two women with their circumcised infants hanged round their necks, Laud could slit Bastwick's nose, and crop Prynne's ears a second time, after they had been sewed on once already.

From this reign of terror Judaism was rescued by the revolt of the Maccabees. If one were inclined to press our analogy home, one might find in Mattathias's refusal to pay the Syrian tribute, the counterpart of Hampden's refusal to pay Ship-money, and again, in the summary vengeance taken on the King's officer, the counterpart of the murder of Buckingham. But other points of resemblance are sufficiently remarkable. The Maccabean, like the Puritan leaders of the revolt, issued from an obscure part of the kingdom. Till his determined stand against the tyranny, Mattathias was an unknown private gentleman, of the now obliterated township of Modin. Having once taken action, he summoned those who were willing to join him, and fled to the hills. There he maintained a guerilla warfare, destroying heathen altars when he could, and punishing apostates, but chiefly keeping alive the old fire of devotion by maintenance of the injured faith. Upon his death the war was carried on with fresh vigour by his son Judas, who became at once the heart and

head of this insurrection. He knew that Antiochus had exhausted his resources by lavish and ill-timed prodigality. He knew, also, that the soldiers who came to fight him were mercenaries, unfit to cope with men who fought for their creed. But he knew, also, that his force was small, and that his sole strength rested in the absolute devotion of his followers to the cause for which they battled, in an enthusiasm stronger than the fear of death for the law of Moses. He, therefore, weeded his ranks before he risked them in the battle-field. All who had fears, or who had ties which called for their return, were at liberty to go; let only those remain who were ready to face death in that cause. He was left with a decimated force, but one against which his mercenary opponent had no hope of victory—a force consisting of men inured to every hardship, and fixed in a faith like adamant. Skirmishes followed: every encounter was in Judas's favour. The Syrian troops could accomplish nothing against his hill warfare. At last the revolt became too serious for Antiochus to trifle with, and an overwhelming force was sent to quell it. When Judas beheld an army of 40,000 foot and 7,000 horse advancing against his small and ill-equipped regiment, and bringing with them a train of slave-merchants to purchase those who should be captured, he called his little band together at Mizpah and fasted and prayed. Glorious if sorrowful memories clustered round this ancient inheritance of Judah.[1] If the sacred fire was now extinct and the sanctuary desolate, there still dwelt near them a recollection of the victorious assemblages of old, when Israel was gathered here together under Joshua and Jephthah and Samuel. Having so reawakened the heroism of ancient Israel in his consecrated band, Judas advanced to meet the enemy. The struggle was brief and decisive. By a stratagem he fell upon their unwatchful camp while one-half of it was out on an expedition to

[1] Joshua xv. 38.

surprise his own; the expeditionary force returned baffled, only to find their camp in flames, and an exultant foe waiting to complete their discomfiture. A second victory beyond Jordan closed the first campaign. Next year a second short and equally decisive campaign against Lysias left the victorious Maccabee free to enter in triumph the desolate and shrub-grown streets of Jerusalem, and to commence the work of purification and repair. Bitter cries of lamentation over the profaned and ruined city, blending with the ordered cadence of martial sounds, rose to a jubilant note of triumph and of praise as the broken gates again lifted up their heads for the entrance of the King of Glory, as a blameless priesthood once more offered sacrifice upon a restored altar whose sacred flame was kindled at no unholy source,[1] and as a regenerated people gathered upon Zion to celebrate a new dedication in a festival which was henceforward to commemorate a redeemed nationality.

Have we not here a very remarkable counterpart to the Puritan revolt and triumph under Cromwell—the revolt of an oppressed people driven to despair by the same means and in a similar cause? Charles, like Antiochus, had exhausted his finances, and to replenish his exchequer had recourse to the same illegal exactions. His policy of persecution, like that of Antiochus, was founded both on political and religious grounds, for the Puritans, like the Jews, were fighting both for their political rights and for their religious faith. Cromwell, too, like Judas, saw that hireling troops could never stand their battle-ground against men fighting for a principle. "You must get men of a spirit," he said to Hampden; and the spirit he enlisted was the religious enthusiasm of his cause. Like Judas he weeded his troops. He would have "none but praying men in his ranks," men who knew what they were fighting for, and to whom their cause was dearer

[1] "Striking stones, they took fire out of them."—2 Macc. x. 3.

than life. He employed that strength which had proved itself ready to suffer martyrdom for a faith, and he was soon at the head of the best fighters in the world. Those fighting Puritans stripped the soldier's life bare of its romance. They possessed not a vestige of the old chivalry. But the Royalists withered under their stroke like grass at the touch of lightning. The triumph of the faith once established, Cromwell's first energies were directed, as those of Judas had been, to the rehabilitation of the public worship, to the "expulsion of all those who might be judged any way unfit for that work, who were scandalous and the common scorn and contempt of that function,"[1] and to the election of a tried and approved sacerdotal body. For the establishment of the Commonwealth was to Cromwell also an act of adoration, and although there was no Temple to be consecrated anew with solemn festival, yet his first Parliament commemorated its opening on "the greatest day that England had ever seen"[2] by the solemnisation of public worship on the Lord's Day in the Abbey Church at Westminster.[3]

The comparison might be extended to further particulars of these two remarkable revolutions, and the parallel still further prolonged. We might compare, for instance, the treachery at Joppa, and Judas's revenge, with the Irish massacre and Cromwell's castigation of Drogheda and Wexford; or in the Maccabean subjugation of the malcontents in Gilead and Galilee we might see the analogue to Cromwell's reduction of Ireland and Scotland. But we are nearer the cardinal point of resemblance between the two peoples when we come to Cromwell's personal sympathy with the Jewish race. Banished from England four hundred years previous, the Jews hailed the advent of the Puritan Revolution, with its subversion of Monarchy and its establishment of a Holy Commonwealth, as an oppor-

[1] Cromwell's Speech to his first Parliament.

[2] Cromwell's Speech to his first Parliament.

[3] Sermon by Mr. Thomas Goodwin, on *The Deliverance out of Egypt.*

tunity for an attempt to regain a legalised footing within the realm. Manasseh ben Israel, a Rabbi of Amsterdam, took up the cause with zeal; petitioned Long Parliament and Little Parliament; presented the general congratulation of the Synagogues of Holland upon the accomplishment of these political changes; recognised in them the hand of God; pleaded his case with eloquence and ingenuity, advancing the temporal advantages to be gained by England in the furtherance of her trades and the sincere attachment of the Jews to such a commonwealth of men of piety and learning. But the matter advanced no further until Manasseh reached the private ear of the Protector. Cromwell then assembled a Conference at Whitehall, 12th December, 1655, consisting of citizens, lawyers, and divines, "to advise by reason, law-learning, and Scripture-prophecy concerning the proposal of admitting Jews," (1) if it were lawful to admit them, and (2), if so, on what terms? The legality was at once decided, but opinion was inconclusive on the question of expediency. Cromwell, addressing the divines as "Men of God," asked if it were not their conviction that the Jews likewise should be called in the fulness of time into the Church? It was. Did not their duty then lie in settling the Jews within reach of the true source of light, instead of abandoning them to Papists and Idolaters? Then turning to the trading interest, he asked if the merchants really feared that "this mean and despised people should overcome in trade and credit the noblest and most esteemed merchants of the whole world?" No; they would bring their trade into English hands. It may be also that Cromwell foresaw occasion to avail himself of the rapid means of intercommunication open to Jewish traders and of their intimate and accurate cognisance of foreign affairs. He was so urgent for the scheme, that one of the conference afterwards declared he never heard a man speak so well. "But Scripture-prophecies, law-learnings, and lights of the human mind seemed to point the other way: and zealous Manasseh went home again." Still, by the

private sufferance of Cromwell the Jews did settle peaceably in England, and the requirements of Charles II. confirmed their quiet domestication.

The whole of the Commonwealth period, indeed, was a time of European stir upon the subject of the Jews, both as regards their learning and their politics. The Hebrew language had participated in the general impulse given to letters by the great Revival of the fifteenth century, and the Reformation of the sixteenth impelled scholars and reformers of the Christian Church to seek a first acquaintance with the substance of the Old Testament in its original tongue. Before the close of the sixteenth century Hebrew types were employed in printing, and of the period from 1600 to 1650 Hallam says, that "during no period of equal length since the Revival of Letters has the knowledge of the Hebrew language apparently been so much diffused throughout the literary world as in this."[1] The greatest knowledge of the Jewish language and literature prevailed from the reign of James I. to the Restoration, or, in other words, during the troubled period in England of the Puritan persecution, revolt, and supremacy. And this knowledge was by no means confined to the books of the Scriptural canon. The Rabbinical Literature, too, was deeply studied by others than the Jewish Rabbis, and by the Christian laity as well as the clergy. Our learned Selden has left the impress of his name and power here likewise, as he has done in many another field of scholarship.[2] So that the Puritan Period is remarkable not merely for study of the Old Testament Scriptures, though among the Puritans that was intense and continual. It became a matter of erudition as well as of religion; and familiarity, or, at least, partial acquaintance with Jewish

---

[1] *Literature of Europe*, iii., 444.

[2] It is interesting to notice that in the preface to the first edition of his *Polyglott* (pub. 1657), Brian Walton gives thanks and praise to Cromwell for help contributed. Later editions omit the Cromwellian reference.

literature, passed rapidly on from perusal of an incorrect and frequently incoherent translation of the Old Testament Canon to a knowledge of these books in their original tongue, and an extended survey of hitherto unexplored realms of Hebrew thought.

But the Jewish nation itself was meanwhile being stirred to its depths by a political agitation which affected the whole Jewish world. The idea of a Messiah had always been present to the Hebrew mind as an inspiration and a hope, an alluring fascination in prosperity, and a solace in the hour of darkest trouble. A Rabbinical edict might invoke a curse upon him who should calculate the time of the Messiah's coming, but it was powerless to subdue the fever of expectation that began to burn as one impostor after another appeared to stir anew the dormant fire: and when visions were beheld like those of Ezekiel, and a divine voice was heard proclaiming, "Your Redeemer is come: his name is Sabbathai Zevi," the prophetic utterance of the Sephiroth passed round the earth like the murmur of the limitless sea. Sabbathai preached in Jerusalem, proclaimed himself Messiah, assumed the pomp of royalty, so that even the Rabbis trembled. His fame reached the ends of the earth. Finance was paralysed. Embassies approached him from all quarters. Even his enemies acknowledged him in Hebrew characters. But when the Sultan tested his Messiahship by offering to shoot at him three poisoned arrows with the option of becoming a Mussulman, Sabbathai chose the easier alternative. The rising collapsed with the confinement of its leader, and the would-be Messiah died a vulgar death in a fortress near Belgrade.

It would be inaccurate to claim either for this Messianic excitement, powerfully though it affected European affairs, or for that new zeal given to the study of Hebrew letters by scholars of the Commonwealth period, a substantially operative influence in the infusion of Judaism into Puritan religious thought. Erudition cannot be said to have its

popular side, and, therefore, cannot be said to have a representative weight when the issues balanced are those of a great popular movement. Mere Hebrew scholarship, therefore, did not contribute anything of more than academic note to the Hebraizing of Puritan England. It was scarcely a calculable force in the permeation of the Puritan genius with Hebraism. This latter was a popular process, and it worked itself out through the English translation of the Bible and through the preachers whose sermons were leavened with that. Still the study of Hebrew Literature was a manifestation of a new interest in the Jews, and may be taken though not as a preponderant influence yet as a phase of the vast Judaizing process that was now going on.

Similarly, although the Messianic ferment of the middle of the century was a thing apart from England, it is significant to find that one ground of reason offered by Manasseh in his petition to the Commonwealth was his conviction of the immediate restoration of Israel, and, therefore, the advent of the Last Day. There were numbers of English Puritans to whom this argument would appeal in its literal acceptation. It would appeal to all those whose minds were inflamed with Millenarian fancies, to Major Harrison and the *doctrinaires* of the Fifth Monarchy, "that thing pretending more spirituality than anything else,"[1] who preached, if not the personal coming of Jesus, at least the immediate establishment of his Monarchy under the saints here on earth. The Fifth Monarchy, indeed, was only a crude form of the Messianic idea presented in a Christian dress. But apart altogether from this Millenarian fanaticism, whose ardour was of the same misguided and ignorant character as that of the zealots who went delirious round Sabbathai Zevi, and whose gospel was to force the mad claim that such fanatics were "the only men to rule kingdoms, govern nations and

[1] Cromwell: Speech to the first Parliament.

give laws to people, and determine of liberty and property and everything else,"[1]—apart from this crazy apostolate there was in the general tenor of Puritan belief a close approximation to the broader lines of the Messianic idea, and between the two there existed a kinship of nature, which but for the intervention of dogma might have manifested itself as a kindred sympathy. For in Puritanism likewise there is something of that prospective character which is the cardinal feature of Jewish belief, something of that preparation and trust which constitute the essence of the Messianic hope. The belief or suggestion of those "Israelites without guile" with whom Coleridge delighted to converse, that "it may have been God's will and meaning as regards Messianic prophecy that the Jews should remain a quiet light among the nations,"[2] may in this respect be considered beside Cromwell's interpretation of the Fifth Monarchy hope, "that Jesus Christ *will* have a time to set up his reign in our hearts, and when more fulness of the Spirit is poured forth to subdue iniquity and bring in everlasting righteousness, then will the approach of that glory be."[3] Apart from the general features of resemblance between Judaism and all forms of Christianity—for these resemble one another as parent and children—there is this particular similarity of mental attitude between the Hebrew and the Puritan faiths, their attitude of expectancy, their trust in prophecy, their recognition in what has happened of something preparatory and typical of what is yet to be fulfilled.

This itself raises a higher and broader issue than the simple and definite belief in a coming Messiah. In its higher aspect this belief assumes in the one case—that of the Jews—the complexion of a broad national faith, of a less clearly defined and less positive outline, but of a more spiritual essence; and in the other—that of the Puritans

---

[1] Cromwell: Speech to the first Parliament. [2] Table Talk.

[3] Speech to first Parliament.

—it widens into the conception of a universal scheme, which is slowly fulfilling itself, and for the realisation of which all things are working together. But this affinity, in the form of belief, combines itself further with a certain identity of matter. For the Puritans, though they declined to acknowledge the full significance of their plea, claimed to participate in the birthright of Israel, and the body and substance of their inspiration is constituted by the Law as much as by the Gospel. The entire course of the Puritan Revolution was to Cromwell—and he is representative of the general Puritan belief—the fulfilment of prophecy. After the expulsion of the Rump, "What is the Lord now a-doing?" he could write to an oracle of high Gospels in New England, "What prophecies are now fulfilling?"[1] He himself was "but a poor weak creature, and not worthy of the name of a worm; yet accepted to serve the Lord and his people"[2] He seemed to hear prophetically spoken to himself the words of Psalm cx.: "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool: the Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek; the Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath." But the prophecies which he heard spoken concerning himself and the cause he followed were all Jewish prophecies. He adapted the words of the Hebrew poets to the Puritan cause, and on his lips they became utterances prophetic of the Puritan triumph.[3] He could encourage the Little Parliament with Hosea xi. 12: "Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." The saints were good Puritans, and these were God's people. In the words of the psalm already quoted, "He makes his people willing in the day of his power," he beholds God's manifestation that this is the day of power, when, "through so much blood and so much trial,"

[1] Letter to Mr. Cotton, Pastor of the Church of Boston in New England, 2nd Oct., 1651. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Speech to the Little Parliament, *passim*.

God had "made this to be one of the issues thereof—to have his people called to supreme authority." Immediately Isaiah xliii. occurs to him: "This people," saith God, "I have formed for myself that they may show forth my praise." "I say you are called with an high calling," he repeats; "and why should we be afraid to say or think that this may be the door to usher in the things which God has promised, which have been prophesied of?" He calls upon the Parliament not merely to look this way, but to endeavour; and, according to that prophecy of Daniel, "The kingdom shall not be delivered to another people." Truly "you are at the edge of the promises and the prophecies." The same speech closes with a lengthened application of Psalm lxviii.: "Let God arise; let his enemies be scattered"—a glorious prophecy, he is persuaded, of the Gospel Churches, and, he significantly adds, "it may be of the Jews also." "Then it prophesies that 'He will bring his people again from the depths of the sea, as once he led Israel through the Red Sea.' And it may be God will bring the Jews home to their station 'from the isles of the sea,' and answer their expectations 'as from the depths of the sea.' But sure I am, when the Lord shall set up the glory of the Gospel Church, it shall be a gathering of people as 'out of deep waters,' 'out of the multitude of waters.' Such are his people, drawn out of the multitudes and nations of this world . . . And, indeed, the triumph of that psalm is exceeding high and great, and God is accomplishing it."

Here we reach the very heart of Jewish inspiration, and listen to the very voice of Israel. Not merely the letter but the spirit of this assurance is Hebraic, even to the touch of what, for lack of a better word, may be termed the unsocial temper by which it is distinguished. It is certain that while the exile in Babylon knit the tie of consanguinity into an indissoluble bond of brotherhood, it had the further effect of promoting and confirming, if not of creating, that spirit of severe exclusiveness which hence-

forward marked the race. The return from the Captivity inaugurated the enforcement of the sternest discipline of the Law, the interdiction of alien marriages, and even the dissolution of such marriages already contracted, and the repudiation of wives and children. It gathered all the passionate affections of the Jewish heart round their city, their soil, their religion, their race. It witnessed the development of a lonely patriotism and of an estrangement among the nations, in which Roman writers discovered only an obstinate pride, and later historians have discovered a want of humanity. Their religion, no longer the loosely fitting garment it had been before the exile, clave to them as a divine vesture. It grew to be a passion which could be cruel even to their own if need were. It marked the seed of Abraham not merely as a race distinguished from the Gentile, but as a race distinguished by right of a religious superiority. In Puritanism we have a similar isolation, and a similar pride. The Saints likewise claimed to be a peculiar people. Nay, they claimed, as we have seen from Cromwell's speech, to be God's people in a truer sense than the very seed of Abraham. And the spiritual pride which developed itself out of the doctrine of regeneration was of a more assumptive kind than that which rested its authority on the rite of circumcision. It amounted to a sense of religious superiority, which, as Puritanism advanced in power, seemed to say through all its dogmatic and intolerant sects, "Stand apart, for I am holier than thou."

But Puritanism was not content to rest in the pride, the exclusiveness, and the intolerance of its multitudinous sects. Nor did it seek merely to diffuse its spirit as a quiet religious influence, like early Christianity, or to leaven the mass of public thought like the Methodism of a later century. It was more than sectarian, more than propagandist. Its leaders, charging themselves with the destiny of England, pressed on to build out of this agglomeration of schismatics and enthusiasts the fabric of a new State,

founded upon a new basis, and composed of new materia. They set themselves to erect a commonwealth of saints, and to establish Christ's kingdom upon earth. With the help of Cromwell's genius for administration, they succeeded for a time. Though under this bizarre Government the nation was kept from anarchy only by the sternest discipline of the sword, and though when the administrative genius was withdrawn, the fabric sunk into hopeless collapse, yet the holy Commonwealth erected itself, the saints ruled, the nation became a Church. Practically this Government of the Commonwealth was a military despotism, but it bore a resemblance to the Jewish theocracy, inasmuch as the religious end predominated over the civil To employ an Aristotelian term, the ἦθος of this Puritan State was identical with that of the Jewish body politic. To both the idea of God was as the sun in the firmament. It was a Government of the people of God in behoof of the people of God for the praise and glory of God. As we read the letters and speeches of Cromwell, we perceive that not only was the whole course of the Revolution a marvellous working out of the will of God, but that in every act of political administration in this calling to which he had been preferred, the thought nearest and ever present to his heart was the welfare of the people of God. "Would all were the Lord's people!" he exclaims to the Little Parliament. "I would all were fit to be called." He preaches to his Parliaments, if not like a Hebrew prophet, at least like a Puritan divine. Under his regimen religion passes from the regulation of private manners to the disposal of public affairs. "If I were to choose any servant," he again tells Parliament, "the meanest officer for the army or the Commonwealth, I would choose a godly man that hath principles. . . . . And I would all our magistrates were so chosen. This may be done; there may be good effects of this. Surely it's our duty to choose men that fear the Lord and will praise the Lord: such hath the Lord 'formed for himself.'" This was accomplished. Theory

passed into practice, without regard for congruity. Temporal and spiritual were merged into a single interest. Saints were elected to all public offices, and sanctity pervaded every institution of the realm, as it did the government of every Puritan household. The Government, in fact, submitted to a theocratic ideal.

It is not singular to find this kinship of ἦθος between the Puritan state and the Jewish, when we reflect upon the extent to which Puritanism was saturated with Jewish influences. The ἦθος of a state must always be a reflex of the character of its people, and here the power of the Jewish Old Testament had inter-penetrated Puritanism to its very marrow. Both peoples had the same source of inspiration. But the Puritans gave the world no new revealing light as the Hebrews did. They only took over the Hebrew revelation, claimed it as their own, and acted upon its inspiring strength. Though ultra-Christians in some aspects of their creed, they found in the Scriptures of the Old Testament rather than the New the fundamentals of their religious thought and conduct. The books of the Judges and the Kings furnished them a more potent incentive in their political walk and conversation than the milder records of the Evangelists. Moses and the Prophets spoke to them in the very voice of God. For was not Moses also *their* heritage? Were not the Prophets *their* heralds? Was not all Judaism but a preparatory scheme for *their* coming? So the Bible, and chiefly the Old Testament, became their one book. It was their sole literature, their intellectual and spiritual food, their guide, philosopher, and friend, their justiciary warrant and their high court of appeal. They conversed, disputed, preached in its very language. Their thought was moulded to its form. Its songs of triumph celebrated their victories, and their grief found utterance in its threnodies of lamentation.

But in spite of all this similitude in their outward history, in the ἦθος of their politics, in the spirit and temper of their religion, in their character as a people, in

their prospects, their inspiration, their claims, and their accomplishments, the Puritans never became truly Hebraic. With all their fervent spirituality, those sublime aspirations and that intense idealism, it is one of the most remarkable features of this revolution that the Puritans never produced a religious poetry. Ever since the first rhythmic prayer broke from the lips of man, religion has drawn to itself much of the finest poetical genius of all ages, whether it be the Hebrew who sings to the Lord his Shepherd, or the unknown author of the Veda, who foreshadows the Christian prayer to Our Father in Heaven, or that greatest of the Greeks, whose heart's cry rings out in the choruses of the Agamemnon. When we consider how the Puritans were nurtured by constant communion with such a literature as that of the Jews, we might have anticipated that some of their rarer spirits should have risen to take a place beside the Hebrew psalmist. It is true that the seventeenth century, with its social unrest and spiritual irritations, was an unfavourable time for the cultivation of poetry. But the Cavaliers could, amid the clash of arms, sing "passionate ballads, gallant and gay, martial songs like a trumpet's call;" and the troubles of the time did not sear the lyric hearts of Herbert and Vaughan. There is a very considerable religious poetry of the England of this time, but though nearly all the poets were ministers of religion, there was no room for one of them inside the pale of Puritan worship. Catholics and Anglicans alike find voice, but despite the force and fervour of Puritan religiosity, nowhere unless in Milton do we hear the music of high adoring song come from Puritanism. Nor did all the troubles and revolutions of Jewish history do other than contribute fresh inspiration alike to poet and to prophet. It was not the political and religious disquietude of the time, but something inherent in the nature of their religion itself which prevented the Puritans from having singers like the sweet singers of Israel. There was a radical difference in the constituent forces of the two reli-

gions that accounts for the absence of a Puritan religious poetry, that enables us to discover why, when they had seen the wheels taken from their Pharaoh's chariots they had no Miriam to lift up her voice crying, "Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously"; and when they had builded their Zion upon their enemies' necks there were no sons of Korah to make music in the Temple.

At no period throughout the whole range of Jewish history has the poetic voice been mute. Every great fact throughout its entire course, right down to modern times has left its impress on the Synagogue liturgy. Long before the Psalter was begun to be formed, from the first prophetic chant of Jacob over his sons, we have evidence of the rising strains that were to swell into the full peal of later prophecy. Apart from the general poetic character of the early books in language and in thought, these occasional lyrics are woven like stars into the texture of the narrative, and shine there with a particular glow. Such are the songs of Moses and of Miriam on the passage of the Red Sea; the swift little Pindaric over Heshbon of the Amorites[1]; the vision of the Almighty to Balaam,[2] "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel!" and the parable which he spoke in ecstatic reverie,[3] "I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him but not nigh!" Such are the words that proceeded "out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, of the thick darkness with a great voice." Such above all is the song of Moses in the wilderness of Moab, which he wrote and taught to the children of Israel upon ending the proclamation of the Law, before he blessed the tribes and went to his quiet consummation. These are only suggestive of a great body of national lyrics now destroyed, and a rich cultivation of poetry, the full extent of which the irremediable loss of the book of Jasher during the Captivity prevents us from adequately estimating.

---

[1] Numbers xxi. 27-30. [2] Numbers xxiv. 5-9. [3] Numbers xxiv. 17-24.

It is not till we come to the formation of the Psalter that we sufficiently discover the resources of Hebrew poetry: Job stands as a work apart outside of history. It is precarious criticism to enter upon an assignation to the several psalms of their dates and the circumstances which they commemorate. But we can see how the several books of the Psalter faithfully follow and reflect the general progress of Hebrew history from the anointing of David by Samuel, down to the rebuilding of the walls by Nehemiah and later. The first lyric period furnishes a full poetic record of the troubles and consolations, the hopes and fears and divine trust of David's chequered life. All the chief events and experiences of his career, whether as a shepherd, an outlaw, or a king, are commemorated in odes that had their first accompaniment from the harp with which he had beguiled the melancholy of Saul. But of so universal a strain were these, and so highly religious, that when the Ark was established in Mount Zion they could be collected and arranged for the service of the sanctuary.

Then the perils under Jehoshaphat are brought before us, the desecrations by Ahaz, the humiliation of Judah, the dangers from the Assyrians, laments for the divided kingdom, appeals for reconciliation, prayers of the faithful in the north thus exiled from the Holy City. The evil days of Manasseh and the good days of Josiah, the Captivity and the Return are alike reflected in hymns that bear witness to the readiness of the Jewish mind to catch the inspiration of passing events. The question of a Maccabean origin for some portions of the Psalter is too full of difficulties to be discussed here; but if, as some critics maintain, it was just the Maccabean period that was most fertile in poetic literature, this theory only extends the area over which Jewish poetry is the mirror of Jewish national life, and enlarges our estimate of the degree to which poetic utterance was a divine instinct of the Jewish mind.

For to the Hebrew, poetry was both prayer and praise. These scattered wild flowers of the Psalter thus garlanded for Mount Zion sprang from the very heart of their religion, and brought with them the aroma of purest worship. The duty of God's people in acknowledging and adoring his perfections called for the poet's skill, and alike in mercy and in affliction the poet's words became for the Hebrew the medium of direct communion with the Divine. No auxiliary was left disregarded which could deepen their impressiveness upon the people, and enhance their solemnity. The Levitical choirs were numbered by thousands, trained to all manner of musical instruments, and dressed in gorgeous apparel. The wealth, profusion, and splendour of the Temple decorations dazzled the eye, the soul-stirring pomp of ritual smote the imagination and the feelings; and as the whole congregation knelt with uplifted hands in reverence, the choral antiphon resounded through the holy place, fraught with the burden of a people's yearning towards God. Whatever poetry and music could perform, all that eye could see and tongue could utter were brought to minister to the Temple service. All the "far-stretched greatness" of the kingdom was made contributory to the mystic glories of the Mercy-seat, and all the emotional wealth of the Hebrew heart searched for tributes to bring before Jehovah.

The dominant note of the Psalter is praise of the perfections and glory of the God of Israel. His personal majesty was too awful to behold. Even his name was an unutterable word. But the heavens and the earth and the heart of man were full of manifestations of the power of him whose footsteps were unknown. The heavens declared his glory: the earth was his and the fulness thereof: behold his marvellous works among the deeds of men. Adoration can rise no higher than we find it in the Psalter. But all this objective adoration has its subjective side. It is for man to praise God, because his arm is mighty, and his hand is strong, and here we are led on to the moral

aspect of God's dealings with man. In the terror of his name, in the majesty of his glory, in the marvels of his creation and the omnipotence of his might, man must discover reason not only to fear and adore, but to follow and obey, and be dedicated to his service. So the fear of the Lord becomes the beginning of wisdom, and adoration merges itself in the appeal to righteousness. "Fear God," it is true, but "keep his commandments," for only then will the blessing follow. If calamities arise, if any of the dire curses of the Law descend, it has been for some disobedience. How shall this obedience best be shown? Who shall ascend to the hill of the Lord? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart. Mercy is there abounding, but there is also justice that will not swerve aside, and judgment that will surely follow; therefore, "blessed are they that keep judgment and do righteousness." "A brutish man knoweth not, neither doth a fool understand this;" only the righteous can see the beauty of holiness. Follow the Law, then, for "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." If these be forgotten, and the face of the Lord be turned away, nought remains but a desolate, forlorn, forsaken cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou left me?"

In this combination of religious enthusiasm with intense ethical fervour, we reach the source from which Puritanism drew the strength and sustaining force of its morality. The Puritan found these Psalms adapted to all his spiritual wants. His praise of God consisted in singing a translation of them, whether in public worship or by his own hearth. Their words were his prayers. So far as religious enthusiasm and ethical fervour went, there was nothing to have prevented a Puritan from having written them. Why, then, is Puritanism so barren? The Greeks, Romans, Arabs, and others have all, as well as the Hebrews, made their religion poetical. The Church of Rome and the Church of England have alike produced a sacred poetry. Why could

Puritanism *sing* nothing but a bald doggerel version of the Hebrew psalms?

There was a twofold reason why the Puritans never reached that flower and fruition of their religion, and this double reason consisted both in what they lacked and what they had superabundant. They wanted that fulness of life which made David dance before the Ark, and enabled Solomon to deck an earlier bower of Acrasia and to write an earlier epithalamium. They wanted that richness of sympathy and closeness of communion which the Hebrews had with the elemental powers of nature, and with mere physical loveliness, their full recognition of the claims of earthly things, and that willingness to be human which underlies all their spiritual language. And they had in superaddition the Puritan dogma. Both by what they had and by what they had not, they were cut off from "the vision and the faculty divine." They knew that God was almighty; but they had no singer for him "who sitteth and poureth out the flood," whose voice "scattereth the flames and maketh the cedars of Lebanon to skip like a calf." They recognised him as their provider and comfort and support; but they had to go to the Hebrew to find that his presence to the thirsting soul was as waterbrooks to the panting deer. The sunrise was doubtless a sight to gladden their hearts; but to the Hebrew, "The sun hath pitched a tent in the heavens, from which he goeth forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber," as it were, rubicund and joyful. Their Gospel had a provision for mutual kindness, but they never sang of that brotherly love whose refreshing influences descend like the dews on Hermon. The brevity and pathos of human life were before them; but it was a Hebrew singer who saw that all flesh was but like grass which groweth up in the morning and in the evening it is cut down and withereth.

> Man goeth to the dwelling of his fathers,
> To his eternal home, and sees the light no more. . .
> As sheep they are driven to שְׁאוֹל,
> And those after them make them their song.

In the lyrics of the Hebrew singers the divine light is made to rim round the whole circle of life with an horizon of glory, while the world beyond the bourne is but dimly conceived of as a place of shadows, where there is "no work nor device, no knowledge nor prudence." Not till after the Captivity had the Hebrews more than a vague conception of that immortality which was to the Puritan "the be-all and the end-all." To him, as to the Greek, death was the gateway of a dreary שאול which he shuddered to enter. All his praises seek to cast a divine splendour round this life on earth. All his desire and his effort are turned to glorifying God without any expectation of the reward of enjoying him for ever. The keynote of his praise is God's glory upon earth. The Hebrew poets threw upon this life the light divine; but it was still this life which was of supreme interest to them, and God's world was to them this world. There is no asceticism here, no attempt to throw discredit upon earthly things, or to see only their "vanity and insufficiency," no suspicion of the pleasure derived from earthly glory, or of the feelings awakened by earthly beauty. Hence comes their fine sympathy with external nature and with the lower animal creation alongside of their concernment with Israel's destiny. They enjoy living, and have time to look round, and feel freely without suspecting the feelings which arise; and it is this plenitude and freedom of feeling which supplies them with all that is sublime and all that is tender in their imagery, from the light which covers Jehovah as with a garment, to the desolation of heart crying out like the pelican in the wilderness.

We are at once struck with the outward splendour of Judaism as contrasted with the austerity and bareness of Puritanism; and the contrast between the sensuous magnificence of the Temple-service and the wan, cold, colourless worship of a Puritan church is an index to the radical distinction between the Puritan and the Hebrew mind. To the former earthly pomp was a delusion and a snare.

He saw only the "vanity and insufficiency of temporal things." It was not this life, but the life to come, which was of sovereign interest to him; and had not his dogma forced him to regard creation as part of a Divine scheme, his conception of it would have logically issued in pronouncing creation to be a profound mistake. Death was to him not the entrance to a world of darkness, but the opening of the gates of glory and the passage into eternal bliss. His life was a fever of concentration upon one idea, the enjoyment of God hereafter, and this world for its own mere sake was of no manner of interest to him. His dogma ate into the fulness of human life. His conscience seared his imagination. His intellect was imprisoned in iron bands, that corroded his sympathies and made his vision like a sick man's dream. The splendour of the Elizabethan Renascence, however much it might resemble Solomon in all his glory, made no appeal to such natures. It crumbled away as soon as their influence made itself felt, and what remained of it when they assumed the supremacy went down before them like their enemies on the field of battle.

The difference between the essential character of Judaism and that of Puritanism is that between an inspiration and a dogma. The Hebrew regarded life in its entirety through the eye of poet and seer; the Puritan viewed it through the warped lens of his creed. Hence where the one people sent forth prophets, the other could only produce theologians. Born of the wrong race, Aryan when they should have been Semitic, the Puritans aspired to the sublimity of the old Hebrews, and began to equip themselves as an Israel of God by anatomising the literature of the Bible into a scheme of prophecy and a theological system. The Old Testament became significant only as read in the light of the New, and both were made subordinate to the dogmatics of a hyper-Calvinistic Calvinism. Coleridge once said that he never fully realised the Divine beauty of the Anglican Litany until he once attended service in a Scotch

kirk. What would he have said had he been suddenly confronted with the chasm between Ezekiel and the Shorter Catechism with Proofs? When we think of the points of likeness once more between Hebrew and Puritan, and then, with our minds filled with the raptures and splendours of the Jewish prophets, we turn to the Puritan preachers, we ask if it is possible we can have perceived any likeness between the two peoples at all. We have descended of a sudden from poetry to casuistry, from prophecy to pettifogging. We find much expository acumen, much hard logic, much keen controversy, argument, sub-division, proof; but for literature only a mass of sermons, pamphlets, exegetical commentary, and Calvinistic cabbala. They cannot even write prose that is not heavy with pedantry and dull to distraction; far less can they smite the Divine harp of the sons of Asaph. For this religion has ceased to be poetical; its Orientalism has been crushed, compacted, and dried into a system of dogmatics.

It was precisely these dogmatics, and the unintelligible preachings in which they were expounded, those savoury discourses so nourishing to the faith if bewildering to the reason, that hardened the Puritan trust into an adamantine fixity. Their theory of life was based, it is true, on a mistake, viz., the complete divorce between spirit and sense. This is no mere repetition of the old conflict between Ormuzd and Ahriman, the light and the darkness, the forces that tend towards health and those that tend towards corruption. It implies a split in human nature itself, a division of the individual, one part against another, a house divided against itself. The supernatural within, the "vital spark of heavenly flame," alone tends Godwards to eternal life: the natural, with all its accumulated forces, is dragging the supernatural devilwards to eternal death. No reconciliation between these is possible. No murmur of harmony nor silence of peace can be felt until this natural, with its passions, however generous; its aspirations, however noble; its sensibilities, however tender; and

its wayward longings to make life beautiful and happy, has been buried beneath the altar of the heavenly flame. Body and intellect and sense, poor waifs in their garments of original sin, must be beaten down, mutilated, crucified; the soul alone must live. But the mistake once conceded and the strife closed, grace soars triumphant. A genuine old Puritan moved in the very presence of the living God. In tears and terror he had fought out with himself the battle of the spirit, and he came forth at last radiant at heart, in spite of his tristful exterior, with the jubilant prayer of victory upon his lips into the eternal light. There is something which dwarfs criticism with its imaginative grandeur and sublimity in such a conflict and conquest as this.

It is a fervour of this kind which we encounter in *The Pilgrim's Progress.* There we have fashioned forth to us the arduous course of a soul faithful to its ideal through a progress of frequent falls, and often baffled endeavour to a final well-assured triumph. The struggling soul is brought purified at last into the presence of the Divine Glory. How does it start? With the agonised cry of him who reads the writing on the parchment roll, "Flee from the wrath to come!" It advances through all the struggles of the conscience-tortured Puritans. Its voice reaches a pitch of shrieking intensity, but except to such as are under the same sectarian influence, its language is either devoid of spiritual meaning, or must be translated into a different spiritual speech. To most it is only a spiritual dialect, and its author the speaker of an unknown tongue.

But the true "accent of high seriousness" springs not alone from firmness of grasp, or tense seizure of any idea. That alone will furnish the keenness of the fanatic, but the greatness of the seer can only be attained by him who combines strength of grasp with largeness of vision. Peter the Hermit was not greater than Shakespeare, though the one rode the foaming crest of the European wave that dashed and broke round the Holy Sepulchre, and the other

lived through the scepticism of *Hamlet;* nor was there any Puritan preacher whose earnestness could hold rank with Jeremy Taylor's, though Taylor vindicated the authority of

> That capability and God-like reason
> Which was not given to fust in us unused.

The Puritans attained to this earnestness simply because they had that view of life which their creed taught them, and regarding life as they did, with a partial and imperfect vision, their earnestness could only develop into that which it was—a species of monomania. It appears only as a fervour of concentration, each one's eye fixed on his own soul, until, like the fatuous Fakir, he believes that he has solved the infinite by continuous gazing on his own navel. It was not because the Puritan was too earnest for the trivialities of verse that he was incapable of artistic utterance; he had shrouded his earnestness in the gloom of his creed. He had built out the softening light of our every-day sun, and sat waiting for the unearthly splendour and unfructifying glare of an unknown infinite. He had cut off the springs from which poetry is nourished, and those moments of supreme emotion which call for the impassioned utterance of the poet, found with him their most natural expression in the primitive mono-syllabic interjections.[1] He was smitten dumb by his creed. There was both a want and a superfluity in this religion—a lack of warmth and sweetness, an indifference or an insensibility to loveliness, an absorption in creed, and an idolatry of dogma, an agony of conscience robbed of its fruits by a torturing of reason, and issuing only in a distorted vision and a mutilated being.

JOHN G. DOW.

NOTE ON MILTON.—Since Carlyle edited the *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, English opinion on this period has been prone to fall into the latter of two pitfalls which invariably waylay the

[1] Cromwell remarks, in one of his letters upon the Scotch worshipping in Edinburgh, "after their usual fashion of groans."

criticism of enthusiasts, viz., inadequate justice and excessive appreciation. It has become common to enlarge the meaning of the term Puritanism, so as to include all English Protestantism,—the extravagances of the movement being only regarded as ebullitions which are to be regretted, but which the violence of the times may easily condone. No critic of importance better illustrates this blunder than the late John Richard Green, and few passages in history are more ingeniously sophistical than that in which he endeavours to show that Spenser was "Puritan to the core." If any one cares to try, he may take the passage in Green's history, and by substituting the name Tennyson for Spenser, and the *Idylls of the King* for the *Fairy Queen*, employing the same line of argument and almost the identical language, he may as satisfactorily prove that the Poet Laureate is "Puritan to the core."

The same danger waylays the critic of Milton to a more slippery extent, because Milton did identify himself with the Puritan cause. We have to remember, in the first place, that the great English Revolution of the seventeenth century was political as well as religious. It began with a constitutional resistance, though it ended in a Puritan triumph, and among its constitutional elements was included much that had a far wider scope than all Puritanism combined. The constitutional opposition included gentlemen like Algernon Sidney—"What a gentleman he was!" exclaims Coleridge —whom, with all his fine moral qualities, no critic would dream of calling a Puritan. Having eliminated the non-religious constitutional element, we must further distinguish between what is merely Protestant in the opposition, and what is essentially Puritan. For the two are by no means identical. There was a national and patriotic dread of the power of Rome that might still make the established Protestantism of England totter, and there was this Protestantism carried to sectarian issues. The Puritan movement is as intelligible as the Gnostic heresy, and its idea has a sufficiently well-defined content. The movement is marked by unmistakable characteristics, it advances with a well-understood aim, and the name is a contemporary growth with the movement itself. To make the name cover something which its historical meaning will not justify, is simply to pervert history. To force upon the content of its idea an interpretation at variance with its historical conceptions, is as bad as our latest philosophico-religious attempt to force the Hegelian philosophy into the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Observing, then, that the political aspects of this revolution include more than Puritan politics, and its religious aspects more than Puritan religion, we are prepared to consider Milton's part in it and his relation to it, and the sense in which he is its representative as a

Puritan poet. In his youth we may say that Milton was not a Puritan at all. His father was born and educated a Catholic, trained in the amplest Elizabethan culture, a skilled musician and a lover of art; later he destined his son for the Church of England, though the poet's passion for liberty made him "church-outed by the prelates." His home influences made his life so singularly pure and noble as it was, and early inspired him with that high ambition to make of himself "a composition and pattern of the best and noblest things." His first tutor, however, was the Puritan who "cut his hair short," and his next was the ungainly and broad-tongued Scotch Presbyterian, Thomas Young. At one-and-twenty we find him writing in a strain of asceticism which indicates the beginning of that ineffectual struggle of Puritanism to obtain complete possession of his life. In his *Ode on the Nativity* we discover the future author of *Paradise Lost*, but the poet had not yet decided in favour of the Puritan cause. He had still the alternative before him; he could have joined hands with Lord Falkland, and realised this early promise in a truer sense than by writing Latin dispatches for the Commonwealth in the company of Bradshaw. When the political struggle bore in upon him, he could idealize both sides in *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. These poems derive half their charm and all their power from the condition of balance that still existed in the poet's mind, from the fact that he was neither Puritan nor Cavalier, neither saint nor roisterer. The same balance is continued in *Comus*, in which the praise of virtue takes the form of a Cavalier masque, and nearer to cavalier sympathy are the *Shakespeare Epitaph* and the *Arcades*. *Comus* is a rich idealisation of the best part of Puritan character by one who throws upon it the light of the Renascence, but the idealist has not yet joined the sectaries. Not until *Lycidas* do we hear the first sound of battle. The poet comes down from "the starry threshold of Jove's Court" to hammer his sword upon an anvil. In the passage in which he introduces the enraged and menacing figure of the apostle Peter shaking his keys against the worldly clergy, we have already the controversialist and the partisan. There is already the mixture of poet and sectary which we find in *Paradise Lost*. He is still the singer of the Renascence, but he is preparing for work that compels him to lay past his lyre. He has sounded the first note of the *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano*, and henceforth he is politically on the Puritan side.

Throughout his prose-period we hear the accent of the Puritan mingling with a sublime prose-poetry. He has the Puritan preacher's argumentative tone, and he carries into his argument the same Puritan spirit of narrowness and quibbling—the spirit that revels in quotation of texts, and clenches a knotty point by an appeal to chapter and

verse. He has the same intolerance, the same uncharitable and unsympathetic temper. It is vain to attempt to reason with him: he will simply shout louder, and call you ugly names. In his invective he wields his pen like one of Cromwell's pikes. When he goes to the Bible, it is not with the judicious temperance of the rationalists, but with the squinting eyesight of an Ironside sergeant. But here, also, he transcends Puritanism. Though ostensibly helping to fight the Puritan battle, he is contending for much that is inconsistent with Puritan authority. His call for liberty, whether in Church, or State, or domestic life, or private judgment, embodies demands which Puritan supremacy would never have conceded. Certainly Puritanism gave as little inspiration to the *Areopagitica* as it did to his treatises on Divorce.

While we bear all this in mind, it is unnecessary to say much about the later poems. *Samson Agonistes* is a Hebrew inspiration cast in a Greek mould. *Paradise Lost* (and the same remarks will apply to *Paradise Regained*) is, in several senses, the epic of Puritanism; but it is far more. Being the product of a certain age, and that a most remarkable one, it would have been strange indeed if Milton had not assimilated the influences around him, and made his work so far a reflex of the age in which he lived. This is true of every mind from the highest to the lowest. *Paradise Lost*, then, like Milton's other literary work, is inspired both by the politics and by the religion of the Puritan revolution. But his religion is more than merely Protestant. It has the impress of Sectarianism upon it, and breathes the spirit, not so much of a great religious emancipation, as of a power that would bring the human intellect once more into thraldom. It is theological more than religious, and its set of theological dogmas is Puritan and predestinarian. It is Puritan in the special character of its vindication of the Fall of Man, Free-will, Original Sin, the Atonement, and other articles of the Westminster Confession. Disregarding its dogmatics, we further observe that it embodies less of the alluring influence of a creation born of love, than the harder constraint of the imperative of duty. We feel less the persuasion through loveliness of the moral ideal, than the compulsion of the moral "ought," a compulsion that indicates some alien power other than art keeping the artist from turning to the right hand or to the left, and making him work "as ever in the great Taskmaster's eye." But when we examine the merits and defects of the poem, we find that it is great precisely where it transcends Puritanism, and little where Puritanism predominates. It is Pagan as an Epic, Puritan as a Theodicy; and the Theodicy half spoils the Epic. It breaks in upon us in dreary dissertations, exegeses apologetics, academic argumentations, abstruse dialectics from the schools, in which the poet disappears and the winged muse is draggled

in a ditch of dogma. For the *nexus* of the poem is one of dogma, and the author has set himself to dispute a thesis and write a commentary upon a Confession of faith, at the same time as he is constructing a work of art. Apart from this incongruity, we find that the best part of Milton's inspiration is drawn from what Puritanism rejected, from the Elizabethan Renascence, from the serenity of Pagan Greece, from the warmth of Italy. Wherein the Bible gave him true poetic inspiration was exactly when he did not go to it as one seeking confirmation for the articles of a creed. He was enabled to make his work great, because he preserved what Puritan ethics interdicted, viz., a recognition of the æsthetical, and because he ignored the notion in which Puritanism is philosophically founded, viz., a divorce between Spirit and Sense.

J. G. D.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THE pages of the April number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* are brightened by an interesting and carefully written article on the important subject of "Jewish Religious Education." In breadth of view and in treatment there is nothing to be desired from the standpoint of the accomplished authoress. Her personality throughout the article appears without a suspicion of egotism, and her frankness is very charming. Her position among religious thinkers is easy to define. She must be regarded as a representative of the Broad School, and is considerably in advance of the so-called orthodox party. Her opinions are shared by a large number of moderate and sensible persons, and there is a great merit in moderation and good sense. Her position, perhaps, is best described as in the middle of the advancing, rather than the advanced, party.

But with all Mrs. Lucas's breadth of view and intelligence, it must be confessed that her opinions are far too much the conventional opinions of the day. In the present condition of religious thought something more than the expression of conventional opinions is needed. The difficulties of religious education for the young are admitted to be very great, and these difficulties are increasing rapidly. The difficulty of harmonising modern thought with religious ideas, such as inspiration and revelation, taxes to the very utmost the resources of parents and teachers. The exactness of scientific methods cannot be applied in the miraculous histories which are the subjects of religious education, and disappointment is felt that Mrs. Lucas has not touched upon these difficulties. Indeed, it may be

asked very respectfully whether she has contributed anything to a solution of the difficulties which she was bound to face. With every desire to give an affirmative reply, it is only possible to say that the real difficulties of religious education remain unsolved and untouched.

"My Judaism is the Judaism of the Pentateuch," is the frank avowal of the authoress; and she goes on to say, "that the record of the early history of Israel has been preserved in the Bible, together with a number of laws, which though they do not appear to be all of the same value, are yet due to the will of God and to God's inspiration." It is no exaggeration to say that every line of that passage bristles with difficulties. It is perilous enough to pledge one's belief to the truth of the "early history of Israel," as narrated in the Pentateuch. It is also very ambiguous. Is it intended to include the Patriarchal period? If it be so, the value of the narrative is greatly diminished by the references to angels, which stamp the mythical character of the history. But probably Mrs. Lucas desires to limit her belief in the early history of Israel to later times; however, she expresses her belief "in God's election of the people of Israel to be proclaimers of his unity," which would carry her belief back to the period of Abraham. It would be impossible to point out any strictly Jewish dogma more difficult to teach than the doctrine of the election of the descendants of Abraham as "the chosen people." The stories in the Book of Genesis concerning the Almighty's dealings with Abraham are not only unteachable at the present day, but to calm and impartial minds the narratives are entirely *unthinkable*. It is much to be regretted that Mrs. Lucas did not inform her readers how she could present to intelligent children as historic truths the marvellous scenes alleged to have occurred on the plains of Mamre. The legendary character of that narrative is proved by the reference to angels. What is an angel? A creature of the imagination with no actual existence. Every narrative in which angels play

their part is discredited, and can only be regarded as unhistoric and untrustworthy. It is impossible to ignore the antecedent difficulties and improbabilities of the doctrine of selection, and if the chief support from the sacred narrative should fail, how can the doctrine be maintained? how can it be taught? Subsequent reference to this doctrine in various parts of the Pentateuch lends very little support to the historic value of the scenes described in Genesis. The later writers speak of the tradition, and do not and cannot testify to the truth of the promise made by God to Abraham, which rests on the authenticity of events, which no evidence can establish and no tradition confirm. It is not intended, on the present occasion, to dwell at any length on this, the primary and fundamental doctrine of conventional Judaism. The object of the writer is to direct attention to other difficulties of religious education of equal magnitude and perhaps of greater importance.

Mrs. Lucas expresses her opinion "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." This statement of belief constitutes her platform, and with the greatest respect for the authoress, it cannot be improper to inquire whether the position thus assumed can be logically maintained, and can be made the basis of religious education. It would appear that Mrs. Lucas herself has some doubts as to the strength of her position, for in the following passage she attempts to lessen the effects of advancing destructive criticism by the very remarkable statement "that her belief would not be lessened if it were mathematically proved that Moses were not the actual author of the Pentateuch, nor increased if the reverse were as absolutely demonstrated." It is almost unnecessary to point out that this extraordinary statement involves the anomaly that the authenticity of the Scriptures is independent of testimony. It is very important, however, to state that Mrs. Lucas, in her efforts

to free herself from the conclusions of destructive criticism, assumes the equal value of contemporary history (which Scripture claims to be) and of oral traditions—reduced to writing many years after the events which they affect to describe. If Moses were not the author of the Pentateuch, some other person or persons must have written in his name, with or without his authority. If the Pentateuch were actually written after the death of Moses, and without his authority, but in the age of Moses, it was not faithful history, and implies a desire to impose upon the credulity of the people by the weight and veneration of a great name. If the Pentateuch were committed to writing long after the death of Moses, it deals with traditions, and its value and authenticity are greatly diminished. In fact, the difference in the value of Scriptures claiming to be contemporary history, and of traditions reduced to writing, consists in the ascertainment of the period at which the traditions were reduced into writing. After the lapse of long periods of time the difference of value may be enormous. Contemporary events narrated by an eye-witness may be truly and faithfully recorded. Events described after the lapse of centuries by writers who trusted to tradition or unauthentic records can hardly be regarded as trustworthy history. If the death of Moses, and the reduction into writing of the Laws of Moses were separated by six or eight centuries, the value of the tradition is relatively small. If the reduction into writing were near to the events alleged, the evidential value is proportionately raised. Thus the value and relative authenticity of the Scriptures depend entirely on the evidences of time of publication as well as of authorship. These important questions cannot be disposed of as Mrs. Lucas desires. The difficulties of authorship and date of publication have to be met, and the questions of inquiring students have to be answered.

Important as this branch of the subject undoubtedly is, the chief object of the writer is to examine the

doctrine of "Inspiration from the educational point of view." What is inspiration? How can we realise the idea ourselves? How can we present the idea to those we are teaching? It is very easy to speak of inspiration in words—so-and-so is divinely inspired. Are there existing ideas in our minds corresponding to the words used? In the first place, it is proper to note that Mrs. Lucas does not believe in verbal inspiration. The doctrine of verbal inspiration represents the inspired individual as a sort of amanuensis writing mechanically words coming into his mind by divine purpose. There is something crude and unsatisfactory in this doctrine, and it is now giving way to the doctrine of plenary inspiration, which is the more modern form of the religious dogma of inspiration. The difficulties of the older form of belief are not in the least diminished, but the greater vagueness and uncertainty in realising the idea of plenary inspiration, obviously give the newer form of the doctrine many advantages. According to the current theology, it is the form of the doctrine of inspiration, in which it is now proper to believe. What is plenary inspiration? How can we form in our minds a conception of the idea? What are the tests of plenary inspiration? How are we guarded against fraud and imposition? What is the criterion of the truth of the doctrine? Where are the evidences? A teacher of religion is bound to offer satisfactory answers to these questions, or to admit that the subject transcends our faculties. If he adopt the latter alternative, he should be classed as an agnostic, and he had better abandon the belief altogether, for it must never be forgotten that belief is an intellectual operation, and without the sanction of mind, there is no true belief. Words may express belief, but the mind gives none without conviction. How do ideas arise in the brain? The brain is the great thinking organ; by some action within the brain, an idea is generated. In order to generate an idea, some change in the brain must take place. The modified state of brain is the antecedent, and the idea is

the consequent. Without such modification of the brain, no idea will arise. According to Psychologists, as every movement of the body is preceded and accompanied by a modification of nerve and muscle, so every action of the mind—the sole organ of which is the brain—is preceded and accompanied by some modification of the brain. What that modification is, is still uncertain, but Psychologists are convinced that cause and effect follow in mental operations with as much certainty and regularity as in all other physical actions. Assuming, therefore, that every mental operation has its cause or antecedent, what is the factor or what is the antecedent in the production of an idea due to inspiration? In other words, what is the antecedent to the production of the idea coming to the brain *ab extra*?

The ordinary action of the brain is suspended; a new factor is introduced. The divine will, acting upon or through the brain, generates the idea in the human mind. If this be true, how is the influence of the divine inspiration made cognisant? How is it that the ordinary factors of ideas are superseded and a new factor is introduced? This question is the pivot upon which the whole belief in inspiration should turn. If the doctrine be true, what is the test of its truth? How can the inspired individual make it clear to himself, and be certain that the ideas in his mind are *not* generated within his own mind, but are generated by divine will? It is necessary to guard against both fraud and mistake. Enthusiasm and fanaticism cause strange freaks in the action of human minds. Imposition and wilful deception may occasionally occur. It is essential to know, and be able to distinguish the human idea from the divinely-inspired idea, and to establish some test by which we can recognise the differences of the one idea from the other. In the history of the world many wise and good men have claimed to be inspired of God. Their pretensions have been accepted by some nations and rejected by others. Who were right? The thoughts of many of these men claiming to be divinely

inspired are sublime and holy. What is the criterion which distinguishes Moses from Asoka, from Zoroaster, from Mahomet, and from others (not referring to Jesus of Nazareth)? Is there any criterion which includes Moses and excludes other claimants to divine inspiration? It is sufficiently clear that there is and can be no such test or criterion of inspiration. The doctrine of divine inspiration has been accepted by a credulous world without question, and maintained throughout the ages without difficulty and without doubt.

A new mode of regarding Scripture seems to be coming into vogue, which, while diminishing many of the difficulties of ordinary systems of interpretation, greatly attenuates the value of inspiration. The new method consists in accepting the theory of gradual development, admitting it may be carried out by non-inspired writers working on a *divine plan.* This mode of viewing Scripture has obviously a twofold advantage. It concedes much to the advocates of evolution, and admits the theory of historic development. It also diminishes to a very great extent the difficulties of a belief in direct inspiration. "What we may suppose to have happened," says Mr. C. Gore in *Lux Mundi*, is that "Moses himself established a certain germ of ceremonial enactment in connection with the ark and its sacred tent, and with the 'Ten words,' and that this developed always as 'the Law of Moses,' the whole result being constantly attributed, probably unconsciously, and certainly not from any intention to deceive, to the original founder. . . . . If we believe that the law, as it grew, really did represent the divine intention for the Jews, gradually worked out on the basis of a Mosaic institution, there is nothing materially untruthful, though there is something uncritical in attributing the whole legislation to Moses acting under the divine command." It would seem that the author of the above passage sees nothing materially untruthful in a pious fraud attributing to Moses the legislative work of a later author on the plan

of Moses. It is sad to witness the intellectual, and indeed moral torsion which is deemed necessary in order to harmonise the theory of development in connection with Mosaic legislation with the doctrine of divine inspiration. Would Mr. Gore regard it "as not materially untruthful" to attribute to Lord John Russell, long since dead, the extension of the franchise in 1884, because the later legislation was to some extent on the plan of Lord John Russell's reform legislation of 1832? The Rev. C. Gore goes on to say, that "what we are asked to admit is not conscious perversion, but unconscious idealising of history, the reading back into past records of a ritual development which was really later." To the secular mind the difference between "unconscious idealising of history," as suggested, and pious fraud, is infinitely small. To Mr. Gore it becomes a method of interpretation; to the ordinary inquirer it is a discreditable practice. If a later writer uses the name of Moses, and assumes the authority of Moses, the act may or may not be *pious*, but it certainly is an imposition upon those who are deceived. These questions of direct inspiration and of gradual development involve sufficient difficulties to appal the educator of the young. Until the teacher has satisfied his own mind, how can he teach? In the present condition of theology no intelligent pupil can be told that inspiration is a truth which must be accepted without question, or that the authenticity of the Mosaic dispensation is above and beyond doubt. To be respected by our pupils we must be honest. To be honest we must admit doubt.

The next part of the subject which obviously is reached, is the question of Revelation. The difficulties of belief in Revelation are hardly less than those in the doctrine of Inspiration. Let us ask what is revealed. Is it knowledge so occult that it lies beyond the discovery of human intellect? Or is it only the anticipation of human discovery? It is extremely difficult, indeed it is impossible to mention any part of revelation that contains knowledge

which is undiscoverable by unaided human intelligence. For the purposes of this inquiry it will be sufficient to divide the subject into Revelation of moral truths and Revelation introducing religious ceremonial.

With regard to the revelation of moral truths, it is quite untrue that the moral principles included in the Decalogue were unknown to the world until the time of Moses. The origin of moral laws is a sufficiently difficult inquiry, with which, fortunately, we are not engaged; but it is abundantly clear that the moral principles contained in the ethical part of the Decalogue were well known among and practised by the Egyptian and other peoples long before the age of Moses. The moral ideas contained in the Decalogue are so simple and so fundamental that it is difficult to imagine any civilised or semi-civilised society existing without rules of conduct similar to those so grandly expressed in the Decalogue. And as a matter of history it was so. There is no evidence whatever that the great ancient monarchies were established without a moral basis to the laws by which the peoples were governed. The evolution of moral ideas from the historical point of view may be a question of extreme difficulty, but most thinkers agree that moral rules of conduct were at a very early age established for the guidance of mankind. One of the most interesting of all problems in the long history of civilisation is the influence of moral ideals and moral principles upon national legislation, and few will doubt that civilisation has been greatly advanced by the recognition of and adherence to moral ideas. The chief aspect of the alleged revelation of fundamental moral principles would seem to be *not* so much the introduction of new principles not previously known, as the high sanction obtained for such principles. It is obvious that the importance of a Divine sanction—the authority for the law—cannot be over-estimated, and it must be conceded that such sanction has exercised a most beneficial influence on the progress of civilisation. But is it true? The question before us is not the advantages of revelation

but the truth of revelation. It must be admitted that the moral ideas contained in Scripture are of the greatest beauty, expressed in the sublimest language. Indeed, the beneficial effects referred to would not have been obtained without a moral grandeur in the Law and the Sanction.

But regarding the Pentateuch as a whole, and teaching the Mosaic legislation as a code of divinely-inspired laws, we are bound to regard another side, upon which the world has expressed in no measured terms its signal disapproval. The moral law upon which so much admiration may be expressed is associated with a ceremonial law and with a caste-priesthood, the evil influences of which, if the system had succeeded, would have been enormous. With regard to the ceremonial law, it is proper in the first instance to point out that it never seems to have occurred to the author or authors of the multitudinous forms of ceremonials which the Pentateuch introduced or copied from neighbouring nations, that ceremonies are but fashions, useful for a time, but giving way, later, to newer and more appropriate forms. The ceremonial law of the Pentateuch was evidently intended to last for ever. It is needless to cite passages in proof of this statement; the whole theory of the Levitical code is that a code of ceremonial law is established, which should never be altered. Any ceremonial law assuming to be fitted for all time stands condemned. Progress and change are the law of the universe. A stable ceremonial law may be in accordance with Oriental ideas, and may have been the desire of ancient lawgivers, but absolute unchangeability is not the law which governs the universe. It is one of the most remarkable features of the Jewish people, whom it is no exaggeration to say, are one of the most intellectual people in the world, that they still profess their belief in the permanency of the ceremonial law, and teach it to the young from generation to generation, while they are as completely permeated as any European people with modern ideas of progress, and the present inappropriateness of the Levitical

code. If we would, we could not regard the ceremonial law of the Pentateuch with any respect or favour. The world has outgrown the belief in religious ceremonials, and no effort can restore that which has so completely passed away. Is it honest to attempt to preserve a mock and hollow belief in such laws as divinely inspired? Is it honest to teach to our children the doctrine that Eastern ceremonials of great antiquity were commanded by the great Almighty to the Jewish people, when we know the contrary is the truth? In the near future it may be hoped that a great change will take place in Jewish belief in this respect. There are, in the Pentateuch, many features very much worse than the establishment of a complex ceremonial law. There is the institution of an hereditary caste priesthood. It is quite needless at the present day to denounce the sacerdotal system. All honest thinkers of all creeds, and in all countries, are agreed that the sacerdotal system is most inimical to the best interests of society. Great thinkers have expressed in unmistakable terms their abhorrence of priestcraft and the systems with which priests are associated. Priests are everywhere, and in every age, the enemies of human progress, and the foes of human knowledge. They flourish where ignorance is found, and they fight step by step against the advances of science; yet the most implacable system that has ever been invented was intended for the Hebrew people by the authors of the priestly code. This system, so harmful in all its details, is one which is "still taught to our children as emanating from divine intelligence." Will our children look with respect on us if we admit (as we are forced to do) that the system cannot be regarded with favour, and that we are very glad it never succeeded? The sacerdotal system attempted to be established by the Levitical or priestly code was not a new system. It was copied, with certain modifications, from the neighbouring nations. The elaborate system of sacrifices connected with the priestly system was possibly appropriate

for the times at which it was introduced, but will anyone contend that it represents a high form of culture, or is compatible with the higher forms of civilisation? The institution of a caste priesthood and the sacrificial system, established or confirmed by the Levitical code, bear every indication of the work of men's hands — men, too, who had not a far outlook into the future, but who, like most Orientals, believed in the permanency of established systems. It is hardly a cynical remark, that those who contend that the Levitical system is inspired by God are bound to explain how it happens that the scheme of revelation always follows on Semitic lines, and is largely drawn from Semitic sources.

However grand and sublime the moral code of the Pentateuch may be, it can hardly be doubted that the legislation as a whole is discredited by the priestly system, with which it is inseparably associated. From the educational point of view, the difficulties of reconciling the priestly system of the Pentateuch with the secular ideas of modern political science are well-nigh impossible, and these are difficulties which the honest teacher is bound to face. Indeed, the dilemma presented by the irreconcileable contraries is either that the priestly system is not a revelation from the Almighty, or that God ordained a system that hopelessly failed, and has since been discredited by all thoughtful persons.

The sublimest parts of Scripture are those that deal with man's relation to his Creator. The treatment of such a transcendental subject does not allow of proofs and verification. Whatever may be the moral significance of the laws relating to holiness, the subject is not one for exact treatment, or for which we can demand certainty. Hence the very wide margin which must be conceded to conjecture and theory. The exhortations of the writers of Scripture appeal much more to conscience than to reason. And it would be idle to require verification respecting subjects where it is impossible to supply

it. Hence it is that theology can never rank as an exact science. It occupies ground in the elevated regions of vagueness and uncertainty, and for those who are unable to believe, no proofs can be offered, and no certainty of truth can ever be attained.

It is not desired to avoid the subject of miracles. Miracles are at the present day the difficulty rather than the support of the theologian. The want of historic certainty in all ancient records diminishes to vanishing point the value of alleged miracles. Religious histories are everywhere full of wonders and miracles, but no trustworthy evidence is ever forthcoming in order to establish a miracle. Assuming that Almighty Providence could alter the course of nature if he desired to do so, the question is, Has he done so? It is a question of fact to be dealt with by appropriate evidence, as every other question of fact. It is hardly too strong a statement that no Biblical miracle approaches the necessary test of trustworthiness. All narratives of miracles are very much of the same character and none give the guarantees of accuracy and historical truthfulness which are needed in order to establish a suspension of the natural laws which appear to govern phenomena. In the course of religious education the Jewish teacher will be compelled to regard supernatural religion from the Jewish point of view, *as a whole*, and to form some estimate of the system as a factor in the progress of civilisation. From the tenour of the previous remarks, no very exalted opinion of such a system *as a whole* can be formed. The object of every religious system should be to raise the level of humanity, and fit man to rise to higher forms of civilisation. In order to accomplish these great objects, it is necessary to possess high ideals and lofty standards of conduct. Throughout the whole of Scripture the sentiment most praised, and that which is most prominent, is obedience. The crimes of King David are condoned to a great extent in consequence of his obedience to the Divine Will. Obedience doubtless is a fine sentiment, and obedience

to the Will of God leads to resignation and submission to unseen powers. It is a virtue on the passive side of human nature, and does not incite to heroic actions or to nobleness of conduct. The active virtues are the true influences in the progress of civilisation, and they are relatively neglected, and the more passive qualities are unduly preferred. Hence it may be inferred that the Jewish system would never have greatly aided in the advance of civilisation. It is well worthy of repetition that the legislation of the Pentateuch is almost wholly in accordance with Semitic ideas and Oriental habits. There is a narrowness quite incompatible with the general advance of civilisation. The entire dependence—as contemplated in the Pentateuch—on supernatural support and interference would have checked, if not destroyed, the progress of knowledge, and the great triumphs of science would never have taken place under a priestly system. By the failure of the Jewish system the world has been saved a great calamity, for it can hardly be questioned that the Pentateuchal Legislation contemplated a system entirely opposed to the modern ideas of progress, and the advance of civilisation. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that all that the modern world regards as the greatest successes of modern thought and modern practices would have been impossible under the system attempted to be carried out by the Hebrew Legislators. If that system had not been destroyed by the successive conquerors of Judæa it would have succumbed to the inherent difficulties of harmonising an ancient Oriental religious system with advancing secular ideas. To imagine its extension over the whole world is to imagine universal decay and not progress as the destiny of mankind. It is difficult to understand how at the present day any honest teacher can be found who can conscientiously maintain the divine origin of the Levitical Code and the Priestly system thereby established. If, as some moralists teach us, the value of a thing is best estimated by imagining ourselves deprived of it, let us imagine ourselves without those

possessions of secular knowledge, which we value, and rightly value, so highly; all our stores of knowledge swept away, all our mechanical inventions lost to us, for in the eyes of many theologians, the powers of nature are the attributes of God, and not the servants of man. Indeed it must not be forgotten that the rapid advance during the last three centuries in knowledge and power, and in all that constitutes modern civilisation, has been made in opposition to, and in defiance of those religious ideas which underlie the Jewish system. The advance of scientific knowledge limits and curtails the belief in the supernatural interferences, and as the former advances the latter recedes. The conflict between modern ideas and supernaturalism is only beginning, notwithstanding three centuries of scientific discovery, and no one can doubt the issue. The opponents of the old system are bold and aggressive, their arguments cannot now be ignored. The current literature is full of the attacks of the rationalists upon conventional religious belief, and the replies are weak and half-hearted. The schools and colleges, to which young Jews are sent, follow the direction of the intellectual current, and disbelief is unconcealed if not avowed in all the abodes of learning. Is religious education to disregard the signs of the times? To do so would be to live in a fool's paradise. The difficulties of the day have to be met. The youth of the Jewish community cannot be put off by evasive answers, or by reference to the traditional explanations of supernatural events. The conventional modes of treatment are no longer of any avail. It is indispensable to meet reasonable objections with reasonable explanations. The time is come when an effort must be made to harmonise modern scientific thought with ancient religious ideas, and it is greatly to be regretted that Mrs. Lucas has not made any attempt in that direction.

There is another kind of Judaism to which Mrs. Lucas has not referred, and which is different to any form of Judaism mentioned in her article: *It is the Judaism of the*

future. There have been sneers at the prediction of the near advent of Cosmopolitan Monotheism. The Judaism of the future will be historical Monotheism.

The great conflicts now taking place between modern thought and ancient religious ideas must, sooner or later, involve the whole of the platform of traditional Judaism. If Jews desire to maintain their well-won character as an intellectual people they must take part in this conflict.

It will not be out of place to refer again to some of the results of modern criticism, in order to indicate clearly the position of the modern critical school. It may well be conceded that, in various matters of detail, critics are not altogether agreed. But in most of the essential parts of the subject there is little substantial difference of opinion

The Pentateuch is not believed to be the work of Moses. It is not the work of one author; it is a built-up composition. The precise periods at which the several parts of the Pentateuch were written or published may be doubtful, but it is clear that several centuries elapsed, after the death of Moses, before the "Five Books" were in the possession of the Jews: possibly seven or eight hundred years. It is difficult to estimate the importance of this fact in lowering the authenticity of the Sacred Books. The first part of the Pentateuch which appeared is probably Deuteronomy, which may have been written and published six centuries after the death of Moses. Leviticus, or the Priestly Code, appeared two to three centuries later. The early history of the Hebrew people is to a great extent legendary. It is very possible that the patriarchs are mythological personages. It is almost certain that their histories are gathered from various sources, and are altogether untrustworthy. The period of literary activity and reduction into writing of traditions, was the age which began with King Josiah, and ended with the return of the exiles from Babylon. During those years historical Judaism was formed. Since the age of the Septuagint it has hardly varied. The reality of the Sinaitic Legislation is very doubtful, and the

whole story of the Tables of Stone is probably legendary. Enough has been stated to indicate the peril of traditional Judaism. What is the value of traditions? Their value depends on surrounding circumstances. It may be very great. It can be reduced to nothing. It need not be doubted that ancient histories may be handed down for long periods of time, from generation to generation, by oral transmission, and without any writings whatever. It is alleged that in ancient Greece there were individuals who could recite the whole of Homer, and ancient Bards won their renown by astounding feats of memory. Many Hebrew traditions are doubtless of great antiquity. But where oral traditions are worth anything, they are not combined with written documents. The combination is a source of great danger. The Jews were a literary people, and reduced their traditions to writing. History tells us how they dealt with them, how narratives were expanded and embellished, and how ceremonials grew and were added to. The old traditions were immersed in the oceans of details of more recent commentators and editors. Hence Jewish traditions became of little value in proportion to the amount of the literary skill of those who reduced them to writing, and the oral traditions were lost in the plenitude of the literary efforts to preserve them. The critical methods of the new school of theologians are well known and need no explanation. The results of their labours are accumulating, and are passing downwards from the learned class to the general public. Are these results foolishness, or are they the outcome of a critical examination of the Scriptures conducted upon trustworthy methods? If the former be true, let the Jewish learned men advance their arguments and maintain the authenticity and integrity of Scripture. If the latter alternative is true, dogmatic Judaism is untenable, and an immense reform of thought and of practice cannot be far distant. The signs of the times all indicate a great cataclysm in religious belief. It is becoming more and more difficult to believe in supernaturalism. The Law of

Evolution is more and more applied in order to explain the growth of systems and the rise and fall of beliefs. How should we apply the new learning in explaining the development of Judaism ?

The fundamental idea of Judaism is Monotheism. It is unnecessary to question the great historical fact of the early appearance of the Monotheistic idea among the ancient Hebrews. It is extremely probable that the Monotheistic idea arose in the Abrahamic family. It is certain that for an immense period of time the descendants of Abraham regarded this idea as a precious gift of God, to be preserved in the family, in the tribe, in the nation, as a priceless inheritance. The desire to preserve that simple cult gave rise to the divergence of their religious ideas, from the conventional religious ideas of their cognates, the Syrian Semites. Rites and ceremonies, partly in accordance with, and partly differing from the Syrians, were the means by which the ancient Hebrews strove to safeguard their religious ideas. The dangers and subsequent destruction of the political state alarmed the prophetical school, and the Scribes, who feared the loss of the Monotheistic idea in the calamities attending the loss of national independence. Hence the reduction of all existing traditions, and the immense development of conservative laws at the time of the exile.

These laws were promulgated with two objects, and these still continue, viz., the separation of the race and the preservation of the idea. The Judaism of the future has no other objects. The beloved "Torah" was the means intended to accomplish these objects, and if the authenticity of the "Torah" should be impugned, will the fundamental doctrines of Judaism be affected ? By no means. The pure Monotheistic idea is becoming more and more the cult of the school of science, and is the only hope of the thoughtful physicist. The peculiar isolation of the Hebrew race, and the tenacity with which they have preserved the idea of Monotheism, are

historical facts beyond question. Those facts it is impossible to deny. But it is equally impossible to maintain the supernatural history with which those facts are associated. Racial characteristics will account for a great deal, peculiar conditions will explain much more of the strange and marvellous history of the Jews. No one desires to rob that history of its strangeness and its marvels; but modern thought will not admit the supernatural as an explanation of any historical phenomena. The change that has to come is a change more of the *point of view* from which the facts are regarded than in the facts themselves. No one would deny the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt, but very many question the supernatural agencies by which the exodus is alleged to have been conducted. Very much has been made of the evidences of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt brought to light by the Egyptologists. These evidences undoubtedly strengthen the belief in the fact, which has not been denied, of that sojourn, but do not in the least support the allegations of supernatural agencies in the circumstances of the exodus. To remove the supernatural element from the Biblical narratives is the great reform of the near future. That reform will practically consist in converting supernatural history into marvellous history. It will deepen rather than weaken interest in the instructive and highly-suggestive evolution of the Monotheistic idea, and in the tragic fortunes of the descendants of the Patriarchs. But the question may be fairly asked, Will the modern Jews resent the loss of the supernatural in the history of the race? It may be hoped that calm consideration of the evidences will ultimately reconcile modern Jews to a change that elevates their ancestors and raises them to the heroic standard. That which is withdrawn from the supernatural must be added to the genius and greatness of the leaders of the ancient Hebrews. The history of the Jews regarded from the purely secular point of view, is a history of which any people may be justly proud, and which became glorious

through the martyrdom of its members, and the terrible sacrifices so freely made through centuries of persecution in order to preserve the integrity of the fundamental ideas of Judaism, and the purity of the race. The supernatural histories, the legends and the traditions were the "means" employed to preserve Israel. The jewel is as priceless as it ever was in the long history of the Jews; it is the setting alone which, in these modern times, is becoming of less value than it formerly possessed.

The history of the Jewish people need not be regarded as closed, even when such stupendous changes in thought shall have been effected, or their high destinies as played out and ended. As the custodians of a great and sublime idea, they will again be found in the front of religious thought. Formerly the pioneers through the dense labyrinth of ancient superstitions and inhuman practices, they will again become the leaders in a great religious revolution. The difficulties of religious belief, so often mentioned in these pages, affect equally and similarly all existing religious systems. The movement which is impending will involve all creeds and all classes. The fundamental idea of Judaism in such a movement will stand above the chaos which will attend the destruction of the conventional beliefs. That cherished idea will not be touched, and its existence will not be imperilled. The movement will be to a great extent obviously a destructive movement, but it will also be conservative. It will be a conservative movement, inasmuch as it will tend to preserve and perpetuate the belief in pure Monotheism. It will be a radical movement, so far as it will sacrifice and destroy ancient, worn out and valueless forms and ceremonies which are now out of joint with the times and irreconcileable with modern thought and practice. It will be a cosmopolitan movement, for it will seek to unite the wise and the thoughtful of every creed and clime in the one great and simple and all-sufficient cult—that of pure Monotheism. These are some of the burning questions of

the near future, questions which are second to none, from the educational point of view, and which now press for solution. They are inadequately brought forward in the foregoing pages in the earnest hope that more thought and more attention may be directed to problems of such importance and such magnitude, which for their solution may well require the united efforts of the most learned, the most conscientious and the most courageous of the present generation.

ALFRED G. HENRIQUES.

ISAAC ERTER: A MODERN HEBREW HUMOURIST.

"How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" Such were the sorrowful words uttered by the Jewish exiles when, sitting by the streams of Babylon, they were asked by their conquerors to sing some of the beautiful songs of Zion. And, indeed, how could those captives be expected to tune their national harp in presence of a mocking enemy, who had caused them so much grief and affliction, and had apparently also put an end to the further development of their sacred literature? But, happily, times changed later on for the better, and, with the regeneration of the Jewish nationality during the period of the Second Temple, there arose in the midst of the Jewish people poets and minstrels, who drew new sounds from the harp of Zion which were full of charm and sweetness. Of this, several Psalms composed at that time give conclusive evidence.

A similar revival of Hebrew literature took place during part of the Middle Ages in Spain and Italy, when it was enriched with several beautiful specimens of Hebrew prose and poetry, written and composed by the representatives of the so-called Spanish and Italian School. In modern times, too, a regeneration of the same literature has been effected in Galicia, a country which forms part of the Austrian Empire. During the first half of the present century there flourished in that country an able band of writers of Hebrew prose and poetry, who may be regarded as the founders of what is now termed the Galician School. The most able representative of that school is Dr. Isaac

Erter, the subject of the present essay. The following short sketch of Erter's life will, perhaps, be found interesting, especially as it will afford some insight into the spiritual life of the Galician Jews of the past generation.

Isaac Erter was born in the year 1792, in a small Galician village called Janischock. His father, a poor innkeeper, had to endure a life-long struggle against poverty and want, but, in spite of this, he did not neglect to have his son instructed in Hebrew and Talmudical lore. When young Erter had made some good progress in these subjects—which, by the way, he only learnt mechanically and without any fixed plan or method—his father caused him to marry a Rabbi's daughter, who, however, died within the first year after her marriage. Far from feeling discouraged by that sad experience, old Erter soon insisted upon his son marrying another girl of tender age, but, fortunately, the second marriage proved a most happy one; for his second wife was a genial and most pleasant companion to him in all the vicissitudes of his career, and encouraged him to endeavour to obtain for himself an honourable position in life in which effort he was ultimately most successful. But in the meantime he had to suffer all those troubles and vexations which a married man without any definite means of a livelihood is bound to undergo, and, in order to forget them for awhile, he frequently mixed with the members of a strange religious sect, known by the name of "Chassidim." The chief characteristics of this peculiar people may be said to consist in their leading a life of hilarity and excitement, and in being passionately devoted to their spiritual leader, called Rebbe. Although such Rebbes are as a rule most ignorant and illiterate persons, they are, nevertheless, held in high estimation by their devotees, who credit them with the possession of supernatural powers, by means of which they are able to work miracles. But, after a time, Erter became disgusted with the loathsome practices of the sect and their leaders,

and leaving the whole fraternity altogether, he went to live in Lemberg, the capital of Galicia. There he soon associated with several young men of talent and culture, who interested themselves on his behalf, and procured for him pupils whom he instructed in Hebrew and religious subjects. They also made him acquainted with the works of Maimonides and Mendelssohn, to the study of which he subsequently devoted many of his leisure hours. For three years (from 1813 to 1816) Erter led a comparatively happy life, and enjoyed the society and friendship of some genial spirits among whom may particularly be mentioned, Rapoport, the subsequent Chief Rabbi of Prague, and Nachman Krochmal, the renowned Hebrew scholar and philosopher. But his dream of happiness did not last long. For, when Jacob Ornstein, the then Chief Rabbi of Lemberg, heard of the existence among his flock of a small and youthful band occupied with the study of secular subjects, he became alarmed, and in order to put a stop to such an ungodly practice, forthwith excommunicated all the supposed culprits. This unexpected action had a crushing effect upon poor Erter, who was thereby deprived of his pupils, the only means of his subsistence. Under these circumstances, Erter's longer stay in Lemberg was out of the question, and he consequently decided to settle in the neighbouring town of Brody. On his arrival there, he met with a hearty reception from the enlightened section of the community, and as a new Jewish school had just been inaugurated there, he was entrusted with its management. After a short time, however, he resigned his position, and made up his mind to prepare himself for a more independent calling. With that object in view Erter left his already grown-up family of daughters in charge of some kind and obliging friends, and went to Buda-Pesth, at the University of which town he intended to prepare himself for the medical profession. He was then thirty-three years old, had neither money nor friends to assist him in his most venturous undertaking, and yet—wonderful

to relate—he attained his object. After five years' hard study during which time he endured the greatest misery and privation imaginable, he succeeded in passing all the necessary examinations, and, having taken his medical degree, he soon after began practising in some small Galician town. Now, it so happened that at that time the cholera was raging most severely in some parts of the country, and as Erter displayed considerable skill in dealing with the epidemic, he drew upon himself the attention of the Austrian Government, which entrusted him with the task of preparing certain essays, treating of the origin and spread of contagious diseases. Ultimately he returned to Brody, and continued to practise his new calling, making himself especially popular among the poor, who found in him a kindly benefactor. His leisure time he devoted, just as he had done in previous years, to his favourite occupation, viz., the composition of essays, or rather satires, on Jewish subjects. These satires he usually sent to his literary friends, to be read and criticised, before allowing them to be printed in the current Hebrew periodicals. Among those friends he reckoned, in addition to Rapoport and Krochmal, Professor S. D. Luzatto, Salom Cohen (editor of the Hebrew periodical *Bikure Ha-Itim*), and Dr. Letteris, the subsequent editor and publisher of Erter's collected writings under the title of הצופה לבית ישראל.[1]

The last years of Erter's life were again visited by various hard trials, chiefly caused by the untimely death of his two married daughters, to whom he had been deeply attached. He did not survive them long, but died peacefully in 1851 during the Feast of Passover, being deeply mourned by the poor and a large circle of intimate friends.

From what has hitherto been said, it will be seen that Erter's life was passed amidst much agitation. To this very circumstance, however, may be attributed the existence of

[1] Vienna, 1858; Second Edition, 1864.

the excellent Hebrew satires contained in the *Ha-Zophe*. The sad experiences of the author during the early part of his married state, the life he had led among the "Chassidim," the treatment he had received at the hands of the Chief Rabbi of Lemberg, and, finally, the observations he had made in his capacity as a medical practitioner—all these and many other things are most graphically described in that little volume. The style in which these descriptions are couched is full of humour and sarcasm, and they possess the true mark of excellence, inasmuch as familiarity with them adds to their attractiveness. Erter also wrote some poetical pieces, but they bear no comparison with his masterly prose, which, as Graetz well says, has points of resemblance with that of Heine.

The titles of the satires in question are: 1. מאזני משקל; 2. הצופה בשובו מקארלסבאד; 3. גלגול נפש; 4. תשליך; 5. תלונת סני וסנסני וסמנגלוף; 6. חסידות וחכמה; and each section treats of a different subject. It would be no easy task for anyone to reproduce in English, or in any other language, the many beauties of form and style found in the original Hebrew of those essays. Equally difficult would it be to arrange the pieces in order of merit, since each has a peculiar fascination of its own. But the following free translation of some parts of the essay, entitled גלגול נפש (Transmigration of the Soul) may, perhaps, give the reader a faint idea of Erter's style and mode of writing. The essay begins as follows:—

"I am a physician, and it is my duty to heal wounds, and to procure a remedy for every disease of the body. It is true that those of my colleagues who can boast of possessing high titles, look down upon me with a certain contempt, inasmuch as they think that they alone have a right to speak with authority of things they do not know much about. But, nevertheless, I am as well qualified a medical practitioner as they are, and my patients do not fare worse than theirs. The only difference between them and myself is, perhaps, to be found in the fact that they drive to their patients' houses in splendid carriages, while I visit mine on foot. For, the more horses and carriages a physician has, the more knowledge and medical skill is attributed to

him by the members of the Jewish faith. Moreover, such distinguished and high-titled physicians, who are mostly employed by the wealthy classes of the community, are generally handsomely rewarded for their services, even when their patients have died an untimely death, for among the rich even death is an expensive affair. But I, whose chief practice is carried on among the poor, do seldom get any pay for my services, and if any of those poor people should die, then his or her soul 'goes out free for nothing.' Once I passed before the house in which one of my patients had recently died. He did not die quite suddenly, but had been ill for some time, and I was called in to prescribe for his illness. That patient happened to be well off, and after I had visited him once or twice, and he continued ailing, there came a great multitude of his female neighbours and relatives—for the rich are always surrounded by their relatives and pretended friends—and said compassionately: 'This poor sufferer is still in bed, and shall we keep silence? Can *that* man (pointing to me) be expected to restore him to health again? Where are his horses, and where is his carriage? Let us call in some better and more skilful men, and let them have a consultation about the case.' Better and more skilful men were summoned; they arrived and examined the patient. They then nodded their wise heads, and prescribed a new medicine which, having been fetched from the apothecary's shop, was given to the patient. He took it once or twice, and was soon after 'gathered to his fathers.'"

Here follows a long and humorous description of the author's meeting with the soul of his recently departed patient. On that occasion the soul related to him the story of its many adventures during a long earthly career, how it frequently passed over from one body into another, and how it had once also been transferred from the body of an ass into that of a physician. In that capacity the soul informed the author it had prospered greatly, not on account of its cleverness and extraordinary medical skill, but because it had acted on certain practical rules which it recommended the author to be guided by in his profession.

The soul then goes on to enumerate those rules, which are as follows:—

I. "Powder your hair white, and place on the table of your study a human skull and various curious skeletons of the animal world. Those coming to you for medical advice will then say that your

hair must surely have turned white through overwork in your profession, and through the continual study that you are making in the domain of natural science. II. Fill your library with large-sized books that are richly bound in red and gold. No matter whether you ever open and read them or not, people will always have a high opinion of your great acquirements and wisdom. III. Sell and pawn everything for the sake of having a carriage of your own. Your patients may die right and left through the errors of your judgment, yet the fact of having your carriage standing and waiting outside their door will shield you from adverse criticism. IV. If called to a patient, you must pay less attention to him and to his malady than to those persons who are round about him. On leaving the sick-room, assume a grave face, and say that the case is a most critical one. Should the patient die, then you will have hinted at his death ; but if, on the other hand, he gets well again, his relations and friends will naturally attribute his recovery to your extraordinary medical skill and cleverness. V. Have as little as possible to do with the poor. For, as they will only send for you in hopeless and desperate cases, you will not gain any honour or reward by attending upon them. Be, therefore, exceedingly reserved to them, and keep them at a fair distance. Let them wait outside of your house, and those who pass by will look with amazement at the crowd waiting patiently to obtain your services. VI. Consider every medical practitioner as your natural enemy, and speak of him always with the utmost disparagement. If he happens to be young, then you must say that he has not had sufficient practice and experience, and can do no good ; and, if he is old, you must declare that either his eyesight is bad, or that he is a little crazy, and by no means to be trusted in important cases. VII. When you are asked to take part in a consultation with other physicians, then you would act wisely by always loudly protesting against the previous treatment of the case by your colleagues. Whatever the issue of that case may be, you will always be on the safe side."

In the same satire Erter speaks in by no means flattering terms of his old enemy, the Chief Rabbi of Lemberg, after having already alluded to him in similar terms in another satire, entitled: מאזני משקל. There he had censured that exceedingly pious Rabbi for having published a bulky commentary on the well-known code of Jewish laws, called *Shulchan Aruch,* under the title of ישועות יעקב, as being the production of his own pen. But Erter shows

that all which the would-be learned divine had contributed to the volume in question consisted merely in the title page, while the rest of it was in reality the work of other authors. And such a man pretended to be one of the chief representatives of ultra-orthodox Rabbinism, and to serve as a model of honesty and true piety! But, not satisfied with this revelation of the real worth of the literary contribution made by this ecclesiastic to Jewish lore and learning, Erter seizes the opportunity offered to him in the satire *Transmigration of Souls* to refer once more to the soul of the same spiritual chief who had once caused his temporary ruin. That very soul, says Erter, made to him a full confession of its origin, and declared that it had formerly belonged to a mean, dirty-looking and ill-tempered watchdog of the lowest type. Being too dangerous an animal to be allowed to move freely round about the premises of its owner, it had to be kept chained to its kennel. There it moved fiercely to and fro, watching all the time for any passers-by; and no sooner did it notice some one coming than it began to howl and to bark with all its power and strength, and aroused all the dogs in the neighbourhood to follow its example, the result being a tremendous and deafening noise. Woe to the person who came by chance within its reach without being provided with a powerful stick, or some other protective weapon. The watchdog would then attack him suddenly, and inflict upon him most serious wounds. But, on the other hand, the savage brute would, in spite of its pretended courage and fearlessness, retreat at once in a most cowardly manner, and crouch behind its kennel on noticing that the passer-by was well-armed, and thus able to defend himself against any attack on its part. Once upon a time that watchdog swallowed a big bone, in consequence of which it died an untimely death, but its soul continued its transmigration, and entered the body of a human being. When the latter grew up and became a man, he still retained the nature and all characteristics

peculiar to the canine species, or rather to a cowardly watchdog. Unfortunately that man thought fit to choose the Jewish ministry for his calling, and, as ill-luck would have it, succeeded ultimately in obtaining the cure or guardianship of the souls of his flock. Far from following the golden path of a true minister of the Jewish religion, who is in duty bound to promote peace and harmony in his community, he allowed himself to be guided by his canine instinct, and bullied everyone whom he happened to dislike. He thundered forth his anathemas right and left against those persons who wished to enter the portals of the temple of knowledge and wisdom, and induced his adherents to assist him in carrying out his supposed holy task. But, like his cowardly prototype, he only inflicted mortal wounds on the helpless and the unprotected ones in his community, while he did not dare to do any harm to the rich and influential members of his flock, who would not submit to his evil machinations. When this Rabbinical tyrant died, his soul, says Erter, migrated into the body of a fox, and thence it entered again in due course into the human frame of a future spiritual leader of the "Chassidim."

The Rebbe swindle, and the clever tricks of the whole fraternity of these performers of supernatural wonders form a most fruitful subject for Erter's satire, and the author recurs to them again and again in several places. In the satire under notice, Erter gets hold of the soul of such a Rebbe, and causes it to relate some of the adventures through which it had passed during its earthly career. Among other amusing stories, it also narrates an incident giving a description of a clever trick, by means of which its late owner, the Rebbe, had extricated himself from a most awkward position, and shows how he had deceived his devotees even at the time of his death.

"My own son," says the soul of the defunct Rebbe, "was once ill, and my wife, the mother of that child, came to me and asked me imploringly that I should offer prayers to God that the life of the dear

patient might be spared. 'Be not afraid,' I said to her; 'the son of God's favourite will *not* perish.' Next day, and also on the third day my wife implored me again in the name of heaven and earth that I should intercede on behalf of the poor sufferer whose illness had meanwhile taken a serious turn for the worse. But I answered, and said: 'Compose yourself, you silly little woman. I have already assured you that my son shall not die.' Later in the day my wife rushed into my room, bathed in tears, and exclaiming, 'Alas, the Lord has dealt very bitterly with me, and has taken from me my beloved child. What shall I do, and what shall my life be without that darling, the joy of my existence?'

"Now, it so happened that several of my devotees were present in my room when my wife was assured by me that her son would not die, and again when she actually informed me of the latter's death. I was thus placed in a most awkward predicament; but soon a happy thought occurred to me which helped me out of my embarrassment. I pretended to be quite amazed at the sad news, and exclaimed, 'What? am I to believe that my own son has died, and no information to that effect has reached me from heaven? No, never. You may do with my son whatever you like, but I cannot acknowledge his death till it has been officially notified to me from the world of spirits.' And when, in due course, the remains of my son were carried away to their last resting place, I did not tear my garments according to the general custom, nor did I follow the funeral procession, pretending all the time to be unaware of the fact of my son's death. But after the lapse of several days, when sitting one evening in the midst of my adherents and devotees, explaining to them some passages of the Bible in my own mysterious way, I suddenly began to cry, and to shed copious tears. 'Alas!' I exclaimed, 'now, just now, I begin to believe in my son's death, for a heavenly message has just informed me of that sorrowful event.' Soon after, I began earnestly to mourn over my son's demise, and all the people round about me looked on with amazement, and believed in me and in my holiness more firmly and more truly than they had ever done before."

The soul then goes on to relate the circumstances which caused its departure from the Rebbe's body.

"One evening," it says, "which happened to be the eve of the festival called 'Simchath Torah,' the Rebbe jumped and danced, according to his usual custom, round the 'Bimah' (reading platform) of his little synagogue, amidst the acclamations of his followers and devotees. As on many other previous occasions, he had then also drunk a quantity of intoxicating wine and

spirits, and felt exceedingly jolly and animated. In that pleasant mood he called out: 'Make room for all the saints of the Bible, who have just come here to rejoice with me on this joyful festival. Let me drink the health of Father Abraham and of the other patriarchs who accompany him.' And amidst his shouting and drinking he suddenly beheld a vision. It seemed to him that the walls of the Synagogue were turning round and round, and fearing lest he might fall to the ground, and his intoxicated state might become known to the bystanders, he quickly exclaimed: 'Come ye, my spiritual guests, Abraham, Isaac, and all the rest of you, and follow me to my own room. There we will have a sacred meeting, and discuss our secret affairs.' Saying which, he dragged himself into his own room, and locked and bolted the door behind him.

"When his devotees saw this, they said to each other: 'No one is like our Master, and no one can be compared to our holy Rebbe; he is a perfect saint, the holy of holies to the letter. How have they all left paradise, those great and exalted personages of the Bible, and have come to his place of worship in order to rejoice with him in his pleasant company. Nay, before our very eyes he has spoken to them as a man speaks to his friends, and amidst jumping and dancing he addressed them in a most familiar way, and loudly toasted their health. Now, they are all assembled in his room where they are discussing certain matters concerning ourselves, such as our final release from bondage, and our return to Zion by the help of the Messiah. Our Rebbe will also succeed in subduing the powers of the evil spirit, Samael, with all the other legions of the evil spirits; he will tread him under his feet, and will thus prevent him from doing us any harm.'

"While they were thus addressing each other, and their minds were occupied with the discussion of the Rebbe's doings, a boy rushed in breathlessly, and, amidst the greatest consternation, told all those present that he had just seen the body of the Rebbe lying lifeless on the ground behind the yard of his house. Thereupon all the Chassidim ran out, woe-stricken and terrified, and behold, there on a heap of refuse and mud close to the window of the Rebbe's room, lay his corpse, the dead body of the great saint. At the sight of which they all began weeping and lamenting, and said: 'Alas, on account of our own sins and transgressions of the Law that righteous man has died. The evil spirit Samael has overpowered him, and has thrown him through the window down into the yard.'

"But the real fact is—thus the soul concludes its narrative—that he had neither any quarrels with Satan nor any fight with the rest of the evil spirits. The evil spirit that caused his untimely death was of

quite a different nature. It was the spirit of wine and of other intoxicating drinks that had cut short his existence. For, after having on that eve partaken freely of some very strong potations, the Rebbe felt rather heavy and ill. He opened the window of his room, and leant out into the fresh air. No sooner had he done so than he lost his equilibrium, and fell headlong on the stones below. No immediate help being near at hand, he soon after expired."

There are several other passages in Erter's writings which treat most humorously of the same subject, but I shall only give one other short extract from one of his satires, having for its title, "Piety and Wisdom." After having pointed out in general terms the great advantages which the calling of a Rebbe offers, the author takes the young aspirant into his confidence, and describes to him its glorious prospects in the following words:—

"When," says he, "you are a 'holy man,' you will have a greater treasury than the king has, inasmuch as all the gold and silver belonging to your devotees who may live in your district will be yours. Any king or ruler of a land who wishes to levy taxes from his loyal subjects, is obliged to appoint and employ tax-collectors for that purpose, but your adherents will place all their money and wealth at your disposal without your solicitation. Should any of them become ill, money will be sent to you to offer prayers for their recovery. You keep, at any rate, those monetary presents, for if they die it will generally be assumed that their death was a punishment for their previous evil doings; but, if they are restored again to life and health, then that fact will be attributed to your effective prayers. The same will be the case when people come to you to obtain your advice in regard to business or matrimonial matters. If they are successful, and everything turns out to be according to their heart's desire, then it is you and your great Divine power that have effected all this; but, on the other hand, if your counsel and foresight have deceived them, they will have to ascribe their failure to their own follies and misdeeds."

Erter succeeded in infusing a new life and spirit into the Hebrew tongue, which is generally classed among the dead languages. To quote the words that he himself uses on behalf of the genius of the Hebrew language, "I am dead in the mouths of my children, but I live still in their hearts." Erter did more than merely

protest against the lack of originality in later Hebrew writers, for he himself supplied the deficiency that he had censured. But Erter was no mere writer of original Hebrew prose. He had the welfare of his Jewish countrymen constantly before his mind's eye, and it was with the object of improving their low and degraded mental and social state that he wrote those satires in which their shortcomings and follies were put forth and ridiculed. He spared no class; Rabbi and layman alike felt the sting of his scorn. He acted on the good old proverb, *Ridendo castigare mores,* and thereby really effected some good in the direction indicated. For some time he also edited, in co-operation with some other genial spirits, a Hebrew periodical under the name of *He-Chaluz* (החלוץ), which continued to appear after his death under the editorship of a friend. This journal was intended to promote enlightenment and learning among the Jews of Galicia, and gradually to win their sympathies for a project of Erter's, which was calculated to produce a vast amount of good to their children and future generations. He advocated the establishment of an agricultural colony in his own country, in which Jewish young men should be employed to till the ground and to farm tracts of lan on their own account. This healthy and useful occupation, he maintained, would help to decrease, to a great extent, the misery and poverty, which are, even now, the characteristic features of that particular part of the Austrian Empire. And, strange to say, that very plan which was drawn up so many years ago by Erter without being carried into effect, has most recently been taken up again in the capital of Austria by the most influential members of the Jewish community of that city through the instigation of Baron Hirsch. Let us hope that it will soon be realised, and that the seed sown by the author of the *Ha-Zophe* will bear excellent fruit, " rejoicing God and men."

One word more, and my object to pay homage to the genius of a man of extraordinary talents may be attained.

If there be any fault to be found with the little work just named it consists in this, that the essays or satires it contains are too few in number. But it may safely be said that, in spite of their deficiency in quantity, they will outlive many a more voluminous work. True humour is a rare possession, and Erter's style will never cease to be a source of delight to those who have a relish for keen satire and for an elegant and poetical employment of the language of the Bible.

JOSEPH CHOTZNER.

ABOUT PREACHING.

In his *Jüdische Homiletik*,[1] Dr. Maybaum has published a course of lectures which he delivered during the years 1888 and 1889 at the Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums in Berlin. An Appendix contains an extensive list—it does not pretend to be a bibliography—of printed sermons delivered by well-known preachers, chiefly in Germany and Austria-Hungary. The text and the subject are given in each case, and sometimes a sentence is quoted from the discourse which indicates its scope in a few words. This Appendix serves indirectly to show how rich German-speaking Jews are in homiletical literature. Its chief purpose, however, is to afford practical aid to preachers who are at a loss for a text or a subject, or both. Its usefulness is enhanced by its arrangement. The discourses are carefully classified, typical headings being "Bereshith," "Pesach," "Wedding Addresses," "Patriotic Addresses," and "Addresses on Various Occasions." In preparing the list Dr. Maybaum has had regard only for the intrinsic excellence of the sermons, not for the theological opinions of the preachers. In his choice of authors he shows himself sufficiently eclectic. The list includes names as diverse as Plessner and Salomon, Mannheimer and Geiger, Sachs and Ritter, N. M. Adler and Holdheim.[2]

---

[1] Jüdische Homiletik, nebst einer Auswahl von Texten und Themen, von Dr. S. Maybaum, Rabbiner der jüdischen Gemeinde und Docent an der Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums zu Berlin.—Berlin, 1890.

[2] There are two sermons by the late Chief Rabbi in the list, one, the inaugural sermon delivered on his assumption of the Chief Rabbinate of Oldenburg, on the 6th of June, 1829 : *Die Pflichten die der Seelsorger gegen seine Gemeinde, die Gemeinde gegen ihn zu erfüllen hat ;* the other, the sermon preached in the Great Synagogue, on the 8th July, 1845, on

In publishing the present work Dr. Maybaum justly claims to have supplied a want. Preachers like Mannheimer, Stein and Philippson have more or less formally discussed the subject of homiletics in the introductions to their volumes of sermons. Philippson, indeed, devoted to it some special articles in his *Allgemeine Zeitung*. It has also been dealt with by Jellinek in the *Ben Chananja*. But a systematic and comprehensive treatise on Jewish homiletics had still to be written, and Dr. Maybaum has written it. His qualifications for the task are unquestionable. He is one of the most effective preachers in Germany, and he owes his success in the pulpit to the careful study of the preacher's art, with which he has reinforced his learning and his oratorical gifts. Practical experience, he tells us, he has enjoyed in abundance; but he has also diligently sought for the best examples of pulpit eloquence, and made them his model. Another characteristic is his unmistakable earnestness — nay, enthusiasm. He takes his pulpit ministrations seriously. They are no vain thing for him; they are his life. There are men who make the pulpit a *dernier ressort*, who welcome it as an alternative to coals, that favourite haven of refuge from the storms of commercial disaster. There is a more numerous class— those who put only one hand to their work instead of both hands, who make sermons as though they were omelets, as rapidly as possible, and with a minimum expenditure of inventive power. They are the preachers who deliver machine-made discourses, devoid of originality, utterly lacking in soul. They have seen, to borrow Mr. Moncure Conway's striking image, no "pattern on the Mount" by which to work. Nor is it inspiration only that they need, but a recognition of the solemnity of their mission and the

---

his induction into the office of Chief Rabbi of the United Congregations of the British Empire: *Die Vorsätze und Hoffnungen, mit welchen der Geistliche in sein Amt tritt.* The latter discourse was subsequently translated into English by Barnard Van Oven. (See Dr. Friedländer's article in this Review for July, 1890).

necessity of throwing their whole selves into it. There are few preachers, I suspect, like Mannheimer—"a real man," Professor Graetz calls him—who used during the whole week to think about his Sabbath sermon, and read everything that he thought might help him in its preparation. In point of zeal, Dr. Maybaum deserves to rank with this old master of homiletics. Every line of his book reveals him as a preacher who is impressed with the responsibility of his office, and who has freely dedicated his powers to the discharge of its duties. If they help to imbue other ministers with a like earnestness these lectures will indeed have accomplished a great work.

Dr. Maybaum's fundamental postulate is that the sermon is an essential constituent of the synagogue service. The historical sketch with which he sets out establishes the truth of this proposition. Passing over the discourses of the Prophets, he looks for the origin of the Jewish sermon to the expositions which accompanied the public reading of the Scriptures in the days of Ezra. As time went on these expositions obtained a firmer place in the synagogue; and about the beginning of the Christian era, as Zunz proves, discourses on the portion of the day were delivered on every Sabbath and festival in Palestine, either during the service or independently of it. As the *raison d'être* of these discourses was the ignorance of the sacred tongue that prevailed among the people, they were naturally delivered in Aramaic, the vernacular. A similar practice obtained outside Palestine, so that in Alexandria, for example, the preacher or expounder spoke in Greek; nor did he scruple to adopt even the rhetorical methods of the Hellenic orators. Anxiety to popularise the pulpit, and to ensure its utterances being understood by the vulgar, led to the adoption of a curious device which continued in vogue throughout the Talmudic and Gaonistic periods. The sermon was delivered by the head of the Rabbinical school (the Chacham), or by his delegate (the Darshan), not aloud to the audience, but *sotto voce* to the Meturgeman or

Amora, who reproduced it in an attractive form for the benefit of the assembly. This arrangement originated in the increased importance that was attached both in Palestine and Babylonia to "dexterity in using the language of the people, to a pleasant voice, and to appropriate elocution —qualities which were not always possessed by the head of the school, whose chief activities lay in the domain of Halachah." Seeing how exceptional in these days is the union of the literary gift with elocutionary power, one could almost wish that a similar co-operative system were possible, by which the business of writing the sermon should be delegated to one man, and the duty of delivering it assigned to another.

The practice of delivering a discourse on every Sabbath and Festival, which was scrupulously adhered to in the Talmudic and Gaonistic ages, fell subsequently into desuetude. Homiletic skill came to be far less valued by the Rabbi than knowledge of the ritual law. If the discourses on the Sabbaths before the Great Festivals survived, it was because they exceptionally demanded acquaintance with the Halachah rather than the Agadah. In Spain and in Italy the Jewish pulpit held its ground during the Middle Ages; but in Germany, and, indeed, in every country where persecution was most severe, it virtually perished. Oppression destroyed the very inclination for sermons. In the mediæval reign of terror the Jew had no thought for anything but his own despair. "His ear," says Zunz, "was deaf to the voice of consolation, and hope for him was but a silent look heavenwards." The growth of the *piyut* also helped to drive out the sermon. The poet dispossessed the preacher, and as the service increased in duration with the dimensions of the Prayer-book, the sermon was crowded out owing to sheer want of time. The synagogues of Germany were not without preachers at the close of the seventeenth century; but their discourses were characterised by all the defects of the Polish style of preaching.

Pilpul then reigned supreme in the sphere of Talmudic study, and it annexed the homiletical domain likewise. The chief concern of the preacher was not to expound the Scriptural text, still less to exalt the moral and religious *status* of his hearers, but to clear up the difficulties of some recondite passage of the Midrash. Even when the discourse was founded on the Bible, its method was none the less vicious. The preacher, to quote Dr. Maybaum's graphic description, began by citing contradictory passages from the Sacred Volume, and then proceeded to emphasise the difficulties they presented by questions resting chiefly on false interpretations, and betraying ignorance of the simplest grammatical rules. In order to solve the problems thus manufactured the preacher would adduce new passages, which served in their turn as the starting-point for further questions, and thus a huge mass of bewildering ideas was piled up before the astonished gaze of the congregation. It was now the preacher's business to knock over these homiletical ninepins by means of a parable, which reflected his own narrow and distorted views of life. In this way all the original difficulties were satisfactorily disposed of to the great surprise of those few hearers who had not already been hopelessly lost in the twists and turns of the intellectual maze. The preacher's language—if the term is not wholly inapplicable to a nondescript jargon—was worthy of his matter and his method. It was not German, or Polish, or Hebrew, but an amalgam of all three, and of other tongues besides. It is hardly necessary to add that this peculiar style of preaching, which was common in the synagogues of Germany a century ago, is by no means defunct, and that illustrations of it are to be met with to-day in London. The Polish Maggid may be heard on any Sabbath in the Jewish quarter at the East-end—a glaring instance of the survival of the unfittest.

The Hercules who cleansed the Augean stable in Germany was, of course, Moses Mendelssohn. The pure language,

the orderly methods, and the exalted doctrine of the pulpit discourses which are delivered in the German synagogues to-day are largely the result of his efforts. In labouring for the diffusion of culture and enlightenment among his Jewish countrymen, Mendelssohn indirectly helped to regenerate their pulpit. But he contributed to its revival by the most direct means also. He wrote three sermons, one of them, in celebration of the Peace of Hubertsburg, being delivered in the Berlin Synagogue by Rabbi Aaron Moses.[1] In a comparatively short time, however, the preachers were able to deliver German discourses written by themselves. The first of these preachers was Joseph Wolf, of Dessau, Mendelssohn's birthplace. With Wolf in 1808[2] the German-Jewish pulpit may be said to have taken its rise. To the ultra-orthodox party in Germany sermons in the vernacular were an abomination. No one with any pretence to historical knowledge could have objected to a vernacular pulpit on the ground of its being heterodox, seeing that its roots extended down to the very earliest ages of Talmudic Judaism. But a German sermon was a novelty at the beginning of the century, and a novelty in the synagogue stood self-condemned. Vernacular preaching suffered, too, in being identified as the symbol of reform. Its advocates were men of enlightenment and profound religious feeling, for whom sermons in the language of their country constituted only one of the changes needed in order to restore to the service its old empire over the mind and the heart. Their programme bristled with

[1] This name has some interest for English Jews. The Rev. Dr. Adler, in his Lecture on "The Chief Rabbis of England" (*Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition Papers*, p. 278), suggests the identity of R. Aaron Moses with the Rabbi of the same name who is included in the הזכרת נשמות recited in most English synagogues on the chief Festivals. There is no record of his having filled any ecclesiastical office in this country; and the fact of his name appearing in the English Rabbinical roll must, Dr. Adler thinks, be accounted for on other grounds.

[2] Zunz gives 1812 as the date. He adds, that from 1809 to 1813, sermons in the vernacular were delivered every Sabbath in the School of the Consistory at Cassel (*Gottesdienstliche Vortraege*, p. 460).

innovations—revision of the Liturgy, a triennial cycle of readings from the Pentateuch, choral singing, and last, but unfortunately not least, the organ. Vernacular preaching had to pay in unmerited opposition for the bad company in which it found itself. The Government came to the aid of its opponents, and forcibly closed the synagogues in which it had been adopted. But even the arm of the law cannot indefinitely postpone the fulfilment of the higher law of religious progress. The demand for a German-Jewish pulpit was but the outward manifestation of powerful spiritual yearnings that were too imperious to remain long unsatisfied. Before many years had passed, vernacular preaching had not only ceased to be a shibboleth, but had become a bond of union.

And here I may not inappropriately shift the scene and transfer the action to our own country. The introduction of systematic preaching in the vernacular into our community took place but a few years after its initiation in the synagogues of Germany. Wolf, of Dessau, had his English counterpart in Bennaton, who delivered a series of discourses in the Liverpool Synagogue during the years 1824 and 1825.[1] The work he thus began was continued by his

---

[1] Marks' Sermons, Second Series, p. 291. See also "Nemo's" letter in the *Jewish Chronicle* for October 7th, 1870. The present writer has a MS. copy of one of Bennaton's Liverpool sermons, made at the time of its delivery, by the late Miss Sarah Hess, of that city. The first Jewish Sermon preached in English was the well-known discourse on "The Faith of Israel," by Rabbi Tobias Goodman. The date is the 2nd of May, 1819, and the place, Liverpool again. Cottonopolis was both the birth-place and the nursery of the Anglo-Jewish Pulpit. Goodman also preached at the Maiden Lane Synagogue on the death of George III. and the Princess Charlotte respectively. It may be desirable to add that the London Jews were not without accomplished preachers, even in the days anterior to the birth of the Anglo-Jewish Pulpit. R. Joshua da Silva, the first Ecclesiastical Chief of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation, who died in 1679, was an accomplished pulpit orator. Thirty-one of his discourses in Spanish, published in Amsterdam in 1688, are extant. Among his successors, Jacob Abendana and David Nieto may be mentioned as able preachers. In the sister congregation, R. David Tewele Schiff

brother, the Rev. Moses Nathan; and in 1836 the Rev. David Isaacs, on his removal from Bristol to Liverpool, inaugurated the practice of delivering weekly sermons. Six years later the West London Synagogue, in Burton Street, was consecrated, and regular pulpit instruction commenced in the metropolis by the Rev. D. W. Marks. In its early days, however, the Anglo-Jewish pulpit made but slow progress. Writing in 1832,[1] Zunz[2] thus refers to the position of Judaism in this country:—"Theology is still a century behindhand, and Jewish institutions are accordingly in a state of stagnation; but the elements of a better condition of things are not wanting. The sermons that are occasionally delivered do not appear to be characterised by any particular importance." Zunz's authority for this statement seems to have been David Levi's *Customs of the Jews*—a work which was already fifty years old.[3] The author of the *Vortraege* makes the necessary *amende* in a footnote. He learns that greater attention is now being paid by the preachers to both matter and diction. Nevertheless, in 1832 the Anglo-Jewish pulpit was not in a flourishing condition. It was still wrestling with infantile troubles. History repeated itself, and the vernacular sermon was assailed in England with the same acrimony that it had encountered in Germany. "Some whom I am now addressing," says Professor Marks,"[4] "must be old enough to remember the time when the proposal to intro-

---

"must," Dr. Adler thinks, "have been a preacher of great power" (*Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition Papers*, p. 286).

[1] The Rev. D. A. de Sola was then delivering occasional Sermons, in English, at the Bevis Marks Synagogue. His "Discourse on the Excellence of the Holy Law," preached on the 26th of March, 1831, was published, and was the first English sermon delivered in that place of worship.

[2] *Gottesdienstliche Vortraege*, p. 471.

[3] Levi's sole reference to the pulpit of his time is as follows: "The Sabbath which happens in those days is called the Sabbath of Repentance, the reason of which is this, the Rabbi of every synagogue on that day preaches a sermon to the Congregation, the subject of which is the Doctrine of Repentance." (*Customs of the Jews*, p. 86.)

[4] Sermons, Second Series, p. 290.

duce English sermons into the Jewish House of Worship was rejected by the congregational rulers as an attempt to foist on the synagogue the spurious offspring of a strange worship. חקת הגוים was the cry with which this attempt was met by hundreds of pious and well-meaning, though most unlettered men, who imagined that a vernacular pulpit was the creation of an anti-Jewish and post-biblical age."

Forty years had to elapse before the pulpit showed that it had taken firm root in the English synagogues. As late as 1862 there were only two ministers who preached regularly every Sabbath in London. They were the Rev. A. L. Green, at the Portland Street Synagogue, and the Rev. Professor Marks, at the Margaret Street Synagogue.[1] In that year the latter urged that a determined effort should be made "to place the pulpit of the English Synagogue on a footing of equality with that of our brethren of Continental Germany." This object, he thinks, can never be attained, "until every Anglo-Jewish congregation is addressed from the pulpit by an Englishman."[2] Utterances like these help us to realise the great strides which preaching has made in the community during the last twenty-five years. The vernacular pulpit is no longer an exotic: it is a thoroughly acclimatised institution. As against the two metropolitan preachers who spoke every Sabbath in 1862, there are now some half-a-dozen who preach either weekly or on alternate Sabbaths, besides others who regularly occupy the pulpit at slightly longer intervals. The number of preachers in the provinces has also largely increased.

If we would account for the impetus that has thus been given to English preaching during the last two decades, we must look to the intellectual movement which has taken place in the community during that period. But due credit must be given to Jews' College, which has provided English Jews with the ministers capable of satisfying their new-

[1] Sermons, Second Series, p. 296. [2] *Ibid*, p. 307.

born spiritual needs. The College has contributed to the development of Anglo-Jewish preaching in a two-fold manner. It has filled some pulpits, and by that very act revealed the emptiness of others. To go sermonless from year's end to year's end is no longer a circumstance that a congregation may acquiesce in—an affliction to be suffered gladly. It is felt as a reproach, a stigma; it is a sign of inferior caste. The feeling of self-dissatisfaction thus engendered is a healthy symptom, for it is a guarantee that, sooner or later, the grounds for it will be removed by the initiation of periodical preaching in the synagogue concerned. Jews' College has done much to breed and foster this noble discontent. Every minister it sends forth satisfies the need of one Congregation only to create the needs of many others. At one and the same time it satisfies and stimulates a hunger to hear the Word of God. No work could be nobler. In seeking for the causes of the increased vitality which is now manifested by the Anglo-Jewish pulpit, justice demands that we should give a prominent place among them to the influence of an institution which hitherto has not received its due meed of appreciation at the hands of the community.

Nevertheless, it is doubtful, to say the least, whether our pulpit has hitherto reached the degree of vigour displayed by the Jewish pulpit in Germany. The progress has not been so wide or so deep. Even when we have made the necessary allowance for difference of population, we shall find, I think, that the number of active pulpits in Germany is larger than it is here. To put it in another way, there are proportionately fewer synagogues in that country without preachers than there are in England. I believe, too, that a comparison based on the average quality of the sermons delivered would not be to our advantage. We have but a handful of really effective preachers, and only a very few of our pulpit discourses deserve to survive their birth, to be read and re-read. Our homiletical literature is of scanty proportions, and the materials for increasing it

are accumulating but slowly. It looks as though we should have to wait a long time for an English work corresponding to Kayserling's *Bibliothek Israelitischer Kanzelredner.* It may not unfairly be urged in our defence that our pulpit is of more recent growth than that of our German brethren; that our one training college for ministers has been heavily handicapped by many difficulties, not the least being the microscopic dimensions of the support extended to it by the Community it serves; and lastly, that from various causes, difference of intellectual *status* among them, English Jews at the outset offered a far less congenial soil than their German co-religionists to vernacular preaching. Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that the pious wish breathed by Professor Marks thirty years ago, though it has already come far nearer to fulfilment than even he could have expected, is a pious wish still. We are not yet abreast of Germany in matters relating to the pulpit. On the other hand, anything like an ideal state has not been reached in Germany itself. Dr. Maybaum hopes (in italics) that the time is not far distant when a service without a sermon on a Sabbath or Festival will be "unthinkable." But at present he can only hope. He also deplores the fact that so many German-Jewish pulpits are filled by foreigners.

It will readily be understood that Dr. Maybaum touches only incidentally on the history of the Jewish Pulpit. His main object is eminently practical. His book is chiefly intended for ministers, actual or potential, and his paramount concern is to induct them into the art and mystery of preaching, in both its literary and its elocutionary aspects. It is because his lectures have this aim that they possess the charm of novelty. A guide for Jewish preachers is a new thing indeed, but no one can pretend that it was not needed. Christian ministers of all denominations have their Preacher's Handbooks, their Homiletical Aids and Hints, and what not. Why should not their Jewish colleagues be equally well cared for? Not that these *vade*

mecums are all admirable. It is necessary to draw the line somewhere, and I would draw it at "Sermon Outlines," the exact analogue of the religious Catechism. The one encourages the idle preacher, the other the lazy teacher. Both put the brain in splints, and are the grave of originality. But this, by the way. The very fact that a work on the art of Jewish preaching should have been recognised as a want, eloquently testifies to the importance of the place which the sermon now occupies in the synagogue. It is evident that preaching in the vernacular has become a more wide-spread practice, and that the need of making the discourse conform to fixed rules, as regards both treatment and style, has grown more imperious. In fine the Jewish sermon is no longer an anachronism; it is thoroughly modern in form and spirit. It has freed itself from the undisciplined methods of Poland, and is now an orderly, coherent production. Nay, more than this; the preacher aims no longer at puzzling and astonishing his hearers. He has ceased to be an oratorical conjuror, a propounder of homiletical conundrums. His sole object is to teach and uplift.

This is the supreme function of the sermon, and Dr. Maybaum never permits his readers to lose sight of it. He sees, in the growing ignorance of Hebrew, the language of the Prayer-book, a potent argument for the utmost possible increase in the activity of the pulpit. Modern indifference to Sabbath observance still further establishes, in his opinion, the necessity of the sermon, which, if it does not succeed in preserving the sanctity of the entire day of rest, may secure at least a part of it for religious contemplation. The importance and the dignity of the pulpit receives from him the the fullest recognition. "For the congregation the preacher is the ideal Israelite, filled with the knowledge and the fear of the Lord. United to him in sympathy they rise to the contemplation of Divine truth and to the reception of the Revelation which flows unceasingly from the everlasting fount of the Sacred Scrip-

tures." It is an exalted keynote that is thus struck, and it gives the tone to the entire work. The pitch is never lowered. The Jewish preacher who ponders these inspiring lectures will acquire something even more precious than a clearer insight into the art of preaching. He will gain a deeper reverence for his mission. He will learn to be strong and of good courage when oppressed by the disparity between the severity of his work and the seeming meagreness of its results. The memory of these discourses will give him new heart, and impel him to put all his strength, all his soul, into his holy task. The book is a tonic.

But I must not forget that I am writing for the public, not for the preachers only. Thus I cannot follow my author into his many homiletical rules. Even the preacher will have to take some few of his recipes *cum grano*. Here and there they seem to me to have a spice of pedantry, quite *à l'Allemande*. Thus one of them affirms the necessity of founding the sermon on the *Sedrah* (Pentateuchal lesson) of the week; to treat even of the *Haphtorah* (Lesson from the Prophets) is a privilege only to be allowed to old-standing preachers who have earned it by much discoursing on the Pentateuch. Another rule prohibits irony in the pulpit, in direct opposition to the example of the great Masters of the Agadah. A third forbids the recital of the text previous to the sermon, thus putting the preacher into utterly superfluous leading-strings. A fourth pays far too much honour to the introduction. Now, of all the pitfalls prepared for the unwary feet of the preacher the introduction is the most deadly. The congregants know it to their cost; and that is why I dwell on it here. To give to the introduction what is meant for the sermon, to waste on the preface strength that ought to be reserved for the subject itself, with the result that the discourse grows long and weedy,—this is the neophyte's besetting sin. Knowing the almost incurable tendency of the beginner to unduly protract his

exordium, Dr. Maybaum suggests that it should not exceed a third of the length of the sermon proper, which still seems to me too liberal. In spite of my author's strong dislike for plunging *in medias res* (*mit der Thüre ins Haus fallen*), I would suggest that the student should be advised, as a general rule, to eschew introductions altogether. Perhaps the grudge against them is all the stronger in this country because the general staying-power of the congregation is inferior to what it is in Germany. Dr. Maybaum talks of half-an-hour on Sabbaths and three-quarters of an hour on Festivals, as the proper duration of the sermon. This is certainly more moderate than the Russian Maggid with his discourse that extends over half a day; but it is a larger allowance, nevertheless, than English congregations are accustomed to. In this country the preacher is cautioned never to exceed twenty minutes, and to the warning is appended a recommendation to lean to the side of mercy. This is a good working rule for English ministers, but a working-rule only. There are exceptional circumstances in which it becomes more honoured in the breach than the observance. A really powerful preacher may exceed these limits; it might almost be said that he may consider himself independent of limits. I have heard sermons lasting over an hour by the clock, and have realised Mr. Weller senior's ideal by wishing there had been more of it. On the other hand, I have listened to pulpit harangues of fifteen minutes' duration which have been just a quarter of an hour too long. For the average preacher the twenty minutes rule is a safe one; but it would be absurd to cavil at the man who takes five or ten minutes more, provided he succeeds in holding the attention of his audience to the end. The rule ought not to be forged into fetters. If, however, a preacher avails himself of this licence only to learn from some candid friend that his hearers have been bored, he will not only be wise, but bound, to heed the note of warning. The *raison d'être* of a sermon is not the gratification of the

speaker, but the edification of the congregants; and as soon as the latter begin to think of the clock, edification is out of the question.

And here I should like to say a word, in the interests of both sides, on the necessity of making sermons, even short ones, interesting; for brevity is no excuse for dulness, though a never-to-be-forgotten speaker once urged the plea. It is certain that sermons are not as popular as they ought to be; and the *équivoque* is true in both senses. The discovery that the threatened discourse is not to come off after all, too often sends an almost audible sigh of relief circulating round the synagogue. If the sermon is tiresome, the fault of necessity lies with the preacher, whose prime business it is to interest his hearers by telling them something that stirs their emotions or calls their thinking powers into play. The old Talmudic doctor who once startled his drowsy audience with the wonderful story of the woman who brought forth 600,000 children at a birth, did not scruple to be sensational in order to be effective.[1] Only a R. Jehudah in olden times and a Spurgeon in these days might venture on such expedients. But the lesson is suggested that it is the paramount duty of a preacher not to be dull. It is a duty, too, which congregants would like to see more often carried out. People are beginning to grumble about the platitudes of the pulpit, and the complaint is not altogether groundless. The charge, indeed, betokens intellectual progress, for to detect a real live platitude is a mark of thoughtfulness. Perhaps that is the reason why the task of detection is so congenial. It is a cheap way of proving one's mental superiority. Nevertheless, what is certain is that we live in an age when fresh presentments of truth are urgently demanded. The preacher's supply of ideas must be constantly renewed; it will not do for him to bring out

[1] He explained that he was alluding to Jochebed, whose son, Moses, was worth all the sixty myriads of Israel. Midrash Rabbah on Canticles 16*a*.

his old stock week after week, ringing the changes with something like mathematical regularity. Nor, to be interesting, need he be heterodox. He can stand firmly in the old paths, and yet charm his flock with his novel methods of illustrating and applying ancient truths. Neither ought he to fall into the error of preaching narrow sermons—narrow in the sense of appealing to only one section of his flock. Most congregations are heterogeneous; they comprise the educated and the untutored, the thoughtful and the unthinking. To each class ought the minister to speak in turn. He must have a quick sympathy for the most diverse wants. To do nothing but aim at awakening the slumbering religious sentiments of the indifferent would be unjust to the earnest believer, who needs exhortation and encouragement. But the latter must not monopolise all the solicitude of the pulpit; there are souls to be won as well as to be kept. A preacher can make no greater mistake than to take thought only for those whose faith is as fixed as his own. He must put himself intellectually in the place of the doubter, and feed him with "the food convenient for him." It is only by such broad preaching—broad in the best sense—that the pulpit can escape that accusation of dulness which is the exact equivalent of failure. Again, if the minister is wise, he will avoid preaching old-fashioned sermons—sermons which, in point of style and treatment, as well as choice of subject, are out of touch with the age. When I was still a novice in the pulpit, an outspoken critic among my congregants—not by any means a man of "reform" views—would sometimes tell me that I did not preach "sermons for the times." If he had spoken to me in Sanskrit he could not have been more unintelligible. But I have since found out what he meant, and the lesson he tried to teach me is one that a minister cannot learn too quickly. The modern sermon must preach Judaism, but by modern methods. If it is an anachronism, intellectual or artistic, it repels; whereas a pulpit discourse must attract. A

preacher has not discharged himself of his responsibility when he has delivered a sermon which would have satisfied him if he had listened to it, but which, to the majority of his congregants, is sound and fury, signifying nothing. He has to bring religious truth home to the conscience of his hearers, and he must take care to select the means most calculated to effect this supreme object.

Thus, we are face to face with the qualities that go to make the successful preacher. Knowledge of Judaism—its meaning and its history—he must possess, of course, as the very first element in his equipment. But equally essential is knowledge of the world and of men. Dr. Maybaum rightly lays stress upon this point. "Despite the proportions," he says, "to which the study of Jewish theology has attained in these days, and the application it demands from the student, the unfledged minister must be no mere recluse, if the great sphere of his future activity is not to remain for him an unknown land. The practical theologian who has to influence men's lives must learn first to know life." This is profoundly true. Unless the sermon is to be more or less sterile, it must spring from an intimate acquaintance with human nature, its weaknesses and its strength, its needs and its hopes. A preacher who is a man of the world, but devoid of culture, will probably be a pulpit-thumper. If, on the contrary, he is a bookworm, he will deliver not a sermon but an essay. He will preach in the air. I am not quite sure that pulpit-thumping is not to be preferred to essay reading. It does stand a chance of rousing the heart's echoes. At any rate, a man who knows little about Judaism and less about men, can never make a good preacher. The ideal combination of the ancients—that of תלמוד תורה, with דרך ארץ, is as desirable as ever. It must become more general if the quality of the modern sermon is to undergo the requisite improvement.

Some arrangement is urgently needed which will bring our Jews' College students into closer contact with the world, without interfering with their studies. Their life-

work will consist in preaching to other hearts and minds. How are they to accomplish this task if those hearts and minds are a sealed book? How can the spiritual physician heal the soul of whose physiology he is utterly ignorant? It may be said that the necessary knowledge will come with experience; but while the minister's experience grows the congregation starves—spiritually. The youthful preacher has to gain his worldly wisdom at the expense of his hearers, who are compelled to listen to admonitions how to live which lack the actuality that a ripe knowledge of life alone can give them. That a congregation must be more or less a *corpus vile* is inevitable; for the minister is always learning, even though he be a veteran. But steps ought to be taken to reduce the subject's sufferings to a *minimum*. Before a man is trusted with the cure of souls he ought to have added some knowledge of the world to his academic acquirements. But of this more anon.

Even ministers who have emerged from the probationary state may well apply themselves more diligently to the study of contemporary life. Jellinek who, I suppose, is the most eminent of living Jewish preachers, has long been accustomed—so Dr. Maybaum hears—to set down in his note-book the various suggestive circumstances that occur in his daily experience, with the view of utilising them in his sermons. As a rule, ministers are content, if they have a common-place book, to fill it with passages they meet with in their reading. And yet a study of the living world will furnish the preacher with by far the most valuable materials he can possibly obtain. He has to play on that most difficult of all instruments, the human heart. Observation of men and affairs will help him to understand its character and its compass, to master the secret of its melody, to awake its diverse tones at his will. But it is possible to mix with the world, and yet to be none the wiser.

There are not a few who, though they diligently

ponder human nature, have yet to confess that they do not understand it. Therefore the preacher needs not only opportunities for studying human life and character, but the very power to observe, and the ability, moreover, rightly to interpret, moral phenomena. He needs eyes to see and ears to hear—in a word, insight. But this is a faculty which no acquaintance with homiletical rules can give—one which experience may develop, but cannot create *ex nihilo*. It is a veritable gift of God. Thus the true preacher is born, not made. A minister may be a walking encyclopædia, an elegant writer, a fluent speaker. He may be all three combined. But unless he is a man as well, endowed with a fine sympathy, not merely for the sufferings, but for the needs, the feelings, the ideas of his kind, gifted with a second sight that pierces the mystery of other hearts and other lives, he will not be a preacher. If this *clairvoyance* were more general, effective sermons would not be so few and far between. As for the solecisms that set the hearers' teeth on edge the preacher's innate discernment would make them impossible. Bad taste and want of tact in the pulpit, as elsewhere, are the symptoms of an unsympathetic nature. To say the right thing at the right time is one of the preacher's most elementary obligations. But it is an obligation which is too often disregarded, because the insight that is needed to distinguish the seasonable thing from the unseasonable is not always present. The want of this sixth sense is often attended by *bizarre* results. Dr. Maybaum cites the instance of the Rabbi who, at a wedding, improved the occasion by gravely reminding the bride of her duty to wear a wig. But we can all furnish examples from our own experience.

It is clear that the preacher's office is one that demands a remarkable combination of qualities. It requires an almost poetic insight, the power of literary and oratorical expression, and deep enthusiasm—all, of course, in addition to theological scholarship. Enthusiasm it requires,

indeed, in common with every other vocation, but in a greater degree. For it is the essential condition of a preacher's success that he should be able to inspire others, and this is manifestly impossible unless he is himself inspired. The minister, then, must possess the various gifts and attainments of the scholar, the poet, the man of the world, the man of letters, and the public speaker. Crown all this by saying that he must needs be a thoroughly good man—which is absolutely essential for eminence in no other vocation—and the exacting character of his office stands out in bold relief. No wonder that there are so few good preachers, Jewish or otherwise. But is it not true that the system prevailing in our community seems to have been expressly contrived to prevent us from obtaining our proper share of the number? We appear to have made up our minds that the ideal preacher, so rich and rare are the ingredients needed to produce him, is a wholly impossible being, and that therefore we must needs be content with mediocrity in the pulpit, and be thankful it is not something worse. Are we doing our best to attract the most talented men into the profession? Or are we not rather doing our best, or worst, not only to keep them out of it, but to drive those out who are already in? The Anglo-Jewish pulpit has made great strides during the past five-and-twenty years, but the progress has been achieved in the teeth of the most unfavourable conditions. To put the matter bluntly, the preacher is shamefully underpaid. He is expected to be a man of ability and high character; he is weighted with the heaviest responsibilities; yet in point of emolument his place is somewhere between a carpenter and a confidential clerk. The Anglo-Jewish ministry has two or three prizes, which, of course, only two or three men can enjoy at the same time; but even these plums of the profession are not for a moment to be compared in value with the average income of a fairly successful solicitor, or engineer, or medical practitioner. When they are contrasted with the earnings of distin-

guished members of the learned professions, the disparity becomes more glaring still. The consequences are only too patent. Young men of ability, who have some pecuniary resources, decline to study for a vocation whose worldly advantages are in inverse proportion to its responsibilities. Those who do study for it are chiefly youths of slender means, whose very poverty is an *à priori* disability, inasmuch as it is seldom found in combination with the good breeding which is so desirable in a minister. The scarcity of the raw material tends, moreover, to keep down the intellectual standard. Men of no particular aptitude for the ministry pass muster owing to the lack of more promising recruits. But this is not all the evil. The dearth of candidates throws open the profession to men who have not even training to recommend them. Besides being devoid of natural aptitude for the vocation, they lack theological knowledge. They have taken to preaching because they have failed at everything else. Into such hands does the office sometimes fall, which should be administered by the very elect of the earth !

Nor does the difficulty lie only in getting good men, but in retaining them. If the ministry is a *pis aller* with some, it is merely a *pied à terre* with others. Owing to the inadequacy of his remuneration, the minister is often tempted to abandon his profession for a more lucrative calling; and as the temptation naturally presents itself only to the most capable, the pulpit is always in danger of losing the men it can spare least. Hardly has a minister gained the experience that alone can fertilise his learning and his endowments, before, at the bidding of self-interest, he may be impelled to throw all the work of years to the winds, and strike out for himself a totally different career. Nor ought he to be very severely blamed. That enthusiasm for his sacred mission ought to save him from such disloyalty is a beautiful theory. But when poverty comes in at the door enthusiasm is apt to fly out at the window, and it is hard for a man to go on living for an idea, and almost living on

it, too, when his children's needs are tugging at his heart-strings. The pastor has too often a redoubtable antagonist in the father. *Le père de famille est capable de tout*—even of exchanging a pittance for a competence. No, we must see that we saddle the right shoulders with the blame. It must be put, not on the renegade, but on the community, which looks on and tacitly acquiesces in his defection. No one seems to realise the harm it inflicts on the pulpit and on the spiritual interests that the pulpit has to promote. "The Rev. Mr. So-and-so, one of our most able and zealous pastors, has been appointed to the post of Controller of the Sealing-wax Department at H.M. Stationery Office. We congratulate both the rev. gentleman and the community." So runs the journalistic formula. Not a word about the serious injury that has been done to our corporate religious life by the unnatural translation; not a word of condolence with the bereaved pulpit.

The remedy is obvious, of course; but something else is needed besides increasing stipends. The ministry must no longer be the appanage of a class. It must offer a career to talents, whatever their social environment. "The Torah," it was declared long ago, "goeth forth from the poor"; but even in the days that gave birth to the saying, the lips of the affluent were also wont to teach the Divine doctrine. The Rabbis and preachers of the Talmud were drawn from every social grade, not excluding the highest. We may be sure that the discourses of R. Jehudah the Prince were no less, but all the more, effective because of the grandeur of his worldly position.[1] To-day especially must the old system be revived. Let our gilded youth be

---

[1] Highly significant is the beautiful passage in *Ketuboth* 104*a*: When "Rabbi" was at the point of death, he lifted his hands towards Heaven and prayed: "Sovereign of the Universe, Thou knowest that I have laboured with both hands for the Torah, yet the breadth of my little finger is greater than the wordly pleasure I have enjoyed through life. May peace be with me where I go." Thereupon a Voice was heard proclaiming "Let him enter into peace."

taught to regard the preacher's office as one even more worthy of their abilities and their enthusiasm than the Bar, or Medicine, or the Stock Exchange, and the pulpit will gain an influence which cannot fail to leave a deep impress for good on the religious life of the community. The Church provides an honoured calling for members of the best Christian families. Why should not the same state of things prevail among us? Why should the Jew consider it beneath his dignity to be a minister of God?

But the pulpit needs the best minds we have, and they are not to be found exclusively among the wealthy. There are many able men who might be secured for it if it only promised freedom from anxiety as to mere ways and means. That a minister should know nothing of the *res angusta domi* is but just, seeing how heavy are the cares that are inseparable from his office. The pulpit, then, must be far more liberally endowed than it is at present. The community must face the necessity of largely increasing the emoluments of its preachers. Those congregations that can bear the burden must tax themselves for this purpose. Those that are not able to bear it must get others to tax themselves in their stead. The Provincial Ministers' Fund has done good work already; but its usefulness might be very greatly extended if its resources were larger. Certainly the principle on which the Fund is based ought to receive much wider application. There can be no question whatever that it is just the little country congregations, consisting, perhaps, of a handful of Polish tailors or glaziers, that most require pastors of ability to guide them. As matters are arranged at present, either the least competent ministers are thought good enough for them, or, worse still, they are left practically without spiritual direction, unless we are to dignify the ministrations of the *Shochet* with that title. No one is responsible for this state of things but the community. Those who pay the piper have the right to call the tune; but those who pay him badly have only to thank their own

niggardly and short-sighted policy if the music is ugly. It may seem a regrettable anomaly that even the work of religion cannot prosper without the aid of hard cash; but no amount of lamentation will get rid of the fact. Those who think that there ought to be sufficient earnestness and zeal among English Jews to make preaching a work of love, have a fine opportunity of bringing about that ideal state by initiating it themselves. "Let the assassins commence," was the retort with which the proposal to abolish capital punishment was once met. Similarly, those who hold that ministers should be free from sordid motives, can inaugurate the ideal clerical order by enrolling either themselves or their sons. But, pending the conclusion of this eminently fair arrangement, it would be well, so as not to lose time, to make sure of getting able men for our pulpits by the reliable, if paradoxical, expedient of offering them adequate pay.

Yet another criticism, and I have done. Our ministers, as a rule, take upon themselves the full burden of their responsibilities too early. It is at once ludicrous and pathetic to find Dr. Maybaum laying down the rule that before the pastor enters upon the discharge of his duties he ought to have passed the crisis in his religious development. In other words, he ought to have arrived at something like fixity of conviction as regards the main principles of his creed. So he ought. But how is he to do it under a system which sends men direct from the class-room to the pulpit, and which sets them to minister to others before they understand themselves? What sort of influence can the pulpit wield, what degree of respect can it command, when it becomes the throne of inexperience? What but disaster can happen when an army is led by cadets? Our system urgently needs alteration. Only experienced pastors should be appointed to incumbencies, however small the congregations concerned. The inexperienced men must be content to serve as curates. It will be time enough to promote them when they have won their spurs, when

they have gained some practical acquaintance with life, some insight into their own religious condition. Seeing that the young minister has so much to learn, how can the task of teaching men and women be safely entrusted to his unaided efforts? His congregation nominally submit themselves to his guidance, though some of them with their wide knowledge of the world, and their mature religious views, are well fitted to be his instructors. Is it not clear that his inexperience is sufficient to discount the value of his homilies? that his exhortations must offer to those that hear them food for criticism rather than the bread of life? Those who tolerate such a system forget that the pulpit owes most of its influence to the personality of the preacher, and that if its potency, as a religious force, is to increase, the congregation must feel more often that they are listening, not merely to a speaker, but to a man.

It may be said that I have throughout invested the pulpit with an exaggerated importance, and that preaching is by no means the whole duty of a minister. But it is unquestionably the chief part of it. The sermon is the sole point of spiritual contact between the preacher and the majority of his congregation. Outside the synagogue they part company, and the minister's opportunities for exercising a religious influence over his flock are practically restricted to those rare occasions when the stream of some individual life has reached a turning-point. The Jewish householder tolerates no "director," nor are our elderly spinsters in the habit of inviting their pastor home with a view to enjoying tea and edification simultaneously. Whether it would be better for our religious interests if we were able to borrow such customs from our neighbours is a problem I have never been able to solve. Nor do I forget or underrate the minister's "parish" work—his labours among the poor, his instruction of the young, his visitation of the sick. But are not the qualities needed for such ministrations the very essentials of success in the pulpit? We need only to look

around us in order to see that our most zealous ministers are our most capable preachers. It must necessarily be so. The most effective pulpit orator is he who throws his whole heart into his work—he whose discourses derive their chief power from his character and his life. The pulpit has its charlatans, no doubt, like every other profession; but they are soon found out. The Rev. Charles Honeyman flourishes but for a day. To be a truly successful preacher, trusted and honoured—a preacher whose words find hearts already open to receive and to cherish them—a man must be conspicuous for enthusiasm and goodness. But possessed of these endowments he cannot fail to shine in every department of his pastoral work. Increased efficiency in the pulpit, and a high standard of ministerial effort, are but synonyms. To aim at the one is to pave the way for the other.

But in truth it is hardly possible to lay undue emphasis on the necessity of a vigorous pulpit in an age whose characteristic note is materialism in both senses of the word. Preaching, powerful and convincing, that appeals both to the heart and the intellect, is the one sure means of vitalising the religious sentiment, the most effective ally of the soul that is struggling to hold its own. In the pulpit the living voice and the personal example of the preacher combine with the solemn associations of the House of Prayer to enforce the message of the inspired Word, to intensify the call of conscience. Faith and duty teach their lessons under the most impressive conditions.

> "God is not dumb, that He should speak no more;
> If thou hast wanderings in the wilderness,
> And find'st not Sinai, 'tis thy soul is poor."

But for many a wanderer the pulpit may haply be the Guide and the Lawgiver. Again, the hesitating feet are led to the Mount of God; the Divine reveals itself anew, and the responsive cry of obedience rings out as in the days of yore.

MORRIS JOSEPH.

CRITICAL NOTICE.

After the Exile: a Hundred Years of Jewish History and Literature. By P. Hay Hunter, Minister of Yester. (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1890.)

After the Exile is a delightful book; it can hardly be recommended too warmly. Indeed, so far as I know, Mr. Hunter's volumes, in their own way and for their own period, are quite unique. For here, for the first time in English, we have a narrative of a hundred most important years of Biblical history, in which the results of criticism are presented skilfully, popularly, and, above all, without any *arrière pensée* or polemical motive. Mr. Hunter does not aggressively combat traditional views; he does not seek to overwhelm or startle the reader by an elaborate display of erudition or unorthodoxy. One can imagine a person adverse to (because ignorant of) Biblical criticism, who had happened to take up *After the Exile*, reading it through with interest and pleasure from start to finish, and remaining happily unconscious that he had perused a book which, without the critics, could never have been composed. Nevertheless, the critical results are scarcely ever divested of their proper emphasis and importance.

The hundred years of Mr. Hunter's narrative comprise the period from the return of the Jews from Babylon, in 537, to the second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, about 432 B.C. The chief source and authority for that period are the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Now it would scarcely be too much to assume that, of all the books of the Hebrew Scriptures, these two are commonly adjudged to be the dullest, and are read the least. Yet it is mainly out of this material that Dr. Hunter has constructed a narrative that is never dull, and of which the interest rises frequently to fascination. A Jewish reviewer cannot help reflecting with sadness and regret upon the utter impossibility of such a book as this issuing from the pen of a *Jewish* minister. Will the heavy bondage to traditional opinions, which, among some other reasons, would effectually prevent its appearance, never come to an end?

That *After the Exile* is so interesting and valuable is due to a happy combination in Mr. Hunter of several qualities necessary

to a Biblical historian. First and foremost our author is a thorough student, well acquainted with the literature of his subject, and able to make use of it with independence and discretion. Only very rarely are there traces of what one might call a pre-critical period. Thus, a disciple of Graf would now scarcely speak of "the office and title of the High Priest" as having "come down from a remote antiquity" (Vol. I., pp. 251-55). Criticism would find something at which to demur in the statement that the Jewish people, after the captivity, *found their way back* to their "*primitive belief* in the divine unity," or that "the masses" in the generations immediately preceding the exile "had ceased to be worshippers of one God" (Vol. I., pp. 78-80). The *seventh* new moon was not a specially "popular holiday" (Vol. II., p. 192), and this error is perhaps the cause of the little slip in the first foot-note upon p. 193.

There will, of course, remain for long—perhaps for ever—differences of opinion between critics respecting many a detail in the history of the fifth century B.C.; but I am inclined to think that in a few instances Mr. Hunter may find upon reconsideration that the more preponderating weight of evidence is against his own views. Thus, in the early chapters of Vol. I., several Psalms (*e.g.* xliv., lxix., lxxix.) are used to illustrate the condition of the Jews in Babylon, which more probably belong to a later period. In spite of Ewald, it seems to me very doubtful whether Ps. lxxxix. and cxxxii. can refer to Zerubbabel (Vol. I., p. 226); and, again, Prof. Cheyne will, I fancy, be able to show that a Maccabean date for Ps. lxxxiii. is more likely than the reign of Artaxerxes (Vol. II., p. 90). Stade, in his *Geschichte*, and Kuenen, in his *Onderzoek*, have brought cogent arguments to prove that the chronicler's account in Ezra iii. of an attempted rebuilding of the Temple some sixteen years before Haggai's first prophecy is very improbable. If their views meet with general acceptance, Vol. I., pp. 100-119, will need revision in another edition. In the excellent account of the early Sopherim, in Vol. I., pp. 272-289, it should have been more definitely indicated that the Torah which the priest-scribes studied was to a great extent their own compilation. In Vol. II. this fact comes out more clearly. But surely it is anything but "probable in the highest degree" that the scroll which Ezra read out to the assembled people upon the first of Tishri, 444, "was the Pentateuch in substantially its present form" (Vol. II., p. 225). The original "Priestly Code" had been, it is true, already enlarged by the inclusion of the "Law of Holiness"; but it is unlikely that the amalgamation of these documents with the "Jehovistic" and Deuteronomic elements of the Pentateuch had already taken place. In a note Mr. Hunter argues that the article in the covenant "as to mixed marriages (Neh. x. 30) has no basis at all

in the Priestly Code. It rests on Ex. xxxiv. 12-16, and on the Deuteronomic Code (vii. 2, 3)" (Vol. II., p. 225, n. 1). But the spirit of the Priestly Code is certainly against any dimming of Israel's sanctity by contact with the heathen. (*Cf.* such passages as Gen. xxvi. 35 ; Num. xxv., xxxiii. 50-56.)

Mr. Hunter's mastery of his authorities would not have sufficed to produce *After the Exile.* Rarer gifts than those of patient reading and discriminating acquisition are necessary for an historian. And dramatic power, happy expression, ready insight and vivid imagination, are perhaps no where more urgently required than in an history of the hundred years after the Babylonian exile. Frequently a casual verse in Ezra or Nehemiah must be picturesquely expanded into a page before its whole meaning can be brought fully home to the reader's mind. Or, again, the early growth of a new tendency, which finds expression later on in mighty deeds, must be represented by an ingenious mixture of inference and combination. For a single example of either procedure, I may refer to the first chapter of Vol. II., *Ezra at Jerusalem*, and to the thirteenth of Vol. I., *The House of Zadok.* Jewish history in these hundred years can frequently receive light and explanation from the contemporary history of the Persian Empire, although the two seem often enough to have very few points of contact. Mr. Hunter is, however, careful never to neglect the setting of his picture in the framework of universal history. Compare for instance the use he makes of the campaign of Cambyses against Egypt (Vol. I., p. 128). It is but very seldom that our author's gifts of historic imagination and forcible expression lead him a little astray. Thus the antithesis, "Into the exile there went a generation of heretics, out of it there came a generation of devotees" (Vol. I., p. 80), is too pointed in either term. The universalist and spiritual reasons (Vol. I., pp. 45-49), which, according to Mr. Hunter, led some among the exiles to take no personal part in the return, are ingenious but improbable. It must be remembered that the particularist movement of Ezra and his school springs from Babylon. The reasons why so many keen patriots or keen religionists must have remained behind in Babylon are obscure ; but compare Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. II., p. 107. Clever as the reasoning is which leads up to the statement, it is hardly safe to say that "Ezra, when he promulgated the Torah, did so in compliance with a popular demand" (Vol. II., p. 186). A very excellent use is made of the prophecies of Joel, but it is, to my mind, very doubtful whether the "internal evidence" that Joel wrote during the reign of Xerxes is as "strong" as Mr. Hunter supposes (Vol. II., p. 239). Kuenen (*Onderzoek*, II., p. 342) is, I think, more probably right in postponing his date to some indefinite period after Ezra. Still, to give history its necessary life

and colour, one must assign the literature of one's subject to *definite* periods, and though it is not so likely that Jonah, like Ruth, was written during or just after the dissolution of the mixed marriages, the admirable account of that strange little book in the third chapter of his second volume makes the reader very glad that Mr. Hunter, at all events, has made up his mind upon the matter. For it *might* have been written then, even though it *was* written later, and its use is, therefore, quite legitimate to paint with vividness and power the opposing religious currents of the time. Nor must the caution in our author's preface be forgotten : "I have purposely avoided touching on questions of Biblical criticism in this book, confining myself to the historical form. Hence an appearance, which is only an appearance, of presenting disputed points, as if they were undisputed."

One reason which makes Mr. Hunter's narrative of this particular period so specially pleasant to the Jewish reader is its perfect objectivity. We are not bothered by those interminable and monotonous allusions to the moral evils and inadequacies of particularism and legalism with which almost every Christian narrator of this portion of Old Testament history thinks it necessary to interlard his pages. Of course, there is a page or two of moralising at the end, but it is gently and impartially done, and it is obvious that Jew and Christian must, for a long while yet, have somewhat different morals to draw from the events of *After the Exile*. But full justice is done by Mr. Hunter to the aims and motives of Ezra and his school. Unsympathetic as their views are to many of us now, it is carefully pointed out how they were partially justified by the circumstances of the time. With one possible exception (Vol. II., p. 41) Mr. Hunter never applies misleading modern catchwords and categories to the thoughts and feelings of that distant and different age. His book can be read with equal profit and pleasure by Christian and by Jew ; it is to be hoped that it may be succeeded before very long by a companion volume upon another period of Old Testament history. It should be added, in conclusion, that the book is attractively got up, and is printed in large, clear type upon good paper. The omission of an index will, I trust, be supplied in an early second edition.

C. G. Montefiore.

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

The Genesis of the so-called Septuagint, the First Greek Version of the Pentateuch.

Two opposite views have obtained currency as to the circumstances under which the Pentateuch was rendered into Greek. The theory generally adopted traces the origin of the Translation to the desire evinced by a Greek ruler of Egypt—one of the Ptolemies—to obtain for the Royal Library a copy in Greek of the Jewish Scriptures. This view rests on a narrative of one Aristeas, which has a spurious colour.

The author of Aristeas's Letter lived, as I have elsewhere proved, at the beginning of the first Christian century, under the Emperor Tiberius. His tale of a translation, done at the request of one of the Ptolemies, is embellished with legends and disfigured by anachronisms. Nevertheless, the kernel of his narrative is supposed to be historical, because it is supported by a tradition of the Alexandrian community. A Judæo-Alexandrian philosopher also relates, independently of Aristeas, that the day when the Translation was completed and solemnly handed to the king was commemorated by an annual festival in Alexandria. A Talmudical tradition also names a Ptolemy as the instigator of the Greek version of the Torah.

Others again deny that the version owed anything to royal favour, and ascribe its origin, instead, to the need the Alexandrian community, who were ignorant of Hebrew, felt to hear the Word of God in the vernacular. At the public reading of the Law it was customary to have the text rendered into the language of the people, verse by verse, by a competent interpreter. Thus the Translation was gradually evolved as the production of one or several Meturgemanim (interpreters).

This hypothesis derives support from the circumstance that we meet occasionally in the extant version with Hebrew terms, such as Pascha, Sabbath, etc., which would have sounded unfamiliar to a Greek king, and would not have been left untranslated in a version prepared for his use.

If, on the one hand, this argument is not absolutely decisive, neither, on the other, has royal interest in this work been proved by conclusive evidence. Scientifically, therefore, the Genesis of the Pentateuch remains undetermined. Its style and literary character favours either theory equally. For the LXX. is admittedly on the whole a literal version. Every Hebrew word is rendered by its Greek equivalent. What deviations, additions, omissions, or other alterations do occur, form the subject of textual criticism or are obvious euphemistic turns of phrases, which, in their literal sense, were deemed derogatory to God. The literary colouring of the Version does not help us to solve the question.

An attempt has been made to prove that the LXX. was specially prepared for a king of the Lagide dynasty, from a rendering, pointed out in the Talmud, which, at first sight, does seem strange. In the list of animals, forbidden for food, אַרְנֶבֶת is not translated λαγώς but δασυπούς. The Talmudic explanation has been adopted that the former term was purposely omitted, so as not to offend the first Macedonian King of Egypt, the son of Lagos. He would, naturally, feel affronted if he read his surname in the category of unclean beasts. Or, perhaps, as he claimed to be a natural son of Alexander the Great, the offence would have consisted in reminding him of his real father whom he wished to forget. At all events, whatever the precise *petra scandali* might have been, once admit that *dasypus* was used out of respect for a Lagide, and it naturally follows that the Translation was prepared for a sovereign of that family.

This reasoning fails, however, to stand the test of criticism. For *dasypus* and *lagos* are employed by Greek writers indifferently, with precisely the same connotation. The translator need not, therefore, have avoided the one term and selected the other out of deference to his sovereign ; he might simply have been following the prevalent usage. Moreover, Aristeas's Letter says that the Version was prepared at the desire not of the first Lagide, Ptolemy Lagi, or Soter, as he is also called, but of his son, Philadelphus, to whom the line of argument, indicated above, would not apply. The Fathers of the Church, indeed, assume that the LXX. was prepared either for Ptolemy I. or for him and his successor. But that is a mere unsupported assumption, without a particle of proof. Aristeas's Letter only mentions Philadelphus as the patron of the Septuagint.

A remark of Origen, who dealt so thoroughly with this and all other Greek versions of the Scriptures, might, on a superficial examination, favour the supposition that it was prepared for a Lagide ; or, at least, that deference was paid to a king in its preparation. In Ezekiel viii. 12 the first half of the verse is wanting in the LXX. Origen notes this omission with his usual asterisk, and adds the follow-

ing remark: — "The two words, 'The king will mourn,' may, perhaps, have been purposely omitted by the seventy translators, so that the king might not suspect them of suggesting that *he* would have occasion to mourn." This note assumes, then, that the translators expected that the king would read their Version or have it read to him. The main fact of Aristeas's Letter would thus be confirmed. But if an argument, *e silentio*, is never sufficient by itself, still less can it be relied on in this instance. Origen himself neutralises the force of his remark by adding that the phrase omitted by the translators may have been wanting in their copy of the Scriptures, though it is certainly required for the symmetry of the verse. The argument falls completely to the ground, when it is remembered that Ezekiel and the other prophetical and poetical books were translated much later than the Pentateuch, certainly not during the reign of the first sovereign of the Lagide dynasty.

And yet positive proof exists that the translator avoided the plain rendering and substituted another less likely to excite prejudice,— out of deference to a Greek ruler. In that portion of Deuteronomy (xvii. 14-19) which deals with the election of a ruler, the word מלך occurs three times. "When thou . . . shalt say, I will set a *King* over me, thou shalt set a *King* over thee; one from amongst thy brethren shalt thou set *King* over thee. Thou mayest not set a stranger over thee which is not thy brother." Here מלך is rendered, every time not *βασιλεύς* but *ἄρχων*. The sentence in v. 18, וישב על כסא ממלכתו, is rendered *ὅταν καθίστῃ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτός*—"when he sitteth upon his rulership," which, indeed, is bad Greek. Does not this avoidance of the terms connected with sovereignty look significant? The other translators, Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus are not afraid of rendering מלך simply *βασιλεύς*. The translator of the First Book of Samuel uses the word in the chapter which relates the story of Israel's agitation for a king. Only the translator of Deuteronomy seems to have avoided the term consciously. A delicacy of feeling prevented him rendering the sentence "thou shalt not appoint a stranger *King* over thee" literally, or mentioning the throne of his fatherland. How shall we account for this variation if we do not assume that the translator's respect for the foreign ruler to whose government the Jews were at the time subject, restrained him from letting the king read that, according to their Scriptures, the Jews were to select their ruler from their own body? And this is equivalent to the admission that the translation was prepared with special reference to a sovereign of Alexandria. It was assumed that he would glance at the version of Deuteronomy, as of the rest of the Pentateuch, and care

was therefore taken to omit phrases that might give umbrage. The pith of Aristeas's Letter would thus be confirmed, viz. :—that an Alexandrian King gave his countenance to a translation of the Pentateuch.

This being settled, the next problem that presents itself is the identification of the particular Ptolemy under whom the LXX. was prepared. It could not have been Ptolemy I., Soter; for though some of the Church Fathers give his name, not even a legend hints at his connection with the work. The second Ptolemy, Philadelphus, is named in Aristeas's Letter. But that letter is historically worthless. Its author hit on this king by chance, and, as it happens, guessed wrong. To lend plausibility to his guess, he introduces the figure of Demetrius Phalereus as having counselled Philadelphus to become the patron of the translation. He had heard of Demetrius as the author of a book on the Kings of Judea. He did not know, however, that this Demetrius was a Jew. Fancying him a Greek, the author of the letter identifies him with Demetrius Phalereus, an Archon of Athens; with equally wretched ignorance he styles him Ptolemy's librarian, and, as he was a contemporary of Philadelphus, credits him with having influenced that king to patronize the LXX. In truth, Demetrius Phalereus was in little favour with Philadelphus, who actually threw him into prison. In short, the writer of Aristeas's Letter had no authentic information of the connection of Philadelphus with the LXX. A false combination misled him. Philo and Josephus follow him blindly on this point. Apart from these authors, there is no evidence that Philadelphus took any interest whatever in Jews or Judaism. There is, however, historical evidence that Ptolemy VI., Philometor, felt and showed a deep interest in both. Without the misleading suggestion in Aristeas's Letter, his name would have naturally occurred to the student as the patron of the LXX. In order, however, to convert a probability into a certainty, we must resort to internal evidence.

One of the main differences that divided Sadducees and Pharisees turned on the date of the feast of Pentecost, and arose out of conflicting interpretations of a text. One of the laws of the festivals, in Leviticus, prescribes that the produce of the new harvest must not be used before a first-fruits offering of barley is brought. The time for bringing it is ממחרת השבת "on the morrow of the Sabbath." There is no hint of any connection between this offering and the Passover. But, as it is three times distinctly stated that a counting of days is to commence "on the morrow of the Sabbath," and to last for fifty days, at the end of which Pentecost is to be kept, that feast ought always to fall on a Sabbath. So the Sadducees, who supported the literal interpretation of Scripture, wished to

have it. The Pharisees interpreted this law differently. The counting, according to them, ought to begin on the second day of Passover, whatever day of the week that might be ; and so Pentecost, too, could fall on any day of the week. They were forced to sacrifice the literal meaning of the phrase, ממחרת השבת, and explained it, "The morrow of the feast." How did the Greek Version render these two words ? Decidedly in the Pharisee sense : *της ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης*. *Πρώτης* here signifies the first day of the Feast of Passover ; *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς πάσχης* is understood. *Ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης* is given by Origen as the genuine original reading. He remarks that *another* translator, keeping to the literal sense, rendered it *ἐπαύριον τοῦ σαββάτου*, or *μετὰ τὸν σαββάτον*. When in verse 15 the same phrase is rendered *ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαύριον τῶν σαββάτων*, this must be an interpolation in the LXX. by *ἄλλος*. The original translator could not have been guilty of such gross inconsistency or thoughtlessness as this variation would imply. Josephus, it should further be noted, also gives the Law in the Pharisee sense. He refers to the first-fruit offering of barley, brought on the 16th of Nissan, and to Pentecost, fifty days after this date (Antiqq., III. x. 5-6). Following the LXX., he did not read the word Sabbath עד ממחרת השבת תספרו חמשים יום (Levit. xxiii. 16). The LXX. renders *τῆς ἐπαύριον τῆς ἐσχάτης ἑβδομάδος ἀριθμήσετε πεντέκοντα ἡμέρας*, also omitting the difficult word השבת.

If the LXX. had been prepared before the outbreak of the antagonism between the Sadducees and Pharisees the translator would have faithfully adhered to his text. His deviation from it proves that he was cognisant of the controversy, and consciously rendered his text in harmony with the teaching of the Pharisees. He omits the word שבת, or, to be quite accurate, translates it, "The first day of the feast" ; following the Talmudic interpretation, ממחרת יום טוב.[1]

---

[1] Compare *Sifré* to Levit. xxiii. 14-16. What was the exact reason that impelled the Pharisees to place themselves in antagonism to the literal meaning of the text? It was a difficult matter for the bearers of the tradition to justify their interpretation (Cf. *Menachoth*, 66*b*) ; but it would seem that necessity was the ground for the course pursued. The feast of the Passover was coincident with the beginning of the barley-harvest, or rather was closely connected with it. If Passover fell on a Saturday or on an early day of the week, the use of the new crop would have been postponed for several days, if the offering—subsequent to which the barley became lawful for general use—could only be brought on the day after the actual Sabbath. The people may have occasionally felt the necessity of an immediate use of the new barley, owing to the older stores having run out. Must they be forced to endure the privation of food, and

When did this antagonism between Pharisaism and Sadduceeism first break out? There is no trace of it before the Maccabean wars. Religious activity had, up to that time, nothing in common with politics. It pursued its course of development, unaggressive and unmolested. The Maccabean wars, undertaken with the object of winning national and political freedom, produced for the first time a fusion of religion and politics. Parties, half religious, half political, came into existence. The Sadducees, essentially politicians, and only half-converted Hellenists, wanted to gauge all religious obligations by the standard of political interests. They desired to remove all the checks which the prosperity and progress of the State sustained through the perpetuation of traditional customs. Their opponents, the Pharisees, clung firmly to every religious prescription that had once come into general use. They were convinced that the scrupulous observance of religious laws alone could further the welfare of the Jewish nation.

The two parties started from opposite points, and conceived the Maccabean success differently.

The Sadducees thought that the Maccabees had won their freedom by their military prowess, and the political sagacity of their leaders. The Pharisees believed that heaven had blessed their arms as a reward for their piety, and for their scrupulous observance of the affirmative and negative precepts of Judaism, which, therefore, should always be maintained. This was the pith of the opposition. So Josephus also says that the split between Pharisees and Sadducees arose in the days of Jonathan Maccabeus, *i.e.*, after liberty had been gained by that leader's warlike energy and political capacity. These opposite standpoints of regarding the Maccabean wars which then first came to light determined the methods recommended for securing the fruits of victory. The Pharisees maintained that freedom and national prosperity were bound up with the maintenance of all religious institutions, even those that are devoid of a Scriptural basis, provided they are sanctioned by tradition, ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς. The Sadducees, on the contrary, denied the obligation of any institutes but those prescribed in the Written Law, νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα.

To return from this digression to our own argument. This anti-

---

that, too, on a festival? To prevent this delay, the Pharisees may have adopted their interpretation of the text, in accordance with which the new crop was available on the second day of Passover. They had some support from the passage in Deuteronomy which prescribes that the counting of the seven weeks between Passover and Pentecost should begin with the inauguration of the harvest (Deut. xvi. 9, מהחל חרמש בקמה תחל לספר שבעה שבועות).

thesis of views involved in controversy the dates of the barley offering and of the feast of Pentecost that followed it after seven weeks. The Sadducees consistently held fast to the literal sense of the text ממחרת השבת; and, accordingly, maintained that the counting should begin "from the morrow of the first Sabbath" (after the Passover). The Pharisees, on the other hand, upheld the tradition, hitherto followed, that the first day of Passover determined the date for bringing the offering and that of Pentecost. The first translator of the Pentateuch into Greek, knowing of these divergent interpretations, modified his translation to suit the views of the Pharisees. Hence it may be reasonably inferred that this Version could not have been composed before Maccabean times, when the necessity for deviating from the text had not yet arisen. Nor yet could it have been prepared much later. For Sirach, who came to Egypt in the reign of Hyrcanus, already found a Greek Version of the Pentateuch and the Prophets. If we assume that the Five Books of Moses were translated about Jonathan's time (134-144 B.C.), that would correspond with the reign of Ptolemy Philometor. The Version exhibits traces of deference to a king. This sovereign can be no other than Philometor, who so highly favoured the Jews. Onias was his general, and helped to fight his brother. Philometor not only permitted him to build a temple in Egypt, but also assigned ground for the erection of a fortress in which Onias might maintain a garrison to defend the Sanctuary. He also made him Arabarch—*i. e.*, ruler over the district then called Arabia. Onias was, in a sense, a vassal of his monarch. His father was the last high priest of the old family Onias III., whose loyalty to religion brought him into conflict with the Hellenistic contemners of the law. The son revered the Torah as much as the father. It was, therefore, quite in accordance with the fitness of things that his king should have shown so warm an interest in the Scriptures which the Jews cherished as to desire to read them in a Greek version. Equally natural is it that the translator should have carefully avoided all phrases that might cause the king to harbour doubts of the loyalty of his Jewish subjects, and should thus have substituted an alternative expression for Βασιλεύς (מלך) in his translation of the passage relating to the election of a king.

Thus the Septuagint itself proves that it owed its inception to the patronage of Philometor.

H. Graetz.

The Shtaroth of Merton College.—(JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 527). The second of the *Shtaroth of Merton College*, edited by Dr. Neubauer, is at first sight so obscure, and also, in consequence of some misprints, so unintelligible, that it can be translated only after closer examination. Literally it may be rendered somewhat as follows :—

I, the undersigned, fully acknowledge herewith that I received £50 from William de Watville, through Maestre Walther de Merton, on a debt of £58, which the said William owed to me, according to a bill of £58 drawn in the names of the said William and myself. The part of this bill bearing the seal is in the Record Office of London. Its instalments are to be paid in five years, on the following terms of payment, to-wit, at Easter of the 29th year of reign of King Henry, the son of King John, £6, and at Michaelmas next £6 ; in the following three years £12 yearly, at the above-mentioned dates, and in the fifth year £10 more, at the aforesaid periods. As to the last £8, I agreed with the said William and his heirs that he should pay to me and to my heirs 40s. at every Michaelmas term for four years, the first instalment of which would begin at Michaelmas of the thirtieth year of the reign. On account of this £8, the bill for the amount of £58 has been left with me under the condition that as soon as the said William or his heirs draw a bill on me and my heirs (read לי for לו) for those £8 payable in four years, or on the remainder of the said £8, my duty (read אז for או) and that of my heirs will be to return the bill of £58 cancelled to the said William or his heirs or their attorney. In case he should not attend to my wishes with regard to the said £8 at the above-mentioned dates, then I and my heirs shall be authorised to force by law the said William and his heirs by means of the said bill of £58 to pay for all the past years of the said £8 (read מהנקוב') and of the interests increased by delay of the instalments, with the condition, however, that they do not run up interests on the said 40s. one quarter after the term. I testify besides that neither the said Walther, nor one of his ancestors ever owed anything to me, and that neither I nor my heirs can make any claim against the said Walther and his heirs from the creation of the world to Michaelmas of the said thirtieth year of reign. What I acknowledge, I seal.

AARON B. ABRAHAM.

Aaron herewith testifies to have received only £50, and to have come to an understanding in reference to the remaining £8, that they should be paid in four terms. In the event of such terms not being kept, the whole sum or the unpaid part thereof to be recoverable

together with interest, but that the amount due at each term should remain free of interest for a quarter of a year.

און in the fourth and fifth Shtar is here in the midst of the Hebrew words of this legal document, not *an* the English *one* (p. 529, note 7), which would be meaningless next to שום, and would also involve the omission of an indispensable substantive, but, by the side of חותם, the bill, and חתיכה, the past instrument, expresses every other legal acknowledgment of debt, which is indicated by און, power.

In the fifth Shtar שושישורש is, of course, the phonetic transcription of "successors," and refers to the legal successors of the scholars of Merton.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, 1891.

THE ETHICS OF SOLOMON IBN GEBIROL.

WITH Solomon Ibn Gebirol begins the series of those celebrated Spanish Jewish poets, who, in their genius and their works recall the glorious fame of two of Israel's crowned representatives in the golden age of the nation. As poets and authors of liturgical poetry they appear to have inherited the harp of David, the holy singer, while as thinkers and philosophers they possessed the wisdom of Solomon, and united them both within themselves.

Solomon Ibn Gebirol was born in Malaga in the year 1021—1022,[1] was brought up in Saragossa, and lived afterwards in Cordova.[2] Whilst yet young his fame as a poet spread far beyond the borders of his country, so that from Egypt and Babylon a request was sent to him to compose an elegy upon the death of the Gaon Haya (1038). The treasury of secular and religious song that he left behind him after his death, which took place in Valencia after the

[1] An acrostic, quoted in Dukes' *Ehrensäulen*, p. 19, runs as follows:— אני שלמה הקטן ברבי יהודה מלקי חזק; Zunz (*Literaturgesch. der Synagog. Poesie*, p. 189, note 2), gives the following: אני שלמה קטן ברבי יהודה אבן גבירול מאלקי חזק ואמץ לבבכם וכו'; cp. Abraham Ibn Ezra, in his Introduction to Moznaïm. For the date see Senior Sachs, in his uncompleted work, רב שלמה בן גבירול, p. 33.

[2] Moses Ibn Ezra, in Munk's *Mélanges de philosophie juive et arabe*, pp. 263. 515.

665

year 1069,[1] perhaps in 1070, had already become so famous as to assure for him an immortal memorial for all time. Not only were his liturgical compositions very favourably received by his co-religionists in Spain, North Africa, the Provence and Italy, but a few were also adopted into the German and Polish ritual, and thus even in remote countries his name was not altogether forgotten. It was, however, reserved for modern times to pay proper homage to the importance of Solomon Ibn Gebirol, and to reinstate this man, whose many-sided worth was unknown, in his full rights. A number of diligent editors and celebrated scholars, such as Leopold Dukes, S. D. Luzzatto, Michael Sachs, H. Edelmann, Abraham Geiger, Leopold Zunz, Senior Sachs, and others, have paid particular attention and study to his poetry, and thus also were the means of bringing to light his grammatical poem, *Anak*.[2] It was, however, left to Solomon Munk to reveal in Ibn Gebirol, the famous philosopher, who, under the distorted name of Avicebron or Avicebrol, was highly esteemed by the renowned Christian scholastics, Albertus Magnus and Thomas d'Aquinas, and whose works were subjected to a detailed refutation.[3] Munk also edited the abridged Hebrew version by Shemtob Ibn Falaquera of the *Fountain of Life*, which was written in Arabic, and published it as a Hebrew appendix [4]

---

[1] This is certain from the fact that the piece called שנותינו ספו was composed in 1069, as Munk, *Mélanges*, p. 156, has remarked. The doubts, raised by Dr. Neubauer in Grätz' *Monatsschrift*, 1887, p. 498, against this statement, open up a very important question, which has little to do with our subject here. Cf. also Abraham Zacuto, *Juchasin*, ed. London, 1857, p. 217.

[2] The verses of this incomplete poem are often quoted from the preface of Solomon Parchon to his מחברת הערוך (ed. Stern, Pressburg, 1844, p. 23 *sqq.*), as in Dukes' *Ehrensäulen*, p. 101, and his collection of שירי שלמה ii., p. 56 ; they were at length edited by Egers in the *Jubelschrift für Dr. Zunz*, Berlin, 1884, Hebrew portion, p. 192 *sqq.*

[3] V. *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1846, No. 46.

[4] Under the title of ליקוטים מן ספר מקור חיים לר׳ שלמה ז״ל בן גבירול, Paris, 1857.

to his book—*Mélanges de Philosophie juive et arabe* (Paris, 1857-9)—which was mainly devoted to Ibn Gebirol. In this way he made students acquainted with the metaphysics or theology of the celebrated Spaniard as far as the means he had to hand allowed; subsequently several other points were elucidated and rectified by others.[1] Nevertheless, there is still lacking a special and complete exposition of the Ethics of Solomon Ibn Gebirol, although his writings upon this subject are well known, and have never been entirely lost sight of. This topic the more deserves our fullest attention, because Gebirol is the oldest of the Jewish philosophers of Spain, and was a man whom, as an inspired poet and the interpreter of the most exalted religious feeling, we rightly admire and love.

In order to be able to give an account of the characteristics of his ethics, let us cast a brief glance over his inward nature, as it is so clearly and truthfully displayed in his poems.

Being a man of extraordinary and versatile talents, at once a poet and a philosopher, a grammarian and an exegetist, Solomon Ibn Gebirol obtained a wide-spread fame, and suffered equally from the flattering recognition of his friends, as from the embittering hostility of his opponents. His was a genius full of fire and animation, with strong creative powers. For his admirers and friends he felt an enthusiastic regard, whilst, on the other hand, he was fully conscious of his own importance, and expressed himself to that effect as frankly as his nature was frank; and thus, especially in his youth, he could not avoid conveying an impression of overbearing haughtiness and self-esteem. This aspect of his character appears to have estranged the hearts of his sincerest friends. Two prominent patrons of his are especially to be noted: Jekutiel ben Hassan in

[1] Seyerlen, in Baur and Zeller's *Theolog. Jahrbücher*, xv., p. 486 *sqq.* and xvi.; M. Joel, *Ibn Gebirol's Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Philosophie*, in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie*, Breslau, 1876; J. Guttmann, *Die Philosophie des Salomo Ibn Gabirol*, Göttingen, 1889; D. Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Attributenlehre*, Gotha, 1877, pp. 95—115.

Saragossa, and Samuel Hannagid Ibn Nagdela in Granada. To both of these he dedicated some powerful and excellent poems,[1] but he afterwards directed against the last-named and others verses bitterly complaining of their supposed coolness towards him.[2] His own fiery and impulsive nature was unable to reconcile the inroad of a colder feeling into the hearts of his friends with any truthfulness and sincerity. The inexplicable reserve of his well wishers and patrons cut him to the heart, and evoked his bitter reproaches. In all this we see sufficient justification for his constant ill-humour, but other and deeper causes must primarily have caused it. Left an orphan and without brothers in his boyhood,[3] engaged, perhaps, in a long struggle with poverty and distress,[4] he very early acquired a disposition too much inclined to gloomy seriousness. This tendency was strengthened by his profound studies and occupations, seeing that on their account he had to abandon the gaiety and enjoyments characteristic of youth. Thus, in his first years of manhood, when in 1045, at Saragossa, he composed his ethical masterpiece, *The Ennoblement of the Character*[5] (תקון מדות הנפש), he complains of physical weakness, persecution and discontent.[6]

In spite of all this, Ibn Gebirol still felt within himself the power of passing beyond the narrow limit of his own circumstances, when guided by the hand of science, to discover and to maintain a free and unhampered outlook upon the moral life and its duties. His seriousness rendered him particularly fitted to grasp thoroughly the facts of the

---

[1] Dukes, שירי שלמה, Nos. 8. 14. 15. 16 for Jekutiel, No. 17 at his death ; Nos. 26. 27. 28 for Samuel Hannagid.

[2] *Ibid*, Nos. 4. 49. 50 et cetera.

[3] Senior Sachs, התחייה ii., 22.

[4] Dukes, שירי שלמה, p. 3, the end of the poem, and Note 8 ; S. Sachs ib. p. 28, n. 1.

[5] Translated from the Arabic into Hebrew by Judah Ibn Tibbon for Asher b. Meshullam of Lünel.

[6] *Tikkun midd. hannef.* ed. Riva di Trento, Preface, p. 5a, lines 6, 7.

human intellect and will, and to elicit the rules according to which the character and actions of man must be ethically assessed. The occasional outbursts of violence or bitterness, of despondency or mistrust, that occur in his poems, originated only in the weakness of an easily excited, but not ignoble nature. His character remained pure, free from malice and falsehood, unswervingly directed to all that was best and noblest.

Ibn Gebirol, however, did not wish that the ethics he taught should be altogether regarded as the result of his own thoughts and sentiments. On the contrary, he liked to connect his own teaching with the utterances of older authorities on the same subject, and clearly strove to enliven and adorn his work by the aid of a rich store of ancient proverbs, appropriate stories, and Biblical confirmation. This method was very much in accord with the prevailing taste of the times. Collections of wise sayings, rules of wisdom, narratives of remarkable events, were very popular and largely read. The Arabic collection of the maxims of Greek and later sages that was made by Honein ben Isaac, a Christian writer (809—873), was very popular in Jewish circles, and, later on, Judah Alcharisi felt inspired to render it accessible also to the Jews outside Spain by a Hebrew translation, under the title of מוסרי הפילוסופים[1] Ibn Gebirol also compiled a work comprised of similar sayings, and called it *The Choice of Pearls* מבחר הפנינים.[2] Thus, in his ethical work, he acted precisely

---

[1] Printed in Riva di Trento, 1562, and Luneville, 1807, together with the pseudo-Aristotelian *Book of the Apple* (ספר התפוח) upon Immortality, and the *Tikkun Mid. hannefesh* of Ibn Gebirol, under the title of גורן נכון. Apart from these other works, *Tikkun Mid. hannef.* also appeared in Constantinople, 1550, together with Bachja's חובות הלבבות, and by itself in Wilna, 1845, and in Lyck, 1859.

[2] Also written in Arabic, and rendered into Hebrew by Judah Ibn Tibbon. On account of its title the collection was wrongly ascribed to Jedajah Penini of Beziers. It has been printed more than twenty times, first with a commentary by Simson Munay, in Constantinople, 1484. Recently, the

according to the fashion of the age in that he nearly always attached some suitable proverbs to the discussions of his introduction and to each separate chapter.

In passing, Ibn Gebirol gives the sources of the doctrines quoted by him, and the authors of the cited sayings. Sometimes he does this by a general indication, and at others by expressly naming his authority.[1]

Such general indications are the sages,[2] the ancient ones,[3] our sages,[4] the philosophers,[5] one of the kings.[6]

The following are definitely named in his chief ethical work:—Socrates,[7] "the god-like," Plato,[8] Aristotle,[9] Galen,[10] Ptolemy,[11] Lokman,[12] the moral sayings of Origen,[13] the

---

book appeared in London, 1851, ed. Filipowski, and afterwards in an elegant form, with an English translation and Notes, ed. Ascher, London, 1859.

[1] In the following foot-notes T. refers to the ethical work, תקון מדות הנפש, ed. Riva; P. to *The Choice of Pearls* (מבחר הפנינים); M. to the מוסרי הפילוסופים, ed. Riva; and L. to the *Fountain of Life* (מקור חיים).

[2] T., I. 2; אחד מן החכמים T., I. 2; קצת מן החכמים T., I. 2; III. 2, cp. P., IX. 7; החכמים T., I. 3; החכם I. 3; II. 1, three times; IV. 2, three times; חכם אחד I. 2, twice; אחד מן הערב, *i.e.* an Arab poet, I. 3.

[3] הקדמונים T., I. 1. [4] חכמינו T., p. 7a.

[5] קצת הפילוסופים T., I. 3; מקצת הפילוסופים, p. 7*a*; הפילוסופים, middle of p. 4*a*; I. 3; V. 3; הפילוסוף p. 6*b* (where not Plato, as is observed on the margin, but Aristotle is meant; see my *Ethik des Maimonides*, Breslau, 1876, p. 36, Note 3); III. 1.

[6] T., I. 2; according to Dukes, Salomo Ibn Gebirol, p. 114, Note 3, the Caliph Omar is meant.

[7] T., I. 1, twice; II. 2; III. 1; III. 2, p. 13*b* (cp. P., VI. 1, and M., II. 1, p. 7*b*, line 32), and p. 14*a*, at the top (cp. M., II. 1, p. 7*a*, line 8).

[8] T., II. 4 (cp. M., II. 2; P., 53, 2). The saying here quoted is, however, ascribed by Plutarch, in his work, *How one may derive benefit from his Enemies*, to Diogenes (Dukes, ib. p. 71).

[9] T., I. 1; I. 3 (cp. P., 3, 10).

[10] T., III. 1; III. 2 (cp. M., II. 9); IV. 1, cited from the work ספר מדות הנפש, which also, according to another saying, is named in M., II. 10.

[11] T., III. 2 (cp. M., II. 11); IV. 1. [12] T., I. 2 (cp. M., II. 12).

[13] מוסרי ארגינאס III. 1.

philosopher Gumhur,[1] the book of Kuti,[2] Saadiah,[3] King Alexander the Great of Macedon,[4] and King Ardshir Babekan,[5] the founder of the Neo-Persian dynasty, in the year 226.

The most numerous and important, however, of these quotations—those which Ibn Gebirol regarded as the real basis of his ethical system—are taken from Holy Writ. These passages from the Bible are introduced mostly without comment, but, in a few places, an explanation of greater or less length is added,[6] affording us acceptable specimens of his exegetical powers. These stray instances are the more valuable as his commentaries to the Bible have not come down to us. Sometimes, indeed, his desire to find support for certain doctrines unconsciously leads him astray from the simple interpretation of a verse, and his philosophy impairs his exegesis.

In treating of his ethical views, we will separate "general ethics," which deals with ethical principles, *i.e.*, with the object and conditions of virtue, and with the goal of a moral life, from "concrete ethics," which treats of the particular circumstances, phenomena, and results of moral conduct.

---

[1] גמהר I. 2 (according to Dukes, ib. p. 115, Grand Vizier of King Nushirvan).

[2] According to Steinschneider (*Jewish Literature*, p. 101), this is the book of Chefez Alkuti, spoken of by Moses ben Ezra under the name of אלקוטי, as the author of a free rendering of the Psalms in Arabic verse; T., I. 2; II. 2. 3, twice; IV. 1. 4; V. 1. 3.

[3] T., III. 4, from Saadiah's *Emunot*, V. 1, p. 59*a*, line 9, and V. 3, p. 60*b*, ed. Berlin. There are other things borrowed from Saadiah that can be noticed; *e.g.* T., p. 4*a*, line 2, from *Emun.* X. 3, p. 95*a*, line 12; T., I. 1, p. 9*b*, second half, and II. 1, also more or less follow Saadiah.

[4] T., III. 2, twice; what is said in the second place about Alexander and Aristotle, is also found in M., II. 10, where it is ascribed to Galen.

[5] T., I. 1, in P., 44, 41, instead is read, "an Indian King" (מלך הודו).

[6] Special explanations are adduced in T. p. 3*b* to the words שבתי וראה תחת השמש, Eccles. ix. 11; T., I. 4, to זך יהיר לין שמו, Prov. xxi. 24; T., IV. 4, to עצלה תפיל תרדמה, Prov. xix. 15; T., V. 1, to עם אלהי אברהם, Ps. xlvii. 10, and to שלח לחמך על פני המים, Eccles. xi. 1; T., V. 2, to מונע בר יקבהו לאם, Prov. xi. 26.

The work, *The Ennoblement of the Character* (תקון מדות הנפש), discusses both these subjects. They are, however, as the author himself admits, handled in a somewhat sketchy and brief manner,[1] so that a complete system of ethics cannot be constructed from this work. Even as it stands, it often needs explanation and amplification from the other writings of Ibn Gebirol, to which allusion has already been made. We shall, therefore, supplement our outline of his views on general ethics from the *Fountain of Life* (Mekor Chayim, Fons Vitæ) and the *Crown of the Kingdom* (Keter Malchut). For specific points in his "concrete ethics," however, a general reference must here be made to the corresponding passages in the *Choice of Pearls*, leaving it to the reader to compare our remarks with the special chapters[2] in this collection of proverbial utterances. The book is easily accessible in the admirable edition published in London, 1859, with an English translation and notes by the Rev. B. H. Ascher. To properly fill up the gaps in Gebirol's system, these disconnected sentences are, however, not available.

I.

In the province of general ethics, Ibn Gebirol discusses the following points:—

1. The purpose of the moral life, which he deduces from the nature of man. Man, he observes, is the final object of the visible world, distinguished alike by his

[1] Thus Abraham b. Chasdai in his introduction to his Hebrew translation of the "Balance" (מאזני צדק) of Ghasâli, says, with reference to Gebirol's work חבור יקר מאד……אבל הולך בו על דרך הקצר ולא השלימו על הראוי לפי דעת רוב המשכילים. The author himself says (T., p. 8a, line 12 from the bottom), that the work cannot lay claim to grand pretensions. Nevertheless, just on account of its brevity and conciseness, it acquired a certain amount of popularity, as appears from the preface of Judah Ibn Tibbon to the Hebrew translation (ed. Lyck).

[2] There are altogether sixty-four headings to the chapters, that really lighten the task of reference. The heading to c. 13 reads incorrectly זריזות (vigorousness); as is seen by the proverbs it contains, it should be זהירות (circumspection).

form, his activity, and his intellect. He has two divine gifts in common with the angels—speech and reason. Hence it is that the angels are employed in succouring the pious, as is shown[1] in the examples of the patriarchs,[2] of Daniel,[3] and of the inhabitants of Jerusalem[4] during the siege of the city by Sennacherib.

But apart from these common general attributes, men are by nature very different from each other. The influence of the stars, according to Ibn Gebirol, determines the quantity and quality of the innate talents of every man. Therefore personal effort must come to the aid of natural endowment, and by moral means must either compensate for what Nature has withheld, or raise us above the degree in which we have been already placed by the stars. "Ennoblement of the character" must be the aim of all good men, by the help of which sensual desires must be restricted to the indispensable minimum, and the blissful drawing nigh unto God be facilitated, by which immortality is assured to mankind.[5] Accordingly, our author called his ethical system the "ennoblement of the character" (תקון המדות), as his purpose was to wean mankind from frivolous pursuits to a love of moral discipline, and to inspire the thoughtless multitude with a desire to become acquainted with the character of the sages and to duly understand their words.[6] This striving after a moral improvement must, however, take place in the days of youth; afterwards the chance of success becomes exceedingly faint.

2. The basis and pre-supposition of all moral action—viz., the freedom of the will: this doctrine Ibn Gebirol assumes, and only touches upon the question quite casually, without subjecting it to a close discussion. Probably he took it for granted that his readers were well acquainted

---

[1] T., p. 1.—Ibn Gebirol also holds the view of Saadiah, expressed in *Emunot* IV., the beginning, that man is the centre of the universe, a theory which was afterwards disputed: See my *Ethik des Maimonides*, p. 21, note 4. [2] Gen. xviii. 2 *sqq.*; xlviii. 16; Hosea xii. 5.

[3] Dan. vi. 23. [4] 2 Kings xix. 35. [5] T., p. 3*b*. [6] T., p. 8*a*.

with this doctrine from Saadiah's work on the philosophy of religion, which was utilised and expressly mentioned by him.[1] He merely remarks[2] that the passage מיי מצעדי גבר כוננו ודרכו יחפץ, "The steps of a man are ordered by the Lord, and he delighteth in his way" (Psalm xxxvii. 23), does not refer to moral compulsion, but, on the contrary, the meaning is that God created the soul perfect, without any defects,[3] and that, if a man strives after virtue and noble conduct in life (כוננו),[4] he will find favour with God (ודרכו יחפץ).

3. Connected with this doctrine is the opinion that evil cannot be innate in mankind,[5] but that the immortal and rational soul comes pure and undefiled from the hands of God, its maker, and that it is only the vegetable soul, the home of sensuous desires, which is the source of all evil.[6]

4. In his general ethics Ibn Gebirol's doctrines regarding virtue are confined to a definition of virtue and vice.

a. The idea of virtue he explains, according to ancient custom, by a formal definition. He speaks of it in various places as the *via media*, the mean between two extremes.[7] He probably did not obtain this conception direct from its original source, the *Ethics* of Aristotle,[8] as he neither always makes a consistent use of it, nor lays any stress upon the deductions that follow from it.[9]

b. Vice, Ibn Gebirol designates as "sickness of the

---

[1] Saadiah, *Emunot* IV. [2] T., p. 7*b*.

[3] Hence the text reads, מיי מצעדי גבר : through God (*i.e.*, through the gifts of God) are the steps of a man possible, only through them can he walk his way.

[4] *I.e.*, if they, viz., the steps of a man, are directed to virtue and right conduct in life.

[5] As, *e.g.*, the Church Father Augustine and the Church have adopted the dogma of Original Sin. [6] T., p. 7*a*.

[7] T., II. מבחר הדברים אמצעיהם ; II. 15, מה טוב קו היושר בכל העניינים ומה מאד רע המותרות בהם ; IV. 1, twice ; V. 1, 2, 3.

[8] *Vide* my *Ethics of Maimonides*, p. 79, note 6.

[9] *Vide ib.*, upon Ibn Gebirol, p. 12 ; upon the Golden Mean in ethics, see p. 79 *sqq*.

soul," and avoidance of it as its "cure"—an idea that was more or less distinctly taught by the Scriptures,[1] Plato,[2] Aristotle,[3] the Stoics,[4] the Koran,[5] and the later Jewish writers upon the philosophy of religion.[6] That ethics was consequently the "cure of the soul," was not so fully pointed out by him as afterwards by Maimonides.[7] But he does, however, in certain cases,[8] counsel the purification of the soul from vice by running to the contrary extreme, although not so positively as Maimonides, imitating Aristotle and others, has done.[9]

5. The aim of the moral life or the *summum bonum*, Ibn Gebirol terms "felicity," corresponding to the εὐδαιμονία of Aristotle and others. The essence of this idea he explains both negatively and positively.

a. The negative aspect of felicity Ibn Gebirol touches upon very briefly, merely warning against "pleasure" (התאוות), being regarded, like virtue, as an end to be striven for in human conduct,[10] or reckoned among the states of the rational soul. On the contrary, pleasure is the real source of many vices or diseases of the soul, which need a careful course of conduct for their healing.[11]

b. In its positive sense, our author dwells upon true felicity in different passages of his *Fountain of Life*, which we shall here bring together.

The power of acquiring knowledge, he says,[12] takes fore-

---

[1] Hos. xiv. 5; Ps. xli. 5.

[2] *Gorgias*, p. 464 ed. *Steph.* and *Repub.* IV., p. 444 (cp. Guttmann: *The Religious Philosophy of Abraham Ibn Daud*, p. 217, note 1; *The Religious Philosophy of Saadiah*, p. 282, note 1).

[3] Nicom. *Ethics*, I. 13. [4] Cicero, *Tuscul.*, IV. 10, 23; 12, 27.

[5] *Sura*, V. 57. [6] See my *Ethics of Maimonides*, p. 78, note 4.

[7] *Ib.*, p. 77.

[8] T., p. 4*b*, lines 9, 10; I. 4; III. 2, several times; III. 4; IV. 1.

[9] Cp. my *Ethics of Maimonides*, p. 83, II. 1, and p. 84, note 2, where another contrast between Ibn Gebirol and Maimonides is drawn.

[10] As, following the example of the ancient Greek school of Hedonists, the Cyrenaic and Epicurean, many later so-called philosophers taught.

[11] T., p. 4*b*, line 9 *sqq.* [12] L., I. 1.

most rank among the powers of man. Hence it follows that the aim of his endeavours must be "knowledge," and above all the knowledge of his own being, for it is his own being or nature which comprehends and penetrates into the objective world, and enables him to bring external things within the reach of his powers.[1] But man must also continually strive to attain to the knowledge of the ultimate cause (העלה האחרנה), to whom he owes his existence, in order to secure felicity (ההצלחה).[2]

If knowledge is the first means, moral conduct is the second, whereby the human soul unites itself with the higher world, is purified from obscuration,[3] and freed from the fetters of Nature.[4] Ibn Gebirol uses words to the same effect in his grand poetical hymn, "The Crown of the Kingdom":—

> Who thy secret learneth, eternal bliss attains;
> Its joyous fruit partaking, life unending gains.

Or again:—

> Thou, God, art the Light
> That shall shine in the soul of the pure;
> Now thou art hidden by sin, by sin with its cloud of night.
> Now thou art hidden, but then, as over the height,
> Then shall thy glory break through the clouds that obscure,
> And be seen in the mount of the Lord.

And finally:—

> Thou art the highest!
> To gaze on thee longeth the eager soul,
> In part thy glory seeing, but ne'er the whole.[5]

---

[1] Upon the Neo-Platonic character of these and the following doctrines: Cp. M. Joel's *Ibn Gebirol's Importance for the History of Philosophy*, Breslau, 1876, p. 10 *sqq.*; Guttman's *Die Philosophie des Salomo Ibn Gebirol*, Göttingen, 1889, p. 66 *sqq.*

[2] Other terms of equal importance are: "Continual Well-being" (הטובה התמידה, T., p. 3*b*, line 7); "The Greatest Repose and the Greatest Enjoyment" (המנוחה הגדולה והתענוג הגדול, L. III. 31).

[3] The moral *κάθαρσις* of Plotinus, Joel, *ibid.*, p. 11. [4] L., I. 2; III. 37.

[5] These passages occur in the sections beginning אתה חי, אתה אור and אתה עליון.

The general principles of moral conduct taught by Ibn Gebirol have now been set forth; as regards particulars, the account of the concrete section of his ethics will furnish some details upon the most important of them. It therefore now remains to indicate Ibn Gebirol's view of the method by which the human intelligence can be elevated to attain its highest goal.

According to Ibn Gebirol, through the process of reminiscence,[1] by the help of sense-perception and an activity of thought that gradually grows more spiritual, the soul is raised up once more to the full height of its intellectual condition before its earthly existence is assumed.[2] A spiritual world opens for mankind in the manifold sciences which are partly preparatory and partly perfected, *i.e.*, sciences proper.[3] An irresistible yearning and love impel the intelligent soul continually onwards from step to step to the goal of a higher knowledge, to the knowledge of spiritual beings and of God himself,[4] and these impulses increase in force the nearer the goal is approached.[5] Every success achieved during this progress is accompanied by a sensation of pleasure. Above all, the knowledge of the spiritual beings (world-spirit, soul of the world, Nature, according to the Neo-Platonic phraseology) conduces to great satisfaction and delight.[6] In the same measure as this knowledge is attained grows the power of the human mind to press forward to the knowledge of God and to direct contact with his spirit[7] (הדבקות).

In its further advance beyond the highest of the (Neo-Platonic) spiritual beings, *i.e*, beyond the Universal Intellect, the human mind, as Ibn Gebirol expresses it, comes to a standstill in front of closed gates. For pure form and pure matter, in their separate existence, are the higher

---

[1] This is taken from the *ἀνάμνησις* of the Platonic system.

[2] L., II. 11; cp. V. 65, 66.

[3] החכמות המוסריות והתמות, T., p. 7*b*, at the bottom.

[4] L., V. 46, 51. [5] V. 47, 52.

[6] המנוחה הגדולה והתענוג הגדול. [7] L., III. 31.

presuppositions of that Universal Intellect which already contains within itself a combination of pure form and pure matter. To this point, however, no speculative thought, be it never so keen, is able to push its way.[1] In order to reach it, the human mind must be divested of all sensuality, must entirely free itself from the bonds of Nature, and completely neglect all impressions of sensuous perceptions and desires, like some polluting abomination. All certainly cannot succeed in this attempt, and even the few not at every time. The more thorough this rejection of all sensuality, the nearer does the soul approach to an immediate vision of the highest stages of the spiritual world. The final degree of this divesting oneself of all bodily impulses is a total forgetfulness and disregard of all sensuality, an ecstasy, which alone can bring about the immediate contemplation of that which is purely Spiritual and Divine.[2] He who has thus passed through the portals of the unknowable with a purified soul becomes himself a spiritual, God-like being, as immortal as the Deity, who now informs and fulfils his own spirit, and he delights in his immediate proximity to the absolute *summum bonum*, to the ever-existing Being. His hitherto restless yearning is satisfied, and his pleasure endures to eternity.[3] The fruit of this striving is thus felicity and deliverance from death, and a union with the source of eternal life.[4]

Thus far speaks Ibn Gebirol. We see him here again completely in harmony with the Neo-Platonic philosophy. Plotinus also, in his theory of knowledge and in his ethics, had taught that beside the knowledge acquired through the activity of the understanding (*διάνοια*, *λογισμός*), there existed the possibility of direct contemplation, which is the prior condition of the understanding's activity—a contemplation which is reached by a process of thinking unimpeded and unimpaired by anything earthly and corporeal, and which, in its pure abstraction, is able to become

[1] L., V. 55. [2] L., III. 37. [3] L., V. 55.
[4] מהמות [וההצלה] ההצלחה L., V. 73.

conscious of, and partially to apprehend, the Divine Reason itself. Man, however, only attains the highest state, according to Plotinus and Philo of Alexandria, when, undisturbed even by this very consciousness and by every kind of thinking, in self-forgetful rapture (ἔκστασις) and simplicity (ἁπλωσις), he is suddenly illumined by the light of the Godhead, and becomes so immediately united with it that all difference between him and the Deity vanishes.

II.

But how must the life of an individual be ordered so as to render such a soaring upwards towards the Deity possible to him? An answer to this question is to be found in the "concrete" ethics of our author.

1. Ibn Gebirol attempts to gain a purview over the whole field of concrete ethics in the following manner. Man, as is also mentioned in other passages,[1] is a "little world" (עולם קטן, μικρὸς κόσμος, a microcosm), corresponding to the universe or "the great world." (עולם גדול, macrocosm). In a similar way, the four elements in the visible world correspond to four essential component parts of the human body, which is endowed with noble stature and excellent organs. These four parts are the blood, the spittle, the black gall and the yellow gall.[2] Man has besides five senses, which, as a moral being, he ought only to employ in such a way that they may prove useful and serviceable.

Ibn Gebirol here dwells upon the separate senses, and propounds some weighty doctrines of concrete ethics, by treating of the senses in the order of their importance, and drawing up rules of morality which define how to make use of them.[4]

---

[1] L., III. 6, 44.

[2] Cp. Dieterici, *Anthropologie der Araber im zehnten Jahrhundert* Leipzig, 18 71, p. 4, 42, 189.

[3] T., p. 3*b*, in the middle. The attempt of Ibn Gebirol to discover the five senses in Eccles. ix. 11, must be considered a failure. [4] T., p. 4*a*, *b*

He next attempts to group together the virtues and their corresponding vices, and he combines with them the good and evil fortunes of life. The virtues and vices are treated in connection with the five senses, and in this wise ethics becomes largely the doctrine of virtue. To every sense two pairs of virtues and vices are ascribed, so that, altogether, there have to be discussed twenty terms, in five groups of four each, corresponding to the four elements.

Ibn Gebirol thus enumerates them :—

To the sense of Sight—Pride and Humility, Shame and Impudence.
„ „ „ Hearing—Hate and Love, Mercy and Cruelty.
„ „ „ Smell—Anger and Benevolence, Envy and Diligence.
„ „ „ Taste—Joy and Sorrow, Repentance and Composure of Mind.[1]
„ „ „ Touch—Liberality and Parsimony, Bravery and Cowardice.[2]

In this way Ibn Gebirol constructs, so to speak, the framework for the treatment of the special portions of his ethical doctrines. A glance, however, over the above list will at once show that Ibn Gebirol has made a selection from among the virtues and vices, and has not by any means given a complete classification of them. Some important virtues are missing, as, *e.g.*, three of the four Platonic cardinal virtues, viz., Temperance, Wisdom, and Justice. He also does not try to explain the derivation of the virtues from one fundamental idea naturally dividing itself into many branches. Their relegation under the five senses is external and fortuitous, and is not effected without some straining and artificiality, with the exception of certain instances which may have misled the author to a

[1] Joy and Sorrow, Repentance and Tranquillity are not virtues, but conditions of the mind, which though of a moral nature ought rather to be regarded as good and evil circumstances, than as virtues and their opposites. [2] T., Introduction, p. 8*b*.

false generalisation of his method. Indeed, he himself is aware that his classification will meet with contradiction, but he thinks this will be due to the brevity of its justification and to the lack of proofs from logic and from Scripture, which his bodily and mental sufferings prevented him from adducing.[1]

In explanation and excuse of his work that was thus undertaken under such unfavourable circumstances, Ibn Gebirol informs us that his friends had prayed him to compose this ethical work in memory of days that had been spent together, and at the same time had induced him to link the virtues and vices to the five senses. He explains that he expects attacks from unfriendly critics, but will not on that account relinquish his work, but rather appeals to the judgment of impartial readers.[2] Notwithstanding this, the attempt of Ibn Gebirol to find in the words of Ps. xxxvii. an exhortation to moral improvement in particular relation to his tabulated twenty virtues and vices,[3] although occasionally ingenious and clever, must on the whole be considered a failure.

2. In the subsequent description of the virtues and vices, the goods and evils of life, lies the main attraction which this little work has exercised upon many readers. His method presents the following noteworthy features, to which attention will now be drawn, and which will suffice to convey to the reader a fair idea of the concrete ethics of Ibn Gebirol.

a. The arbitrariness of his classification becomes less objectionable, because under each of the principal virtues and vices already enumerated above, he treats of a series of others that are related to them. Thus, *e.g.*, in I. 1, under the head of "Pride," haughtiness, arrogance, and ambition are dwelt upon. In I. 2, together with shame, modesty and prudence—so that here the Platonic φρόνησις comes at least partially to its rights—are touched upon; in II. 2, incon-

[1] T., p. 5*a*, at the top. [2] T., p. 5*b*, 6*a*. [3] T., p. 7*a*, *b*.

stancy, falsehood, and hypocrisy come under the head of "Hate." In this way the outcome of the plan becomes more thorough than is expected from the original design.

b. This enlargement of his material is also partly caused by a certain inaccuracy. For Ibn Gebirol occasionally could not find the exact name of a certain virtue or its opposite, and felt himself compelled to select some expression of a similar meaning, which, however, also possessed other cognate significations. This circumstance was utilised by Ibn Gebirol to treat at the same time of those other chance cognate significations; *e.g.*, in IV. 2, the word רצון is taken in the four senses: satisfaction, pleasure, benevolence, and favour, which are supported by verses from the Bible; in IV. 3, קנאה is treated as meaning both envy and zeal.

c. The antagonistic views upon ethical questions are not passed over in silence. He mentions, for instance, the advocates of pride, and attacks their position,[1] as Saadiah had already done before him.[2]

d. Ibn Gebirol is particularly rich in proofs of how virtues and vices sometimes, through special circumstances, are suddenly changed into their opposites. He points out, for example, that the honest pride of the religious and virtuous man, as opposed to the arrogance arising from low motives and impulses, is only worthy of praise,[3] just as humility would then be objectionable when, through its retention, the wicked man would gain the superiority over the good[4]; similarly the feeling of shame or bashfulness is to be rebuked when it is necessary to give utterance to the truth, to exhort to goodness, to give instruction in virtue and piety[5]; and, in such cases, a course of conduct that would under other circumstances be deemed too impertinent, or too bold and impudent, becomes deserving of praise.[6] It is further self-evident that all

---

[1] T., I. 1. [2] *Emunot* X. 3, 9, p. 93, ed. Berlin.
[3] T., I. 1. [4] T., I. 2. [5] T., I. 3. [6] T., I. 4.

according to the objects of its attention, love may be either praiseworthy or the reverse,[1] whereas cruelty can never under any conditions be justified.[2] Joy is of two kinds. There is the natural (outward) sort that accompanies the gratification and fulfilment of a wish; its result is laughter. Spiritual joy, however, is the possession only of those pure and noble angelic souls who are happy in their piety and self-restraint. Anger, which in itself is objectionable, when directed both by word and deed against sinners, becomes righteous indignation, and as such is commendable.[3] Just as bravery is so fit a subject of praise, and is glorified in song, when exercised in the service of that which is right and good, its excess or its erroneous use, namely, foolhardiness, merits disapproval.[4]

e. With special ardour and detail, Ibn Gebirol turns to speak of those sufferings of the soul that appear to have oppressed his own heart most, viz., grief or care (דאגה). As he distinctly observes, he is well qualified and anxious to offer counsel and aid to those who suffer from them. As the best remedy, he recommends the withdrawal from all desire of temporal good, which is the cause of care, and the application of the mind to the treasures of science and religion. His advice is: rather renunciation than care.[5]

f. All these ethical teachings are enlivened and rendered more distinct by the numerous examples from the lives of Biblical and historical personages, as well as a number of Scriptural and philosophical testimonies and sayings that are adduced in their support. In the course of this procedure several verses in the Bible are specially discussed, as has already been mentioned. The phrase (Prov. xix. 15), עצלה תפיל תרדמה, "Slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep," is even explained physiologically, according to the views then accepted, in the following manner: the vapours which, through the activity of industrious work, issue from the pores of the skin, in the case of a man who leads an idle,

[1] T., II. 1. [2] T., II. 4. [3] T., IV. 1. [4] T., V. 3. [5] T., III. 2.

dull existence, mount to his head and make him sleepy.[1] When, however, a suitable passage in the Bible cannot be found for some phase of moral action that is under discussion, as, *e.g.*, in v. 4, with reference to cowardice, the author contrives to bring in some passage about a cognate virtue or vice, although it has already been considered, as in the example just quoted, where a passage about idleness has to serve instead of one on cowardice, although idleness had already in IV. 4 been treated of as the opposite of industry.

g. The prominent mention of special illnesses, such as stiffness or swelling of the hip, gout, and diseases of the liver,[2] shows that Ibn Gebirol, like most cultured scholars at the Mohammedan academies, had also studied medicine, perhaps even had practised it as a profession.

h. We will now quote certain expressions and examples in his works that deserve special notice. Ibn Gebirol stigmatises parsimony[3] as one of the worst qualities, necessarily leading to the disgraceful vice of covetousness. We ought not even to be niggardly with our knowledge,[4] seeing that the possession of it in no way becomes lessened by imparting it to others, as little as the flame loses anything by kindling a lamp.[5] A man should accustom himself, says Ibn Gebirol, to gradually break himself off from miserly ways, first, by showing liberality towards his relatives, then towards persons further removed, until liberality to all finally takes the place of niggardliness.

The non-Biblical instances employed by our author are mostly taken from Arab writers.

As an example of simplicity of manners, which in no way prejudices the dignity of a person of distinguished station, Ibn Gebirol cites a ruler, the Caliph Omar. When, one

---

[1] T., IV. 1. [2] T., V. 4. [3] T., IV. 2.

[4] M., II. 2, gives the doctrines in the name of Plato, it thus reads לבן אל תהי כילי במה שתדע.

[5] This is also briefly spoken of in the same place in the name of Plato. Cp. also Sifre to Numb. xi. 17.

evening, this monarch was in the presence of a large company, he himself rose and snuffed the charred wick of the lighted lamp. On being asked why he did not leave the task to his attendants, he replied, with noble pride, "I was a king when I rose from my seat, and as a king have I resumed it."[1]

In the chapter that speaks of sorrow and care,[2] Ibn Gebirol narrates one of those legends about Alexander that were so current and popular among the Mohammedans, and which, with certain alterations, also re-appear in the later Jewish folk-lore.

When he felt that his end was nigh, Alexander the Great wrote to his mother, in order to comfort her, the following letter. "Dear mother! As soon as you hear of my death, cause a large and strong city to be erected, fill it with food and drink, and invite for a certain day people from all countries. When everything is prepared, and the whole world is about to come to the banquet that you have arranged, issue a public order that no one to whom a misfortune has ever happened, or who has experienced sorrow, may approach your feast." When, after the death of Alexander, this letter reached the queen-mother, she did all that her son had requested her. After sending out the general invitation to the feast, she promulgated the decree that no one should enter her palace who had ever suffered pain. The result was that not a single person put in an appearance. She then understood that her son had only desired to console her for his untimely death, by reminding her that misfortune and sorrow were the common lot and fate of all mankind.

King Ardshir, Ibn Gebirol relates in another place,[3] gave to a member of his suite a written slip of paper with the command to hand it to him whenever he saw him in a rage. Upon it was written, "Hold! For you are not a God, but only a body whose parts will become sundered from each other, and in a very short time turn to worms and dust!"

[1] T., I. 2. [2] T., III. 2. [3] T., I. 1.

As an example of magnanimous forgiveness, Ibn Gebirol tells the following:—A king, in anger, sentenced a number of conspirators to death. When they were about to be executed, one of them turned to the king and said, "If we have acted wickedly to become traitors, do thou, O king, a good action and pardon us!" And he forgave them, and they were spared.[1]

i. In conclusion we will quote some of the non-Biblical sayings scattered through the various chapters.

Evil conduct is akin to pride.[2] Aristotle says, Just as beauty of form distinguishes the body, so the excellence of the character distinguishes the soul.[3] Every virtue is envied by someone, except the virtue of humility.[4] To be beloved and at rest are the fruits of humility.[5] He who follows his desires comes to harm; he who resists them grows strong.[6] Plato taught concerning revenge: he who really wishes to avenge himself upon his enemies, let him distinguish himself by becoming more and more virtuous.[7] Once the friends of the god-like Socrates asked him, "How is it that we have never seen you in grief?" He answered, "Because I have never acquired anything that I could not do without, or about which I could grieve."[8]—If you are angry, forgive. For to renounce revenge is no sign of weakness.[9] He who is benevolent is rich; he who obeys has rest; he who relies upon himself will become isolated.[10] Show goodness to him to whom it is due, as well as to him to whom it is not due. For if it is due, then it is being shown in the right place; and if it is not due, then it is becoming in *thee* to show it.[11]

Enough, we trust, has been said to point out the proper place of Solomon Ibn Gebirol in the history of ethics, and to show clearly that this famous poet and thinker, in his short ethical work, on which, moreover, he was not able to bring to bear the full strength of his intellectual powers, as

---

[1] T., IV. 2. [2] T., I. 1. [3] *Ibid.* [4] T., I. 2.
[5] *Ibid.* [6] T., II. 1. [7] T., II. 4. [8] T., III. 2. [9] T., IV. 1.
[10] T., IV. 2. [11] T., V. 1.

he himself deplored, yet took up a definite point of view, and has incidentally left us a number of beautiful and valuable doctrines in a suitable and attractive form. If any readers should feel inclined through the observations in this paper to become acquainted by their own reading with all the details of Ibn Gebirol's ethics, this would be a further and most desirable result of the present sketch. Best of all would it be if this study of Ibn Gebirol's ethical treatise should lead to the issue of its Arabic original, the MS. of which, in Oxford, under the title of כתאב אצלאח ואלחלאק[1] still awaits publication. Several passages in our editions of the *Tikkun middot hannefesh* could probably be corrected and rendered more intelligible through it, and the Arabic verses which the Hebrew translator has omitted, and which are cited in various chapters of the original as additional proofs of the subject to be discussed, may not come as an unwelcome new gift to the friends of Arabic poetry.

D. Rosin.

---

[1] Catal. *Uri*, p. 66, No. 358 (Munk, *Mélanges*, p. 168, note).

OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM IN JEWISH PHILOSOPHY.[1]

BOTH Jewish Theology and Jewish Philosophy—if we may adopt the customary sub-division of what is in truth one essentially whole, however diversiform, subject—start with Deity. As M. Munk has observed, Jewish thinkers, unlike those of India and Greece, did not concern themselves with the science of being, or with a metaphysical conception of the universe. They took the stream of thought, or its constituent elements, a little lower down, and explored the origin of things as related to our actual world and to humanity. Their speculation, in other words, took the course of the sacred *Tetragrammaton* from its original root, the invisible elements of abstract existence, life, breath, etc., becoming gradually concentrated into a general personal name of Deity. Indeed, as the chief Jewish thinkers from Moses to Maimonides regarded the creation out of nothing as the starting-point of the universe, they could hardly have been expected to explore still further back. How non-being could become being was a problem which, however suited to Hegelian transcendentalism, was far beyond the reach of the simpler metaphysics of Jewish thinkers; while the inquiry, what the Creator was doing before the Creation, was one which, though they might not have answered with Augustine's sarcastic severity, they at least thought idle and impertinent.

Of the problem of Good and Evil the starting-point in Jewish philosophy is therefore the Creation—the creation out of nothing—the creation by one Almighty Beneficent

[1] *Der Optimismus und Pessimismus in der Jüdischen Religionsphilosophie.* Von Dr. H. Goitein. Berlin: Mayer and Muller, 1890.

God—the creation pronounced to be in all its parts and products "very good." By this, however, we do not intend to deny that some form of Polytheism may have been a prior stage of Jewish speculation, or that, given such an hypothesis, the problem of good and evil might not then have had a different and wider scope; but as we have no data for the determination of such an issue, the starting-point of the problem for us must, at any rate, be monotheistic. Not only does it owe its birth to monotheism, but the whole subsequent history of the question—every separate stage in its development—is clearly governed by the initial standpoint from which it proceeded.

The great question, then, of Jewish thought—the grand crux of its speculation from its earliest energising—was the problem of Good and Ill—the reconciliation of the undoubted evil of the world with its supposed original perfection. The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil planted in the traditional Eden of Jewish antiquity has been the central tree in the broad and well-cultured field of all its subsequent speculation. As M. Munk well remarks: "Ce qui devait surtout préoccuper les sages des Hébreux, c'etait l'existence du mal dans un monde émané de l'être qui est le Suprême Dieu" (*Mélanges*, etc., p. 462). This characteristically Jewish theme has just received in the learned and remarkable monograph of Dr. Goitein—the title of which heads this article—a fresh and interesting treatment. We feel bound to call our readers' attention to it, as well for the subject as for its treatment. No more attractive and stimulating book on Jewish Philosophy has appeared in recent years.

Briefly, Dr. Goitein's book may be described as a succinct account of the problem of Good and Evil in Jewish speculation, from the Book of Genesis to the time of Maimonides —from the traditional Moses the First to the historical Moses the Second. He starts with the primary fact in Old Testament theodicy—the Creation, with its consummated result of goodness and perfection. Such a starting-point

was essentially optimistic, and this must be regarded as the general tendency — perhaps even the root-thought — of Jewish speculation. That it was afterwards qualified, thwarted, and variously deflected by pessimism does not affect the fact of its originating impulse. The course of philosophical thought does not, any more than the course of any other human principle, always run smooth, whether in the individual or in history. Certainly no commencement of human speculation regarded as such could be fuller of fair promise than this. For the time being the human universe is an Eden, full of goodly trees and flowers and fruit. Unhappily the stage proves transient and delusive. The ideal of the first chapter of Genesis is destroyed by the reality of the third. A serpent, subtlest of all the beasts of the field, lies coiled beneath the trees and flowers of Eden. Like the growth of boyhood in Wordsworth's ode, the progress of Jewish thought soon becomes infected with pessimism. The childhood, once careless, joyous and buoyant, becomes gradually moody and clouded.

> Shades of the prison-house begin to close
> Upon the growing boy.

Man's world proves to be not the abode of goodness, still less of optimistic perfection, except on the doubtful hypothesis that probation, deception, and failure are always good and desirable for its human denizens.

We need hardly say how often the problem thus enunciated, has been treated from every conceivable point of view, by thinkers of all ages and schools of thought. We do not, therefore, purpose to follow Dr. Goitein step by step through his lucid summary of the Biblical aspects of the question. Indeed, this portion of his treatise is confessedly only introductory to its main purpose, which is the consideration of the Problem of Good and Evil by mediæval Jewish thinkers, from Saadiah (892—942) to Maimonides (1135—1204).

We must, however, point out—what Dr. Goitein passes a little lightly over — that almost all the aspects and

issues of the problem find a place in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. Indeed, the question is one which is hardly capable of indefinite discussion. Its main facts are so deeply graven on human experience and history, and present such a uniform character, that the theories necessary to account for them must needs be limited. The problem emerges, as we have seen, at an early period of Jewish speculation. We find, moreover, a growing interest in its discussion throughout this portion of Jewish Literature. The question is started in a tentative, hesitating kind of way in the Psalms, and is solved in a manner which, however natural and becoming, is not wholly in harmony with human experience. The remedy for fretting against the ungodly, viz., the persuasion that "he shall soon be cut down as the grass, and be withered as the green herb," is doubtless in complete accord with an optimistic and ethical view of Providence, but cannot claim to respond to the teachings of experience. Indeed, it is admitted to be insufficient almost as often as it is urged. The Book of Job may be defined as a philosophical drama dealing with this very question, which, however, it leaves, so far as a solution is concerned, unanswered. We should, perhaps, allow that the interest of the book is not confined to its main theme, its incidental bearings and issues being more important than its direct plot. Chiefly to be remarked is its acknowledgment of the disciplinary value of evil and temptation, and the consequent admission that they are permitted by God for that very purpose. Evil is also assigned to a power separate from and antagonistic to that of God's unthwarted will, though this is a conception which disappears when the real argument of the book begins. But the most remarkable incidental outcome of the book is its sanction—ostensibly by the Divine verdict—of Job's defiant attitude and of his forcible condemnation of the ways of God to man. In point of fact the book is—as Kant well observed—a consecration of free critical inquiry into the ways of Providence, as well as a

justification of suspense when the outcome of those ways is uncertain, and of ethical indignation when they seem to favour what is evil. Optimism and Pessimism are herein brought from the region of dogma and authoritative assertion into the arena of human experience and ratiocination. The final decision is left undetermined, though the fact that Job's uncompromisingly pessimistic utterances are approved by Deity rather than the optimistic commonplaces of his friends must be accepted as an impetus to the course of Pessimism which was never afterwards lost sight of in Jewish speculation.

Still more determinedly pessimistic is Koheleth. Here we find a view of human existence—its faculties, uses, and destiny, inexpressibly sombre and dreary, oftentimes verging upon despair. Providence in the sense of Ethical Government is wholly denied. Deity takes no more active or sympathetic interest in human concerns than if he were—like the Gods of Epicurus—far removed in serene aloofness from all things terrestrial. Good and evil men alike are left uncared for and unnoticed, without hope of reward, without dread of punishment. Only one issue for men of ordinary instincts and tendencies is conceivable under the circumstances, *i.e.*, the reckless pursuit of pleasure and indulgence of appetite, while even this is accompanied with the dread warning of a satiety more loathsome than even the misery of the degrading impulse. Here the passage from Optimism to extreme Pessimism in Jewish Thought is complete. Instead of the Creator's award on his creation, it might almost seem that Koheleth had arrived at an entirely opposite verdict. Dr. Goitein here points out—though he does not lay the stress on the point which its importance deserves—how the growing belief of the Jews in a future life—a belief which synchronises in its development with the gradual extinction of their terrestrial hopes—intensified the tendency to Pessimism. It is not sufficiently remembered that the notion of a Future existence, so far from destroying or

impeding the growth of Pessimism, is—we will not say the outcome—but a congruous and associate conception of a pessimistic estimate of man's present life and surroundings. Indeed, the conception and *raison d'être* of heaven and future blessedness is commonly defended by arguments based upon Pessimism, and this is, we may add, only one of several Pessimistic elements closely inwoven into the traditionary dogma both of later Judaism and Christianity.

Coming to the Apocrypha, Dr. Goitein shows that the problem now begins to assume in its evolutionary course somewhat newer aspects, the general effect of which may be described as qualifying the extreme one-sided Pessimism, of which, *e.g.*, Koheleth is the exponent. The son of Sirach calls attention, for instance, to the relation of evil to human free-will—an important factor in the consideration of the question for the whole of its after development. He also insists on the purifying and strengthening influences of human trial and encounter with evil. His general conclusion is that, taken as a whole, the works of God must be pronounced to be good. A remarkable feature of the question at this stage of its progress was the result of the Hellenizing to which Jewish speculation at this period became exposed. The Greek denial of a future existence combined with what was its partial outcome, the disbelief of the Sadducees in the same doctrine, induced a reckless despair as to Providence, and the moral government of the Universe, as well as a practical Epicureanism which set at nought all distinction of good and evil. The effect of this Hellenizing in Jewish thought and usage is set forth in the first chapter of the First Book of Maccabees. It seems right to note this stage in the history of the question, because it was a reduction to practice of the unrestrained and cynical Hedonism advocated by Koheleth; but it must be remembered that in most questions of Jewish speculation Hellenization was a beneficent process, imparting breadth and variety to the discussion of opinions too exclusively dominated by theocratic and racial considerations. The

Apocryphal Book of Wisdom introduces a further and very important development of the question—one that has been adopted as its only possible solution by thinkers of varying races and creeds in every age of the world, *i.e.*, its dualistic or Manichæan solution. As the book is admittedly an outcome of Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, it is quite possible that this characteristic of it—like others of its features—may have its origin in Oriental sources.

And here we arrive at a very noted name in the history of this question—Philo of Alexandria.

Dr. Goitein has given four pages to the discussion of this great thinker, but he has not, in our judgment, sufficiently recognised Philo's importance in the development of the problem. For that matter, the great Alexandrian eclectic exercised an influence on subsequent Jewish speculation the extent of which has not yet been adequately estimated. He stands at the fountain head — though ante-dating it in respect of him—of that effort of mediæval Jewish philosophy which synchronises and corresponds with the method of the Motecallemîn in Arab philosophy and of Scholasticism in Christian thought—a common energy which might be defined as the reconciliation of Faith, or Tradition, with reason. A Jew by birth, training and instincts, Philo was saturated with Gentile culture of every kind. He had explored—from the favourable stand-point of Alexandria, then the cosmopolitan centre of the world's wisdom—the religious systems of the Far East and the philosophies of Greece and Rome. He was fully conversant with all the methods and arguments that had been expounded by these various systems on the problem of good and evil. Add to this that the texture of his intellect, as well as his own inclination, pre-eminently qualified him for forming a cautious, many-sided, and carefully-balanced estimate of the whole problem. Few thinkers were more largely endowed than was Philo with broad eclectic sympathies ; few were more skilled in applying solvents and diluents to every kind of difficulty his varied research

brought before him. If, *e.g.*, a narrative or statement in the Hebrew records staggered his historical conscience, Allegory or Analogy was a potent agency for dissolving or neutralising its effect. If a doctrine or tradition made too great demands on human credulity, Philo's immense reading and many-sided ratiocination could suggest parallels and explanations which, if not wholly adequate, served to modify its *prima-facie* strangeness; or if certain phenomena in the world conflicted with his sense of justice, he found little difficulty, by qualifying agencies of various kinds, to set aside or modify their ill effects. Great, indeed must have been the intellectual or moral dissonance which Philo could not convert into a fair semblance of harmony. Thus, on the problem of good and evil, his arguments and reflections are so varied and so potent, so judiciously disposed and speciously urged, that under his treatment the difficulties of the question seem almost to disappear. We must cull a few sentences on this part of our subject from Dr. Drummond's masterly monograph on Philo, especially as their Hellenic and philosophic tone is found largely reproduced by most subsequent Jewish thinkers who have discussed the question. Dr. Drummond is here analysing the second of Philo's treatises on *Providence* (vol. ii., p. 58).

The constantly-recurring arguments against Providence are mainly of two kinds. First, the existence of pain, which is inflicted by various natural agents, appears inconsistent with the supreme control of benevolent design. The violence of winds and rain, hail and snow, lightning, earthquakes and pestilence, wild beasts and noxious reptiles, inflict the most terrible calamities on mankind. In reply to this, several considerations are urged. First, in regard to the whole question of Providence, it must be remembered that the doctrine does not imply that God is the cause of everything; of what is really evil, or, what lies outside the course of nature, God is no more the cause than the beneficent law by which a virtuous State is administered is the cause of the violence and rapine which spring from the wickedness of the inhabitants. Secondly, of these natural agencies which are occasionally attended by calamitous results, some, like wind and rain, were not intended for the ruin of sailors and farmers, but for the benefit of the whole human race, for they purify the earth

and air, and so contribute to the support of animals and plants ; and if a few suffer it is no wonder, for they are an insignificant portion of that entire class of men for whose benefit providence is exercised. Again, some infliction of pain may be necessary to ensure the safety of the entire system. The man who takes a just view will rejoice at whatever is done without moral evil, even if it do not conduce to pleasure, and will regard it as designed for the preservation of the universe. . . . . Another consideration is that some destructive agencies are only accidental consequences of the primary design. . . . . In the same manner earthquakes, pestilences, thunderbolts, and similar things, though said to be sent by God are not really so, for God is the cause of no evil whatever. The changes in the elements produce these things, not as primary works of nature, but as consequences which follow the necessary and primary works. . . . . .

The suggestion of a moral purpose in pain leads to the second difficulty. If the world is righteously governed, why is pain distributed with such a startling neglect of moral considerations ? Why have the wicked an abundance of all good things, ... while those who pursue wisdom and virtue are almost all poor, obscure, in a low position, without the means of support, etc., etc. ? Why have a Polycrates and a Dionysius everything that heart can wish, while a Socrates is done to death by the plots of a worthless wretch ? . . . . . The first answer is an attempt to limit the extent of the problem. It does not follow that if certain persons are esteemed good by us, they are really so, for the means of judgment possessed by God are more accurate than those enjoyed by the human mind. . . . . Then we must remember that Providence takes a comprehensive view, and that the righteous could not be exempt from suffering without altering the whole constitution of things, or suspending the laws of nature for individual benefit. Having mortal bodies, we are necessarily exposed to human troubles. Bad men may plot against the good. If we are in pestilential air, we must suffer from disease. If the wise man is exposed to the rain he will be wet ; in the north wind he will shiver, in summer he will be hot. Those who live in places where crime abounds must submit to the penalty, and all who brave the wintry seas accept an equality of risk. The good man readily acquiesces in this condition, for the things which the wicked prize are not the highest objects of human pursuit or the sources of real blessedness. . . . . The wise man desires not wealth and glory, but the acquisition of virtue, and to penetrate to the audience chamber of royal Reason."

It is obvious that the tendency of the above extracts is not only optimistic but determinedly so, nor is the con-

nection of the arguments with the philosophies of Plato and the Stoics less obvious. Indeed, we may accept it as a general rule that Jewish philosophical thought, though starting from optimistic sources, when limited to its own traditions, records, and resources, becomes mostly pessimistic, and it is only when this stage in its evolution becomes interpenetrated and enlarged by Gentile learning that we are able to discern decisively optimistic leanings.

Some proof of this proposition is afforded by the Talmud. Although that motley collection of writings abundantly betrays a knowledge of Gentile literature and culture of every possible kind, its real basis and native idiosyncrasy is indisputably Jewish. Now, the tone of the Talmud as to human existence, with its good and evil, is undoubtedly pessimistic. Dr. Goitein has collected a number of passages in support of this fact, but these form but a small part of the overt statements and indirect allusions which might have been adduced in its justification. Special causes might, no doubt, be alleged for this, the chiefest of them being the depressed condition of the Jews in various parts of the Diaspora, the contrast of this with their former national prosperity, and the perpetual disappointment of their Messianic hopes. Dr. Goitein reminds us that in the disputes between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, only one controversial point emerged, the solution of which throws a light on the status of the Jews of that time. The question really was whether "life was worth living," or, as the issue was actually put, whether non-existence was not preferable to existence. The problem was determined in a way which, while revealing the Jewish tendency to pessimism, discloses the sensitiveness of the people—so emphatically marked throughout the Talmud—to the *practical* exigencies of life "It were better for men not to have been born," was the sage decision; "but, inasmuch as man was born, the next best thing for him was to attain the highest possible reach of his ethical religious ideal," a conclusion which might be recommended to the Schopenhauers and von Hartmanns,

the Heines and Leopardis of our time, as a common sense reconciliation of the abstract truth of Pessimism with the noblest energies and aspirations of mankind—a conclusion which puts wholly to flight their favourite philosophy of despair.

Passing over the aspects which the question assumed under Christianity, together with the Gnostic and other sects related to or sprung from it—their solution of our problem being mostly dualistic—we now come to Dr. Goitein's main theme—the treatment of the question of good and evil by Jewish mediæval thinkers.

Dr. Goitein has selected his representative thinkers on this problem with much judgment. He begins with Saadiah, who may here claim to be described as a leader in the Judæo-Arab revolt against traditionalism, which commenced in the ninth century.[1] We need not remind our readers that our knowledge of this remarkable man has received many and important accessions during the last half-century. His position with reference to our subject has been elucidated, among other writers, by Dr. John Cohn, and especially by the translation which that eminent scholar has given of his *Commentary on the Book of Job*, published last year, and which is a considerable improvement on the well-known translation of Julius Fürst, published in 1845. In addition to the careful perusal of Saadiah's writings, Dr. Goitein seems to have explored every source of information open to him on the subject of Saadiah's teaching, the result being a useful and fairly exhaustive treatment, to which future scholars will find it hard to add much of importance.

Saadiah, as Dr. Goitein truly presents him, is a Rationalist of the freest and most outspoken kind.[2] He belongs, indeed, to that highest type of philosophy which, in purest fealty to truth, regards suspense on doubtful issues as

[1] Cf. Steinschneider, *Judische Literatur;* Ersch u. Grueber, sec. ii., vol. xxvii., p. 393. Sec. 11, Der Kampf der Wissenschaft und Haggada.

[2] Cf. Frankel, *Zeitschrift*, iii., 404.

preferable to dogmatic determination. The chief cause of human error, he thinks, is the haste to dogmatise on dubious matters, which is, in philosophy, man's original sin. Saadiah's language on the subject reads almost like a translation of Thucydides' complaint, that men are always eager to accept ready-made opinion, instead of troubling themselves with independent investigation of truth. It is this unseemly haste to accept dogmas, perhaps unproved and unprovable, which leads men wrong, and, therefore, their error must be attributed, not to God, but to their own listlessness and ignorance. Dogma implies infallibility, but the man who desires to possess infallible certainty desires to be Deity, for only Deity possesses absolute, as distinct from acquired, knowledge. Saadiah likens ignorance to darkness; they are privative co-relatives of knowledge and light. Dr. Goitein, who is fully conversant with the general literature of his subject, is aware how largely this privative conception of evil was shared by the Christian fathers, as well as by philosophers in general. He points out that its adoption by Saadiah and similar thinkers was dictated by Monistic considerations, just as John Stuart Mill remarked that the conception of Satan and an independent sovereignty of evil was essentially Polytheistic. But Saadiah's Monotheism does not avail to save him from Pessimism of a type more or less akin to that of Koheleth. With the growth of human wisdom increases, *pari passu*, human sorrow, because the perversion and defects of things are more clearly discerned. The apportionment of good and evil seems to him unfair, the aggregate of human joy being more than counterbalanced by the totality of human sorrow. So essentially evil is this life that its final cause for the godly seems to be chiefly that it is a vestibule or ante-room to the life to come.

Saadiah, however, evades with considerable dexterity the natural outcome of his pessimism, *i.e.*, the incrimination of the Creator's omnipotence or goodness. His various methods of attempting this we have no space to detail.

His general plan is to shift the incidence of evil from the Creator to the creation, but he often has recourse to *à priori* reasoning. Thus he argues that the divine activity cannot be charged with injustice, because evil is caused by fear, or by desire, or by ignorance; but, inasmuch as God cannot be influenced by these, he cannot be charged with unrighteousness. The form of the argument is more significant than its substance. It is an example of a scholastic mode of ratiocination, which finds frequent analogies in the writings of Jewish and Arab thinkers of the time, and serves to prove how widely the methods of scholasticism governed all learned speculation during the Middle Ages.

Not a little of the difficulty surrounding the problem of human good and evil has been owing to the theory that the earth was the centre of the universe, so that man, its noblest denizen, became the final cause of all creation. In the youth of astronomy and geology the conception was plausible. What was true of the sun, moon and stars was, *à fortiori*, true of the productions of the earth. All things being estimated from a merely human standpoint, what seemed good for man thereby became good in itself. Similarly what was bad for man was regarded as inherently bad. Nothing could be simpler than such a human teleology, but it could have only one legitimate issue, viz., pessimism. Nor was this the worst of its results; it demanded a perpetual strain on the witness of reason or human experience. Maimonides, as we shall find, saw the difficulty, and rejected the theory which gave it birth, but Saadiah adopted it, and it forms a strong motive influence in the genesis of his pessimism.

The relation of human free-will to evil Saadiah interpreted in the only way which both preserves the divine justice, and harmonises with the facts of human existence. Like the Mutazilites in Islamism, he vigorously opposed the predestinationism which formed the first article both of faith and practice in the creed of the majority of Mahomet's followers, and made, during the Middle Ages, large and

repeated incursions into Jewish and Christian thought. No doubt the evil which results from human free-will must, in a world governed by divine omnipotence and goodness, assume a certain permissive aspect in relation to that government, and with all his determination to keep the Deity free from imputation of evil, Saadiah is compelled to allow this. Such evil is, however, permitted or ignored wholly for man's sake; it is an unavoidable result of God's goodness, or of man's freedom of choice. It can no more be ascribed to God than the outcome of any righteous act or beneficial law, which incidentally may have ill effects, can be ascribed to the *intention* of the doer or lawgiver. We are able, indeed, to see both here and elsewhere that Saadiah has the less scruple in allowing free scope to various human evils on account of his doctrine of a future compensatory existence.

Man, according to Saadiah, is not only free. It is his high prerogative to be endowed with reason, without which freedom would be only a snare. Human reason is a divine gift inherent in the race, and is both prior to, and independent of revelation. The function of revelation was not to abrogate or set aside man's own reasoning powers, but to supplement them. For example, revelation was not needed to teach men the difference between good and evil; that they would have attained without it. Its object was to *hasten* men's conception of it. Saadiah's standpoint in this particular resembles that of Raimunde of Sabieude, and his doctrine of the law of God being secondary to the law of nature. We may regard it as one method, among others, by which human reason, in Judaism and Christianity alike, attempted to break through the chains of the traditionalism and ecclesiasticism of the Middle Ages.

The extent of Saadiah's pessimism is in great part proved by his stress on future existence. In view of this final restoration of all things he has no difficulty in allowing and accounting for most of the inequalities and

perversions of justice to be found in the world. The pain and early death of children, *e.g.*, which Plato acknowledged to be an injustice needing rectification, Saadiah accounts for by the recompense of a future world. Dr. Goitein remarks on the additional difficulty of accounting for the sufferings of children which beset the creeds of Judaism and Islamism, by reason of their non-acceptance of the doctrine of original sin; and he is so far justified in connecting that doctrine with a disregard of children's ills inasmuch as those Christian divines who have held original sin most strongly, have also adopted the most inhuman theories as to their eternal doom. In contrast with the *decretum horribile* of Calvin and Augustine, it is refreshing to note Saadiah's milder judgment as to the fate of children even of wicked parents. Thus he maintains that the death of the Midianite children, and of those who perished in Noah's deluge—involved, as they were, in the wholesale destruction of their parents—can only be reconciled with justice by assuming their recompense in a future world. We may accept this plea on behalf of innocent sufferers, whose fate awakens little notice or sympathy among Christians, as a tribute to Saadiah's enlightened rationalism, or to his humane sympathies, or probably to both combined. Indeed, it would seem that Saadiah carried those qualities still further in the same direction, for, following the lead of the Mutazilites, who pursued the doctrine of future life compensations to unusual extremes, he held that dumb animals were entitled to a recompense in an after state for their manifold sufferings here.[1]

---

[1] This question was discussed by Proclus, Ennead iii. book ii. chap. xv., and answered by the supposed need of the continuous existence of carnivora. This is but another form of the poet's description of Nature :—

"So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life."

The objections to this cheap solution are twofold—

1. The organisation of the carnivora might have been different, like that *e.g.* which Isaiah assigns them at the Messianic Millennium, when "the lion shall eat straw like the ox."

It would be easy to point out inconsistencies in Saadiah's solution of the problem of Good and Evil. To name two instances :—in his effort to remove evil out of all relation to Deity he assigns it an independent existence. Thus when he says " Sin is not sinful because God has forbidden it, but God has forbidden it because it is sinful," the separate existence of evil is avowed, in contradiction to what he elsewhere urges as to its privative nature. Another contradiction of the same character is found in his doctrine of the Eternity of hell-torments. But with all deductions for incongruities, which, indeed, seem to be inherent in the nature of the subject, Saadiah's discussion of the problem may claim to be a fair and *bonâ-fide* attempt to grapple with a serious and difficult question. While he labours, in due fealty to the traditions of his creed, to preserve the Supreme Being from every direct impeachment of evil, or even of imperfection, he is not less sensible of the claims of all sentient beings on the divine justice and clemency. He is more impartial than some of his successors, less comprehensive than others; but Dr. Goitein shows that he has a claim to be heard on this question, and our brief summary of his teaching seems sufficient to establish that claim.

The next thinker on Dr. Goitein's list is Joseph Ibn Zaddik (1070—1149), who deals with the question of Good and Evil in his ספר עולם הקטן *Book of* (*the*) *Microcosm.* Ibn Zaddik is as zealous as Saadiah in affirming the general perfection of the Universe, and preserving the Creator from every causal or direct relation with evil. Like Plato, he identifies Deity with *the good,* and seeks to prove

---

2. The other objection may be suggested by Mrs. Browning's lines :—

" It had
Not much consoled the Mastodons to know
Before they went to fossil, that anon
Their form would quicken with the elephant;
They were not elephants but Mastodons."

Aurora Leigh.

that the creation, as well as the moral law, is the outcome of goodness. His conception of the material world as an embodiment of goodness seems to have the effect of making him ignore its material ill; he is more awake to the human evil which results from man's free will and its relation to the Creation and the original significance of the Universe. Man's chief faculty is, however, not volition in itself, but volition regarded as a part of his reasoning energy. It is this that constitutes his supremest power. The perfection of man's reasoning energy, compared with his other intellectual faculties, Ibn Zaddik ascribes to the theory (related to if not derived from Neo-Platonism) that the material (stuff) of the reasoning soul is a pure "light-stuff" (one is reminded of the "mind-stuff" of the late Professor Clifford), which came immediately out of the hand of the Creator. The defects of our sublunary world in opposition to the Reason world, עולם השכל, are rendered possible because they are attributable, though only indirectly, to God. Evil has its source in the defect and incapacity of the human or other created agents to realise the perfection designed by the Creator. This incapacity, which is infinitely varied, has, however, its use. It is the cause of the manifoldness of created things, which contributes to the beauty of the whole—a thought which Ibn Zaddik may have derived either from the Stoics or the Neo-Platonists. The relation of the Divine Prescience to moral evil he explains in the usual way by denying to the foreknowledge any compulsory effect. He makes one luminous contribution to the solution of the problem by maintaining that the highest good of man is not to be sought for nor found in Happiness. He finds it in the training of man's intellect towards perfection—in the pure knowledge of the primary source of all things—which is man's noblest intellectual and spiritual achievement. Without a *philosophical* knowledge of God, men, spite of their good deeds, are mere idolaters. Wisdom is the only source of goodness, and man was created that he might attain wisdom. This moral

principle, which Dr. Goitein labels *geistesaristokratisch*, stands in close relation with Ibn Zaddik's pessimistic estimate of life, according to which all happiness is in its very nature illusory. Pain is inseparable from pleasure, which is, indeed, only a temporary cessation of pain. Pleasure or happiness cannot, therefore, be the supreme good, to which, indeed, it bears no direct relation. This life is only of use so far as it is an entrance-porch to the life beyond. The effort of the wise man should be directed to despising, denying, and trampling on this life, for when a man comes to know what this world is he will hate it, and strive only for the life to come.

With this estimate of human life Ibn Zaddik has little concern in reconciling discrepancies between virtue and happiness. In his creed virtue—by that understanding self-abnegation, and asceticism—is in part its own reward, and partly is the virtuous man's title to future blessedness. The mode of future retribution we, as sensuous beings, cannot comprehend. It does not admit of our conceptions even of space and time, and is hence, as Dr. Goitein truly remarks, akin to the Buddhist Nirvana.

Ibn Zaddik's teachings are evidently similar, as Dr. Goitein admits, to those of the Neo-Platonists in ancient, and of Schopenhauer in modern times. As we have seen, he unites an optimistic estimate of the design of the world from the standpoint of the Creator, with a pessimistic view of human life. In this he resembles not a few Christian, as well as various Jewish and other Gentile thinkers. The incongruity of such a theory will always pertain to every scheme of thought which makes a chasm between theology, and, in its highest sense, anthropology.

Both Saadiah and Ibn Zaddik were largely influenced in their consideration of the problem of Good and Evil by Gentile philosophers; one main characteristic of Jehuda Halevi, the poet philosopher—who occurs next on Dr. Goitein's list—is that he takes up an attitude of antagonism against non-Jewish culture. He considers the question

from the standpoint of Revelation. But his method is fundamentally sceptical in the sense that the thought of Montaigne, Bishop Huet, and so many more, is sceptical. Human reason is regarded as absolutely weak and helpless, and can attain to no truth except by divine aid. Such is Jehuda Halevi's theory; in practice, however, he is compelled to allow a certain discriminating power to reason, for "both the articles of the Jewish creed and the precepts of the law contain much that transcends man's reason, but nothing wholly opposed to it." Hence any apparent defects in the rule of the Universe must be ascribed not to the Creator's defective wisdom, but to man's defective vision. So far, the teleology of Jehuda Halevi hardly rises above the level of commonplace. Much of it is of the same kind as, *e.g.*, Paley's *Natural Theology*, but in his reconciliation of his starting point with the facts of nature or human history, he develops some interesting speculation. Thus, while insisting on the obvious meaning of the lion's teeth and claws, and the spider's web, he cannot shut out the other aspects of those instruments. "Is it right," he asks, "that the hare should serve as food to the hyæna, and the fly to the spider?" And can we legitimately ascribe to Deity as just what our conscience pronounces unjust? At this point, however, he falls back on the innate feebleness of the human reason, which, of course, peremptorily decides not only this, but any similar objection.

But with all his effort to limit the rule of the Universe to the direct causation of God, Jehuda Halevi cannot avoid recognising phenomena which cannot thus be accounted for. These he ascribes (i.) to the free play of chance, in the operations of Nature; (ii.) to the original constitution of formless matter, from which all physical forms are derived. He seems aware that these independent entities involve a dualism in relation to the government of the world, but acquiesces in an explanation which, if not inevitable, is the best which the frailty of the Reason has to offer. To the unlimited

potentialities of matter, and the manifold operations of nature, he ascribes the variety discernible in the Universe, but these he considers, like Ibn Zaddik, to add to the beauty of Nature regarded as a whole.[1]

We have already noticed incidentally how the seeming defects in the government of the world were emphasized for Jewish thinkers by the dispersed and down-trodden condition of the chosen people. This is the especial example of injustice which prompts and sustains Jehuda Halevi's pessimism. He, however, manifests considerable skill in finding arguments and analogies which permit him to infer a glorious and retributive future for his people in the advent of the Messiah.

Dr. Goitein points out anew the significance of Jehuda Halevi as a thinker who resolutely opposed himself to extra-Jewish culture at the very time when Arab philosophy was prostrating itself more and more abjectly before the shrine of mediæval Aristotelianism. His successor in Dr. Goitein's list illustrates the influence of Aristotelianism in Jewish thought. Abraham Ibn Daud, of Toledo (1110-1180), considers the problem of evil not from the standpoint of Jewish scripture or tradition, but from that of the Stagirite—in other words from the general point of view of the later Greek Philosophy.

The speculations of Ibn Daud on our subject need not detain us long. Starting from a Hellenic rather than from a Jewish standpoint, he is not anxious to preserve the Divine goodness and omnipotence by an implied denial of evil. On the other hand, he regards evil, especially material evil, as a positive, pronounced and unquestionable fact. At the same time it must not be ascribed to Deity. Its true source is matter—original formless matter—which he defines, in true Aristotelian fashion, as the potentiality or

[1] That creative energy cannot be conceived without manifoldness is, it may be pointed out, a favourite thought of Goethe, and occurs repeatedly in his works. Cf. *e.g. Wahrheit und Dichtung* Book viii., and the "Prolog im Himmel" of *Faust*.

possibility of existence. Imperfection may therefore be a growth or effort towards perfection; in other words, evil may be good *in the making*. Indeed, there is a struggle—a *nisus* in all imperfect beings—not for mere existence, but for higher existence—for the realization of their several potentialities—in St. Paul's words: "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain." At the same time the Creator did not intend that all beings should alike arrive at their highest development; that all plants, *e.g.*, should become animals, all animals should become men, and all men angels. In such a case Nature would suffer from a surplusage of goodnesses (*Ueberfülle ihrer Güter*), and perish piecemeal as a thing that is over-ripe. It is to the infinite variety in the final attainments of created beings that we must ascribe the manifoldness which constitutes so much of the beauty of Nature regarded as a whole. Dr. Goitein reminds us that the same idea is found in Greek (Plato), Arabic (Ibn Sina), and modern (Spinoza) philosophy. Accepting this hypothesis, Ibn Daud has no difficulty in contending that the aggregate of evil is less than the whole sum of good, and that what may appear evil, considered in itself, may claim to be accounted a good, when regarded relatively to the whole creation. Besides, man possesses by means of his free will a power to ward off, or even turn to good, the evil by which he is personally affected, so that even his incidental personal evil may be merged and lost in the sum-total of his lot.

It is instructive to trace how Aristotle's principles and method govern the whole of Ibn Daud's thought. He proves, *e.g.*—in exact contradiction to the traditional thought of his co-religionists—that God could not be the author of good and of evil, because two opposite predicates could not be ascribed to the same subject. So when he speaks of the properties of various evils, vices, etc., he regards them as privative deflections from their true standard; in other words, his method has obvious reference to the Nicomachæan Ethics and the doctrine of the Mean.

The general result of Ibn Daud's teaching on our subject may be defined as a qualified optimism, the nature and scope of which seems fairly described by Dr. Goitein, "The world is as good and perfect as the nature of its matter permits it to be."

With Maimonides—the glory of Jewish speculation in the Middle Ages—Dr. Goitein arrives at ground more widely known and better cultivated. Moses Maimonides has, indeed, long passed from the domain of Jewish thought to the larger arena of European philosophy, and it involves no detraction from Dr. Goitein's clear and able treatment of him to say that he is not able to add much to our existing knowledge of that great thinker's speculation on the good and evil of the Universe.

Maimonides is characterised in this as in all his thought by comprehensiveness of scope, immensity of erudition and a luminous, well-balanced intellectual method. The problem, as he regards it, forms a part of the general moral phenomena of the Universe—the relation of man to his environment; in other words, to that varied collection of processes and facts which we collectively designate under the term Providence. It is connected with the Creator and the nature (*ex nihilo*) of his creation; it has close affinities with the data of consciousness and the experimental fact of man's free-will; it has relations to other sentient beings besides man; it includes the probabilities or potentialities of other planets and heavenly bodies besides our own. The problem must be elevated above the mere human and terrestrial standpoint from which it has mostly been contemplated; it must be considered and decided, so far as possible, in all its bearings and applications, not by a selected and exclusive few. He, therefore, brings to bear on the question all the resources of his encyclopædic learning. With the testimony of the Jewish canonical writings and the commentaries of the Rabbis he joins the evidence of the Greeks, especially of Plato and Aristotle, and the philosophic culture of the

Arabs. The general conclusion at which he arrives on the question of good and evil may be again defined as a qualified Optimism. His theory of creation *ex nihilo* deprives matter of the independence and eternity claimed for it by Aristotelians, but implies a certain amount of permissive agency. This, however, is discounted by the assumption that evil, in the metaphysical sense of the word, is only relative and privative. Existence is the unessential characteristic of Deity; non-existence, on the other hand, constitutes the very *being*, if the paradox be allowed, of evil. This theory is not an unusual one. It has formed a feature of more than one prominent Theodicy. Perhaps its most remarkable expression in modern times is that given it in Goethe's *Faust*, where Mephistopheles declares his nature:—

> "So ist denn alles, was ihr Sünde,
> Zerstörung, kurz das Böse nennt,
> Mein eigentliches Element."

Maimonides endeavours to found it on the celebrated text, Isaiah xlv. 7, "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil," where the two verbs create are forms of ברא which most Jewish philologists, at least of a former day, agreed to accept as implying a creation out of nothing. The evil that pertains to material and terrestrial things is thus in its nature privative and accidental; it cannot be predicated of spiritual beings and worlds in other portions of the Universe. And this argument brings us to one of the most striking features of the the great thinker's treatment of this subject. No one who has given the least attention to the question can have failed to notice how much a rational solution of it has been hampered by the theory that man is the sole final cause of the whole creation. Maimonides rejects this petty teleology wholly and decisively. Just as he refuses to limit the scope of the problem to man, as if there were no other sentient beings on the earth or in other parts of the Universe, so he distinctly varies the issue as to the relation of the earth to the planets or other stellar bodies. Writing

some centuries before the Copernican theory had equalised the relation of the earth with its fellow planets, his opinions have a prescient significance. He seizes the astronomical aspect of terrestrial phenomena with much of the dexterity and cosmic enthusiasm of Giordano Bruno. Our sublunar world may probably be the sole birthplace and abode of evil, and the stars may haply be designed as the abodes of spirits of varying degrees of perfection, or as homes of retribution for earth-born mortals. Dr. Goitein compares on this point some verses of Haller's poem, "Ueber den Ursprung des Uebels," a translation of which we subjoin :—

> Perchance this earth of ours—a grain of tiniest sand
> That floats in the ocean of heaven—is Evil's Fatherland ;
> The stars, mayhap, are abodes of souls translumed to light ;
> And as here injustice reigns, there sways the rule of right.
> Thus we who have learned the world from this earth-atom small,
> Judge but by a fragment torn from its place in the mighty All."

It is obvious how much of the whole ground of the problem is covered by this rational standpoint, and how many of its incidental difficulties disappear by its application. As man is not the sole end of the creation, so the object of human existence—man's *summum bonum*—is not the gratification of the senses, nor the possession of earthly blessings, but the perfecting of his spirit—the knowledge of God, and the love of God which proceeds from that knowledge. It is the intelligence or human reason that forms the connecting link between God and men, and it is this higher knowledge that is the guarantee of man's immortality.

The doctrine of Providence as enunciated by Maimonides is similarly based upon rational principles, and has a decidedly lofty and ennobling character. It may be briefly described as the interdependence and reciprocal connection of the world-reason on the one hand and the human reason on the other, which connection is the closer the more perfect the individual reason may be. According

to this theory the man whose reason abides continually with God enjoys his unceasing protection. Prophets and righteous men are never beset by misfortune, except when apart from God, and the greatness of their trouble stands in a direct relation with the duration of their God-forgetfulness, and the unworthiness of the earthly object to which they surrendered themselves. . . . The special Providence which frees men from the sea of chance is the effect of that spiritual connection. The righteous sometimes lose this, the wicked have never shared it. It hardly needs pointing out that this conception of the *rôle* of Providence does not differ from that maintained by Job's friends; but as Dr. Goitein shows, this stress of Maimonides on misfortune as a material objective fact is elsewhere qualified, as in his criticisms on the Book of Job, by the more reasonable hypothesis that the evil is especially subjective and spiritual, in harmony with the Stoic principle that material evil as such cannot affect the good man.

In contrast with his predecessors among Jewish thinkers, the alleged disproportion between virtue and happiness does not come to the front in Maimonides' speculation. Dr. Goitein, with his usual insight, points out how his ignoring of any such issue agrees with his doctrine of the Divine attributes; for if no positive qualities can be ascribed to Deity, or if his alleged goodness and righteousness differ from those of men not only in degree but in kind, the misfortunes of the godly, nay, even the existence of evil itself, cannot come into contradiction with these attributes. It must be admitted on the whole, that with all his confessed breadth of view and his desire to exonerate the Creator from the partial perfection or positive evil of his creation, Maimonides is not successful in an attempt which will probably always transcend human effort. Dr. Goitein summarily asserts that "he falls on the one side into an ethical and practical Pessimism, and on the other into a metaphysical Dualism," and few who have gone over with critical insight the ground of the *Guide to the Perplexed,*

or Dr. Goitein's own luminous epitome of his teachings, will venture to question that verdict.

Our space is, however, exhausted, and we have only room for a few general remarks on Dr. Goitein's very able, and, so far as we have been able to test it, wholly trustworthy monograph. He seems to us to have raised a literary memorial of unquestionable value to the breadth, profundity and general high worth of Jewish mediæval speculation. Though the ostensible theme is the question of Optimism and Pessimism, it is, while peculiarly a Jewish theme, one that has manifold side issues and ramifications into other departments of philosophical theology. Every reader of Dr. Goitein will be prepared to admit that, many-sided as the question is, it is not more so than the attempts of mediæval Jewish thinkers to arrive at its solution. Unlike Buddhism, Islamism, or Zoroastrianism, Jewish speculation recognises *every* aspect of the problem. This is at once a proof of its comprehensiveness and of its profundity. Perhaps we may say that no other qualities than these are commensurate with the nature of the question. The Universe, with its myriad-fold aspects and qualities, does not readily lend itself to an exclusive Optimism, to a one-sided Pessimism, nor even to a dogmatic and definitive estimate of their relative proportions. Dr. Goitein's work has thus a twofold utility. In addition to its historical and expository value, it incidentally sets forth the only fair method of treating a subject of profoundest interest to humanity. The maudlin disciples of despair, to whom the one-sided pessimism of Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann has given birth, will find in Dr. Goitein's book an antidote, if not altogether to their conclusions, at least to their feeble, short-sighted and wholly unphilosophical methods of arriving at them.

JOHN OWEN.

BIBLICAL STUDIES.

I.—The Last Chapter of Zechariah.

I HAVE discovered, I believe, an episode hitherto quite unknown or unnoticed in the Persian post-Exilic period of Jewish history, which, coming to me as a surprise, I propose to submit to competent critics for examination. The first three Kings of Persia, Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes I. (ארתחשסתא), treated the Jews favourably. Cyrus gave the exiles permission to return from Babylon and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. Darius encouraged them in the work of restoring the ancient fane, which took twenty years to complete. Artaxerxes I.'s marked cordiality to Ezra and Nehemiah, enabled them to vanquish the foes of Jerusalem, and to raise the commonwealth of Judæa from its prostrate condition to one of comparative prosperity. All these circumstances intensify our surprise at the opposite policy Artaxerxes III. pursued towards his Jewish subjects. When this monarch, surnamed Ochus, conducted a campaign against Egypt, he carried away a portion of the inhabitants of Judæa into captivity. Some of the exiles he settled at Hyrcanium, on the Caspian Sea; the rest in Babylon. Syncellus, the Byzantine writer, to whom we are indebted for an account of this persecution, states that it was originally derived from Greek writers, of whom the chief was probably Diodorus Siculus, in that book, of which only a fragment is extant, where he speaks of the Jews.[1] Syncellus' immediate source was certainly

[1] *Syncellus*, p. 481, 10. Ὄχος Ἀρταξέρξου παῖς εἰς Αἴγυπτον στρατεύων μικρὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν εἴλεν Ἰουδαίων, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἐν Ὑρκανία κατῴκισε πρὸς τῇ Κασπίᾳ Θαλάσσῃ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, οἱ καὶ μέχρι νῦν εἰσιν αὐτόθι,

Eusebius' chronicle, which we unfortunately no longer possess in the original. Its notice of this Jewish Exile has, however, been preserved by Jerome and the Armenian Translation. Jerome quotes from Eusebius to the following effect: "Ochus Apodasmo[1] Judæorum capta in Hyrcaniam accolas translatos juxta mare Caspium conlocavit" (*Olympiad*, 105). The Armenian version, recast into Latin, reads similarly: "Ochus partem aliquam de Romanis[2] Judæisque cepit et habitare fecit in Hyrcania juxta Mare Cazbium." Other historical evidence, which will presently be given, also shows that the Jews suffered under the last Persian kings. Strange as this persecution appears, still stranger is it that it is not mentioned in the Book of Chronicles, which was composed after this period. One of the prophetical books, however, contains, I fancy, a reference to it. This conjecture I will now submit to a critical examination.

All critics and commentators have hitherto regarded the last chapter of Zechariah as a continuation of the preceding two chapters, with which it is supposed to form one integral prophecy (Ch. xiii., vv. 7-9, belong to ch. xi., and are, of course, excepted). On the ground that the existence of the royal house of David is assumed in chaps. xii. and xiii., and even the prevalence of idolatry in Palestine is implied in ch. xiii., these two chapters—and ch. xiv. with them—have been assigned to the pre-Exilic period. But this intimate connection between the last chapter of Zechariah and the two preceding chapters presents serious difficulties.

1. The twelfth chapter contains only a fugitive reference

ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἱστορούσιν. The whole account of the transportation of the Jews and of their stay in their lands of exile till Syncellus' time, must have been derived from "the many Greek writers" to whom he refers at the end of his book.

[1] *Apodasmo Judæorum capta* is unintelligible. Perhaps we should read: *Ochus Artaxerxes urbe Judæorum capta.*

[2] *De Romanis* is meaningless. The original may have read *de Idumæis*, altered by the translator into *Romanis.*

to the siege of Jerusalem. The fourteenth describes it in all its dreadful details. The city is captured; the houses are destroyed; the women dishonoured; the wealth of the capital becomes the invaders' spoil, and one-half of the inhabitants are carried away into captivity. If both chapters refer to the same event, the prophecy should have begun with the description of the siege, given in ch. xiv., which is far more dramatic than the short sentence, "I shall make of Jerusalem a cup of confusion for all the nations."

2. The faint resemblance between these two prophecies vanishes on a close examination. The former prophecy predicts, indeed, the siege of Jerusalem; but adds, however, that the city will sustain no injury. It will become "a burdensome stone for all the peoples; all that burden themselves with it shall be sore wounded." This means, in plain words, that Jerusalem will successfully withstand the efforts of its foes to capture it. The second passage, however, says that the capital will be conquered, and describes the dire results of such a catastrophe—the reckless destruction of property, the violation of women, and the exile of a portion of the inhabitants. How can utterances so different have been linked together in one prophecy?

3. In ch. xiv. the boundaries of the land are very narrowly circumscribed. The northern extremity only reaches to Geba of Benjamin. The passage runs as follows:

Living waters shall go out of Jerusalem. . . . All the land will be surrounded (by them), as Araba (the bed of the Jordan) from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem."[1]

---

[1] Ch. xiv. 10, has been quite misunderstood by ancient and modern exegetists, who have taken it to mean that the situation of the country will be changed. So Rashi, following the Tosefta, Ewald, and all the recent commentators. The ancient versions, however, the LXX., Peshitta and Targum correctly render יסוב,—a passive form—"it will be surrounded." The meaning of the verse then would be: The whole land, from Geba in the north to Rimmon in the south, and as far as the south of Jerusalem and Rama (Cp. Joshua xv. 32; xix. 7; Nehemiah xi. 29), will be surrounded, like the bed of the Jordan, with living waters which will flow out of Jerusalem. ראמה the LXX. rightly renders Ῥαμά the name of

Geba, not far from Michmash, was nine Roman miles (thirteen kilometres) north of Jerusalem; Rimmon was fifteen miles (twenty-two kilometres) distant from the capital in a southerly direction. According to Eusebius' *Onomastica*, perhaps the limit would reach a little further south, to Rama. This was the entire extent of Judæa when this prophecy was delivered. It corresponds pretty closely with the area of the country after the return from Babylon (Nehemiah xi. 25, *seq*). Before the Captivity, however, and immediately after the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel, the land of Judæa had a larger circumference (2 Kings xxiii. 9). The boundaries assigned to Judæa in this prophecy, therefore, clearly point to the post-Exilic period.

4. Chapter xiv. predicts that the desecrators of Jerusalem will be punished by a plague; a remnant, however, will escape, and will make an annual pilgrimage to the Holy City to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles, in fellowship with the native citizens. Here we are given to understand that this festival was already celebrated by all the people of Judæa in solemn communion as a national institution. But this was far from being the case before the exile. The Book of Nehemiah tells us that, under Ezra for the first time, and, as a result of his instruction and exhortation, did the people erect booths on the Feast of Succoth. For, "since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun, unto that day, had not the children of Israel done so" (Nehemiah viii. 14-17). The passage in Zechariah referred to cannot, therefore, belong to pre-Exilic times. It must have originated in an age later even than that of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the precept to "dwell in booths" came to be generally observed.

---

a place. It refers to רֵאמֹת נֶגֶב (Joshua xix. 8 in some codices). In both passages the word is spelt with an א. A verb it cannot possibly be. Zech. xiv. 10 is to be connected with verse 8. They prophetically describe how the living water which will go forth from Jerusalem will surround the *whole* land, from Geba in the north to Rimmon and Rama (Ramath-Negeb) in the south.

5. Another argument leads to the conclusion that this chapter belongs to post-Exilic times. In the description of an earthquake, which would be sent as an omen of the relief of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, and would be followed by the universal recognition of Israel's God, the sentence occurs, "And the Lord, my God, shall come, and all the holy ones with him"[1] (Zech. xiv. 5). The "holy ones," who are to accompany God, can here and in all the Scriptures of the exilic and subsequent periods, only refer to angels. (See Job v. 1; xv. 15; Prov. ix. 10; xxx. 3; perhaps Ps. lxxxix. 6 and 8; in Dan. iv. 10, 14, 20, the angels are termed the "holy watchful ones.") It is now fully accepted that the figure of God, surrounded by a host of angels (Dan. vii. 10) was borrowed from the Persians, who gave their God of Light an escort of ministering spirits (Amesha-Spenta). This phrase too, then, indicates a late period for the fourteenth chapter.

The last chapter in the Book of Zechariah was, therefore, composed in the post-Exilic period. This hypothesis alone will explain the marked differences between it and the two chapters that immediately precede it. Those chapters, which assume the continuance of the House of David and the prevalence of idolatry, certainly belong to the period before the Exile, while the last chapter belongs to the period after it.

If, then, it is admitted that these two chapters have no connection with the last, which is to be assigned to an epoch later even than that of Ezra—on the ground that it speaks of the Feast of Tabernacles as an institution firmly rooted among the people, and universally observed by them —the exact date of this last chapter remains to be fixed. It must coincide with a time when the conquest of Jerusalem, and transportation of a portion of its inhabitants was considered imminent. For it is clear that the prophecy can neither refer to the conflict between the Jews and the

[1] The LXX., the Syriac version and the *Targum* read כל קדשיו עמו, and not עמך.

Samaritans, nor to the reigns of the first Persian kings, who were notoriously well disposed towards the Jews.

The prophet has a vision of a terrible catastrophe that is about to befall Judæa. He announces, at the same time, that its people will not all be carried into captivity. God himself will intervene with signs and wonders, which will convert the remnant of the nations who attack Jerusalem into true believers and fellow-celebrants of the Festival of Succoth. The narrative of Artaxerxes III.'s persecution of the Jews, and their partial banishment, determines the date of the prophecy.

This king, who, from a dread of usurpation, had executed all the members of the Persian royal house, and whom the Egyptians had contemptuously nicknamed "the donkey," threw off his lethargy, and set about strengthening the weak points in his extensive empire. Under his father, Artaxerxes II. (Mnemon), the satraps had governed their provinces with a slack hand, and public morals had also become loose. Egypt, with the aid of mercenary Hellenic leaders and traitorous satraps, had shaken off the Persian domination, and was again ruled by native sovereigns—Achoris, Nectanebo I., Tachus, and Nectanebo II. Against this last king, Artaxerxes Ochus undertook an expedition, with a number of warships, and an army consisting of 300,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry. The various nationalities of his Asiatic empire, which extended to the confines of India, and the Greek cities and confederacies, all contributed their quota of troops. With these forces he reconquered Egypt, and reduced Phœnicia and Cyprus to submission. Diodorus Siculus describes this expedition in detail (xiii. 40), and gives its date as the second and third year of the 107th Olympiad (352-351 B.C.)

During this war Artaxerxes Ochus made Jewish prisoners, whom he re-settled in Hyrcanium. So Syncellus, or rather Eusebius, quoting the Greek historians, tells us in his chronicles. The campaign, commencing with the reduction of Phœnicia, and concluding with the subjugation of Egypt,

took place in the neighbourhood of Judæa. Paulus Orosius, who lived about a century after Eusebius, resided, like that Church Father, for some time in Palestine, and collected in 410 A.C., the history of ancient times, remarks that the Persian king's malevolence towards the Jews became manifest after his victory over the Egyptians.[1] We cannot, indeed, conceive it otherwise. While engaged with Egypt, Artaxerxes would hardly have troubled himself about Judæa. Only after the complete subjugation of the former land would he have turned his attention to the latter country.

What was the cause of his animosity against the Jews? About this we have no definite information. The people of Judæa, with their small extent of territory, would hardly have joined the Phœnicians and Egyptians in their revolt against Persian supremacy. The persecution possibly originated in an attempt to coerce *them to violate* their religious institutions, which was resisted.

Ctesias says that Artaxerxes II. introduced, as an innovation, the adoration of the Goddess of Pleasure (Anaitis-Anahida). Departing from the ancient customs of his country, he ordered that statues of this goddess should be set up and worshipped, not only in all the principal towns of Medo-Persia, but also in those of the annexed provinces, like Damascus and Sardis. Artaxerxes III. did not abolish this cult; for while the Persians of the fifth century, as Herodotus their contemporary tells us, had neither statues of their deities, nor temples, nor altars, their descendants in the next century possessed images of the twin-gods, *θεοὶ συμβώμοι*, Anaitis and Omanos, and a common altar dedicated to their service. Artaxerxes III. gave his support to the idolatry which his father had introduced.

[1] *Paulus Orosius, historiarum adversum paganos*, libri VII. (iii. 7). "Tenit etiam Ochus, qui est Artaxerxes, post transactum maximum diuturnumque bellum plurimos Judæos in trans-migrationem egit atque in Hyrcaniam ad Caspium mare habitare præcepit, quos ibi usque in hodiernum diem amplissimis generis sui incrementis consistere, atque enim quandoque erupturos opinio est.

Now, Pseudo-Hecatæus reports that the Persian kings tortured Jews, and put some of them to death, to force the nation to renounce their ancestral faith. These efforts proved abortive. This Jewish-Alexandrian writer cannot have invented this passage, he must have read it in some historical document. Only Artaxerxes II. and his son, Artaxerxes III., can here be intended; their predecessors were favourable to the Jews. The persecution probably only took place in the reign of the latter—Artaxerxes Ochus—who had the opportunity during his Egyptian campaign of observing the inhabitants of Judæa. Pseudo-Hecatæus possibly exaggerated the length of the persecution, and made it extend over several reigns, when it was really confined to one reign. At all events, there is sufficient data for accepting the narrative of the hostile treatment of the Jews by Artaxerxes in his Egyptian campaign.

Let us return to the prophecy at the end of the Book of Zechariah. It must have been delivered, orally or in writing, a considerable time after the epoch of Ezra and Nehemiah, and we are justified in assigning it to this reign. The prophet anticipated a deplorable fate for Jerusalem. He feared that the various nationalities who marched with Artaxerxes would gather round Jerusalem, capture and spoil the city, destroy houses, outrage women, and lead away half the inhabitants into captivity. He deemed it his duty to calm the people's minds by assuring them that the conquest of the capital would not involve the ruin of Judæa, nor the extinction of Judaism. The impending calamity was sent by the God of Israel, and would be followed by a universal conversion to Israel's faith: signs and wonders, testifying to God's power, would bring this result to pass. The majority of the besiegers would be destroyed. A remnant, however, would escape, acknowledge Jehovah as the one and only Sovereign of the Universe, and worship him under that name.[1] This rem-

[1] Zechariah xiv. 9. יהי אחד ושמו אחד, a phrase only occurring in this.

nant would celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles in communion with the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Another proof that ch. xiv. of Zechariah belongs to Artaxerxes III.'s reign is the exceptional favour it accords to Egypt. The Egyptians are not counted among the nations who will attack Jerusalem, and will, therefore, not share in their punishment. This agrees with events under Artaxerxes Ochus. Egypt then enjoyed independence under Nectanebo, Egyptian troops did not march with the Persian hordes. As it had no part in the humiliation of Jerusalem, it would escape the penalty to be exacted for that offence, and would celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles in brotherly communion with the Jews. This prophetic passage should be assigned, accordingly, to the period of Artaxerxes III., and thus would confirm the narrative of that king's persecution of the Jews, given in other historical sources, which, in their turn, throw a flood of light upon this prophecy. The terrible fate, however, which the prophet had predicted for Jerusalem did not befall the capital. Some of the inhabitants—probably only distinguished families — were removed to Hyrcanium and Babylon. Levites were probably also banished about this time, as ch. xii. of Nehemiah seems to indicate.

This chapter furnishes a list of priests, beginning with Joshua, the son of Jozadak, who returned from Babylon, and ending with Jaddua, who officiated in the days of Darius Codomanus. The record covers a period of 200 years—538-338 B.C. Twenty-two other priestly families are further enumerated. Next, a complicated account of the Levitical families is given in three divisions מחלקות Singers, Gate-keepers, and Servitors. The same chapter

---

prophecy, is apparently intended to convey the idea that the principle of Monotheism was recognised by other peoples ; by the Persians, under the name of Ahura-Mazda ; and by the Greeks, in the post-Socratic period, under the name of Zeus. In the future, however, the converted nations would know and worship the one God as Jehovah, the name by which he was adored in Judæa. This will be the only name of God in general use.

says (ver. 22) that the heads of the priestly families were recorded from the time of Eliashib till Jaddua, *i.e.*, to the reign of Darius. The Levitical families, on the other hand, were only "written in the Book of the Chronicles till the days of Jochanan, the son of Eliashib" (ver. 23)—not down to the time of Jaddua and Darius. What does this difference import? Is not the inference a fair one, that the list of Levitical families was not as complete as that of the priestly families, because the former were banished, or had left the country of their own free will?

The following point, too, deserves attention. When the chronicler enumerates six generations of high priests, in their order of succession, down to his contemporary Jaddua, he gives a similar list of David's descendants, also in six generations, from Zerubbabel, who returned from exile with Joshua, the High Priest, to the representative of the royal seed in his own day (1 Chron. iii., 19-23). On the other hand, the Levitical families are only recorded to the time of the High Priest Jochanan, though the Chronicler shows as much partiality for them as for David's seed, and far more than for the families of the High Priests.

We can only account for the omission on the hypothesis that Levitical families, stricter observers of the Law than the families of the High Priests—as was made abundantly manifest during Ezra and Nehemiah's agitation against mixed marriages—were exiled by Artaxerxes Ochus, and transported to Hyrcanium on the Caspian Sea, during Jaddua's term of office, or in the last years of his predecessor, Jochanan. Between Artaxerxes' victory over Egypt, followed by the partial exile of the Jews in the year 351, and the war of Darius, the last Persian king, with Alexander the Great in 333, an interval of eighteen years elapsed. The Chronicler composed his tri-partite work—Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles—between 338, the year of Darius' accession, and 333, the date of the Perso-Macedonian War. During these years the High Priest Jaddua officiated under the Persian sovereignty. The Chronicler felt

that it would be irregular to include in his book the names of contemporary Levitical families, as the list of the heads of "the Levites" did not go further than the generation of Jochanan.

At first, it strikes one as strange that the Chronicler passes over in silence the partial banishment of his people, which occurred, too, in his day. But the difficulty vanishes when we consider the tendency of the Chronicles. The Chronicler's aim was not to write history. He does not mention one of the many noteworthy events that must have happened in the century after Nehemiah's death. He even passes over so tragic an incident as the fratricide in the Temple by a member of the High Priest's family. His interest centres mainly on three subjects: *The Royal House of David* (whose accession to the Messianic throne he awaited); *the Temple and its Ministrants;* and, finally, *the Genealogies* of the families that had kept free from Gentile alliances. Among the numerous episodes of post-Exilic times, he only selects three for recital; the erection of the Second Temple; the restoration of the ancient service; and the onslaught of Ezra and Nehemiah on foreign marriages. He omits to mention the building of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim, is satisfied with a bare reference to the banishment of Sanballat's son-in-law, though he was the son of a High Priest, and does not even trouble himself to give the name of the exile. All this will serve to diminish our surprise at the Chronicler's silence concerning the partial exile under Artaxerxes Ochus.

The omission in Josephus is stranger. He gives an account, in the Eleventh Book of his Antiquities, of the feud between the High Priest, Jochanan, and his brother, and its consequences under another Artaxerxes (*i.e., not* Artaxerxes I.). His history of the period, then, goes back as far as the year 359. Why does he not recount the sufferings that Jerusalem endured eight years later? This question, too, admits of an answer. Josephus's authority for the post-Exilic period was the "Apocryphal Ezra," an

ancient translation of a portion of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, with additions, partly legendary, which Josephus accepted as historical. His copy of Ezra went further than ours, which breaks off in the middle of a verse (ch. viii. 13). From this apocryphal work, Josephus derived his accounts of the quarrel in the family of the High Priest; of Sanballat; Manasseh, his son-in-law; Nikosa, Manasseh's wife; and of the building of the Samaritan Temple on Gerizim. Concerning none of these points does the Canonical Book of Nehemiah give a hint. If this apocryphal book reached only to Artaxerxes II.'s reign, the historian may have remained in ignorance of the subsequent events that took place under Artaxerxes III. The account of the transportation of inhabitants of Judæa, among them possibly Levites, by Artaxerxes III. to Hyrcanium and Babylon in 351, may therefore be historical. It is confirmed by the fact that all the sources state that those exiled to Hyrcanium settled on the Caspian coast, and that their descendants still live there.

I leave it to specialists in Biblical criticism and exegesis to determine whether the last chapter of Zechariah does indeed refer to the persecution of the Jews at this period.

II.—The Central Sanctuary of Deuteronomy.

The assumption, as far as I know, has hitherto been uncontested, that the Book of the Law discovered within the Temple, by the High Priest Hilkiah, in the days of King Josiah (and which occasioned the thorough-going reforms by that king), was the Book of Deuteronomy. Even the Talmud concedes this point. It states that the king was seized with fear when the newly-discovered book was read to him, and that it led to a change of opinions on his part, because the punishment of a king was therein predicted. This very threat of punishment occurs in Deuteronomy: "The Lord will transport thee and the king whom thou shalt set over thee amongst a nation unknown to thee."

As a result of this uncontested assumption, it is inferred that the Book of Joshua belongs to the same series, and that it is only a continuation of Deuteronomy; for in it is related how Joshua carried into effect the various precepts enjoined in Deuteronomy—the ordinance publicly to proclaim the blessing and the curse on Mounts Gerizim and Ebal respectively (Deut., ch. xi. 29, and ch. xxvii. 12; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 33); the ordinance to write the contents of the law on stone "plaistered over with plaister" (Deut. ch. xxvii. 2; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 32), where this law is actually called Deuteronomy, משנה תורת משה; the ordinance that an altar should be erected of unhewn stone near Shechem, in order that sacrifices should be offered up thereon (Deut., ch. xxvii. 8; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 30); the injunction to read the law before the whole nation, and in the presence of women, children, and strangers (Deut., ch. xxxi. 11; cp. Joshua, ch. viii. 33); lastly, the injunction that the Levites should own forty-eight towns together with the precincts (Num., ch. xxxv. 7), which was also performed by Joshua. In fact, the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua are pervaded by a similar spirit, and are composed in the same style. The tendency of the latter book is to prove by facts that the ideal state depicted in Deuteronomy, as the consequence of obedience to the law of love of God, and of the unity of worship, was realised under Joshua, the result being that the people gained easy victories and conquered the land of Canaan.

The Book of Joshua, as an integral continuation of Deuteronomy, was considered by biblical critics as the sixth book of the law, which was therefore named the Hexateuch. This designation is, however, by no means appropriate. The book contains nothing of the chief subjects of the Pentateuch, namely Law, Instruction, and more particularly nothing of the law revealed to the people through Moses. But this is a side issue. Great stress is laid both in Deuteronomy and Joshua on one point which has not as yet been treated in its fullest importance, and

upon which it is the object of this essay to throw light. In both books reference is made to a future central sanctuary which was at the same time intended as the rallying point of the community. About twenty times in Deuteronomy mention is made of a locality to be chosen by the Lord, where he would permit his name to be sanctified. To this place were to be brought the sacrifices and tithes; there the festivals were to be observed, and judgments pronounced. To what topographical spot does this refer? Until now it has been assumed that both the books contained a veiled allusion to Jerusalem, as though this town had been predestined (before the entry into the land) to be the only Holy City. But this assumption is an error, and has only led to a misconception of the tendency of the two books.

In Deuteronomy it is commanded that, after the crossing of the Jordan, the tribes should erect an altar on the mountain near Shechem (it is for the moment unimportant whether Ebal or Gerizim was here meant), that they should bring thither live offerings and peace offerings, the latter of which they should eat in gladness (ch. xxvii. 5, 7). Thereby one of the heights of Shechem became consecrated as a place for worship. If Jerusalem had been referred to as the central sanctuary chosen by the Lord, it would have been in contradiction to this passage (ch. xxvii. 5), and would point to a rival place, whereas repeated allusion is made to the unity of worship.

If Jerusalem had been the chosen spot, then it would have been impossible to make offerings elsewhere, even at Shechem, and this not even once, on the occasion of the entry into the land.

In addition, it is related in Joshua (ch. viii. 30) that an altar was actually built on a mountain near Shechem, and that burnt offerings and peace offerings were brought there. We can here compare the ordinance regarding a place, which was still to be selected, with the one in which a height of Shechem is specially commanded for the

purpose.[1] These parallels clearly suggest that the height of Shechem was not only intended to be used as an altar for burnt-offerings on the one occasion of the entry into the land, but as the rallying spot for all times. In confirmation of this, it is related in Joshua (ch. xxiv. 25, 26) how the leader had made a treaty in Shechem with the inhabitants, how he inscribed the exhortation given by him in the "Book of the Law," and how a large stone was put up under a tree, which stood in the "Sanctuary of the Lord." This stone was to be considered as a memorial. From this it is incontestably evident that the altar referred to by the author of Deuteronomy, and spoken of in Joshua as having been actually erected, must have been the sanctuary in Shechem, and must have been considered as a *lasting sanctuary.*

If, then, a sanctuary was erected in Shechem, no allusion could have been intended to Jerusalem, as the one precludes the other.

If, according to Joshua, the town of Shechem, because of the sanctuary in its vicinity, became the actual central point of the land, as it is averred in Deuteronomy, it was a matter of course that Joshua, when near his end, should summon the elders of the tribes, and the chiefs to Shechem, and there exhort them, and at the same time make a solemn treaty with them (ch. xxiv. 1). In the Book of Joshua, moreover, Shechem is always considered to be the centre. Before this, and whilst the land was being sub-divided, Shiloh was regarded as the centre point (Joshua, ch. xviii. 1; ch. xxii. 12). There stood the Ark of the Covenant, which, however was not a place for sacrifices, nor was it intended for this purpose. Herein lies a harmonising tendency. It is an historical

---

[1] Deuter. xii. 5-7:—המקום אשר יבחר ה' .... והבאתם שמה עלתיכם וזבחיכם .... ואכלתם שם .... ושמחתם

Deuter. xxvii. 4-8:—ובנית שם [בהר עיבל] מזבח לה' אלהיך ... והעלית עליו עולת ... וזבחת שלמים ואכלת שם ושמחת

fact that Shiloh had previously been, and continued for some time to be, the central point, where stood the Ark of the Covenant until captured in the wars with the Philistines. This historical fact could not be ignored in the Book of Joshua. Consequently it was only after the entry into the land, and because the Ark of the Covenant was kept at Shiloh, that this town became a holy meeting-place for worship! And yet Shechem is said to have been designated as the central point, and to have actually been consecrated for that purpose.

This contradiction the Book of Joshua wished to eliminate by the assertion that Shiloh was only the resting-place of the Ark of the Covenant, and a provisional meeting-place in the beginning; whilst, on the other hand, Shechem was chosen as the *permanent* centre after order had been established, because it was in the immediate vicinity of the sanctuary. The distinction conferred upon Shechem both in Deuteronomy and in Joshua was, in fact, a mere desiderium. As, however, it is stated in the latter book that the choice of the town was a historical fact, it became necessary to explain the relations existing between Shiloh and Shechem.[1]

Kleinert, the champion of Deuteronomy, has justly remarked that this book contains no trace of an allusion to Jerusalem, but he is wrong in his other assertion that the position of the place to be chosen by the Lord "was not definitely decided, but was left in uncertainty." From the foregoing it will be seen that the place was clearly designated as "a mountain in the neighbourhood of the town of Shechem." It is also intelligible why in Deuteronomy the mountains around this town have a special purpose,

---

[1] It is to be noted that the site of the Ark of the Covenant was not in consequence considered as a central place for worship. David had appointed a place for the Ark of the Covenant in Zion, but the spot was not thereby constituted as a place for offerings; Solomon did not offer sacrifices in Zion, but in Gibeon, because that was the great high place (1 Kings iii. 4).

and why in the Book of Joshua this purpose is carried into effect, Gerizim being appointed for the announcement of the blessing, and Ebal being intended for the proclamation of a curse. Why should just this mountain near Shechem be chosen? Why should not that of Zion or Moriah, near Jerusalem, be selected for the blessing? Because it was intended to fix the central sanctuary in Shechem.[1] For the same reason these mountains are described with minute detail. "They lie on the western side of the Jordan, near the oaks of Moreh." As a matter of course Gerizim, the mountain from which the blessing was to be proclaimed, was also named as the spot on which an altar should be built, and which was chosen by the Lord, and where, according to Joshua, an altar was actually erected. The substitution of Ebal for the intended locality was effected during the time of animosity between the Judæans and Samaritans. Mount Gerizim was to be chosen as the central place for worship. It certainly seems surprising that in these two books, Jerusalem—otherwise characterised as "the Holy City," "the City of God," and where the magnificent temple of Solomon is called the "Pride of Jacob"—should have been degraded in favour of Shechem, and a simple altar on Gerizim. But this point belongs to the radical reforms which Deuteronomy desired to introduce. It cannot be denied that the prophets in the time of

[1] Owing to the Greek translator, this circumstance has remained obscure. It seemed to him a contradiction that Shechem should be a centre as well as Shiloh. He therefore altered the text, and (Joshua, ch. xxiv. 1) ויאסף יהושע שכמה is given as εἰς Σηλώ; so too (xxiv. 25) וישם לו חוק ומשפט בשכם is translated ἐν Σηλώ, with the addition ἐνώπιον τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ. As, however, in the following verse another sanctuary is spoken of which could not have been in Shiloh, the translator omitted the words במקדש, and again put ἀπέναντι κυρίου. In this manner the contradiction was to be eliminated. On the other hand, the Syrian translation in all these verses has שכם, as also has the Vulgate. In the Complutensian and Aldine edition similarly Συχέμ stands in place of Σηλώ. This variant is used because of the Hebrew text, for originally Shilo must have occurred in the Septuagint as the Vetus Itala also has "Silo."

King Josiah felt a deep abhorrence for Jerusalem and its temple on account of the abominations perpetrated there. The prophet Zephaniah calls Jerusalem the polluted and corrupted city (ch. iii. 1), because her rulers "resemble roaring lions, her judges ravening wolves of the desert, and her priests desecrate the sanctuary and falsify the law" (ch. iii. 4).

Deuteronomy refers in words of the curse to the revolting deeds prevalent at that time. Idol worship, contempt for parents, removal of landmarks, miscarriage of justice towards strangers, widows and orphans, these were the least sins; the moral turpitude went so far as to permit the indulgence of sodomy, secret murders, and the bribing of judges. Further, there were sacrifices of children in the vale of Hinnom. Jeremiah cried, "Search through the streets of Jerusalem and see in the broad places thereof if ye can find one man that executeth judgment and that seeketh the truth" (ch. v. 1). A psalmist of the time complains of Jerusalem, "I see oppression and hate go about in the city; they surround her walls, and from her streets deceit and falsehood do not depart" (Ps. lv. 9, 10). The temple was utterly desecrated, altars for star-worship were placed in the fore-courts and even in the inner parts of the temple, and an image of the vile goddess Astarte, named סמל, was erected and attended by temple wardens; even the priests of Aaron were so corrupt as to take part in horrible idolatry. There were also foreign priests (Khemarim), who probably initiated the others into the rites of idol worship.[1] Therefore, Jeremiah places in the mouth of the Lord these words respecting Jerusalem: "For this city hath been to me as a provocation of mine anger and of my fury, from the day that they built it over unto this day" (Jer. xxxii. 31). In the eyes of these prophets, Jerusalem and the Temple were vile on account of the

[1] 2 Kings ch. xxi. 3; ch. xxiii. 4-12; Zephaniah, ch. i. 4; Jeremiah, ch. vii. 30, 31.

abominations performed there. Ezekiel received a prophetic direction to hold up to Jerusalem the mirror of her evil doings, and the reader feels a shudder at the description of such depths of moral and religious degradation (Ez. xvi. and xxii.). Of Jerusalem, during this period, we can say with Isaiah: "How has the faithful city become a harlot"; and with Ezekiel of the Temple of Solomon: "It has become like unto a sink." The later prophets, Jeremiah, and even more so Ezekiel (who spoke after Josiah's regeneration of his kingdom, and who had witnessed its retrogression into its former corrupt condition), prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, and in fact of the whole country, because of its irreclaimable vices. Zephaniah, who spoke before the regeneration of the kingdom, cherished optimistic hopes of an improvement. He lived in expectation of a complete revolution (such as the invasion by the Scythians), in which the degraded and haughty nobles would be destroyed, and only the poor and lowly would be spared. This remnant would not use force, would not utter deceit and falsehood, and therefore would be protected by God, and Zion would be cleansed from the wicked, and would once more rejoice (Zeph. iii. 8-17). According to Zephaniah, Jerusalem still had a bright future.

The book of Deuteronomy points to another solution of Zephaniah's optimism and Ezekiel's pessimism with regard to the future of Jerusalem. It was not expected that a favourable change would occur in the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but as the result of a radical reformation; Jerusalem, which was thoroughly corrupt, would cease to be the capital, and the polluted temple would no longer be the place of religious worship. In its stead would be Shechem and Mount Gerizim. There the altar should be erected for peace and burnt-offerings (no other offerings were to be permitted); there the tribes were to assemble on the festivals, and together with the poor were to partake in joyous gladness of the burnt-offerings

and tithes, and there the chief judge or priest of the tribe of Levi should hold judgment. A king was to be installed, but one who was worthy, who would be humble and not fond of pomp, and who would take the new book of the law as his guide.

Now, as Joshua, after the conquest of the land and according to the directions of Moses his master, had erected an altar on Mount Gerizim, it thereby (having been chosen by the Lord) became consecrated to the Lord. The Deuteronomist hoped for a thorough-going improvement from the fact that the sanctuary was to be removed from the sin-laden city of Jerusalem and from its desecrated temple, especially as effect was to be given to the new Book of the law which Moses imparted to his people shortly before his death, and delivered into the keeping of the Levites, and which imposed nothing difficult of execution.

If the nation was to continue to exist, it was necessary that Jerusalem should be deprived of its pre-eminence. This is decidedly the tendency of the Book of Deuteronomy. Jerusalem and Moriah were to be degraded, and Shechem and Gerizim to become the central place for worship. This is the fundamental idea of Deuteronomy and its appendage the Book of Joshua. Ezekiel followed on precisely the same lines. In the restoration predicted by him, all the tribes were to have equal territories. Dan in the north and Gad in the south; between these the remaining tribes, and in the centre Judah and Benjamin. The capital and the sanctuary were to be in the middle of the land, in the midst of the country, unlike Jerusalem, which was situated in the south. This arrangement shows that the prophet did not incline to the view of a restoration of Jerusalem, and that he knew Shechem was destined to replace it. The centre, between the northern boundary, in a line with Damascus, and the southern boundary in a line with the southern point of the Dead Sea; this was the centre where in the future the capital, to be named Yahveh-Shamah, and the sanctuary were to be placed. These points

were to meet in the central zone of the district of Ephraim. Like Ezekiel, the Deuteronomist desired that the polluted and desecrated city of Jerusalem should be degraded.

He impressed on King Josiah to give up Jerusalem, and to make Shechem the capital. By this means an improvement might take place, and the fall of the whole country be averted. This project was not entirely Utopian. The territory which had formerly belonged to the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim, and which had been the chief possession of the kingdom of Ten Tribes (Shechem-Samaria), had in consequence of the Scythian invasion, been freed from Assyrian tribute. Josiah seems also to have claimed it as his heritage, for he refused to the Egyptian King Necho a passage through the plain of Jezreel, whereby he met his death near Megiddo. Josiah, therefore, had considered Shechem as his possession. Further, the town, on account of its position and fertility, was far more suitable as a centre than Jerusalem. If the Book of Deuteronomy designed to substitute Gerizim for Moriah and Shechem for Jerusalem, the author of the book could not possibly have been a priest of Jerusalem, nor the High Priest Hilkiah, as it is highly improbable that such a man would have written *contra domum.* Least of all could the author have been Jeremiah, who, despite the corruption of the capital, still hoped that through an improved state of things Jerusalem and the temple would continue to exist (Jer. xvii. 24-27; xxxi. 38-40). It is more likely that the author was one of the sons of Zadok, who took no part in the idolatrous horrors of the temple, and were, therefore, deposed from their office from the time of Manasseh until Josiah's reformation (Ez. xliv. 15). In Ezekiel, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, those sons of Zadok are called *Levitical priests,* in contradistinction to the foreign priests, who were not of the tribe of Levi. It was only these Levitical or Zadokite priests that were considered in Deuteronomy to be worthy to carry the Ark of the Covenant (Deut. ch. xxxi. 9; Joshua, ch.

iii. 3-6; ch. iv. 10), whilst in Numbers it is not the priests but the Levites of the family Kehath, who are appointed to carry the ark. To these Levites who had remained faithful, the Book of Deuteronomy was intrusted (ch. xxxi. 25, 26). The king was to have a copy made of the book in their possession (ch. xvii. 18), so that it could only have been compiled for them and their circle. The High Priest, Hilkiah, who found the book in the Temple, certainly did not belong to the Zadokite priests, as he officiated without scruple in the desecrated temple. He had no conception of the overwhelming nature of its contents when the book was discovered. With the changed site of the sanctuary, a change in its attendants was to take place, for thus only the imminent fall could be averted. Instead of the priests who had taken part in the abominations in the temple of Jerusalem, and who had thereby become defiled and debased like the foreign priests, and also instead of the sons of Abiathar, the sons of Zadok were to officiate in the transferred sanctuary. The Levitical priests were to be the guardians of the sanctuary. Ezekiel borrowed this means of improvement from Deuteronomy.

To these worthy priests, sons of Zadok, Deuteronomy prescribes a simple mode of life. For the priests of those days owned fields, as is shown for example in the case of Jeremiah's cousin (Jeremiah, ch. xxxii. 7), and probably also in the case of other priests of Anathoth, who did not belong to the Zadokites, and who hated the prophet because he censured their abuses. The gifts from the people to the Levites would be very meagre. They consisted in inferior pieces of the sacrifices and a small part, *not the tenth*, of the grain, wine, and oil harvest, nor of the wool-shearing, nor the first-born of the flock, nor the better portions of the sacrifices, which had doubtless been assigned to them by the ancient Pentateuchal Laws. It appears that Deuteronomy is intended to react against the excessive number of sacrifices and against the luxurious display of the temple,

or even against a temple at all. The place for worship on Mount Ebal (Gerizim) was simply to consist of an altar of unhewn stone. Whether it was intended that a closed space or house should be near the altar is not clearly expressed; only once is a "house of God" mentioned (Deut., ch. xxiii. 19), and this may only have been a figure of speech for a place of worship.

The Ark of the Covenant, which contained the books of the law, was to be made of shittim wood (ch. x. 1-3), without being covered with gold, or with a gold lid, as if to show that the Deuteronomical Law laid weight on simplicity and the avoidance of ostentation in the projected form of religious worship. Thus Deuteronomy, too, contains no word with reference to the splendid garments of the priests, on which such great stress is laid in Exodus and Leviticus.

Considered from this point of view Deuteronomy appears as a work marked by unity of purpose, wherein the various component parts—historical reminiscences, exhortations, and ordinances—cohere, and dovetail into one another. Any attempt to tear these component parts asunder betrays a want of comprehension of the true tendency of the book.

H. GRAETZ.

PARSIC AND JEWISH LEGENDS OF THE FIRST MAN.

In a former article I pointed out the instances wherein the Persian legends on Yima and the primal man and woman Meshia and Meshiâne used the Biblical account of the first eleven chapters of Genesis as their basis. I now proceed to trace the occasions on which the Persian traditions were drawn upon in Talmudical-Midrashic utterances.

We must again treat the Yima and Meshia legend conjointly, for, as Windischman[1] rightly remarked, "Gayomarth with his development as Meshia and Meshiâne is the primal man in the theosophic shape of the Zarathustric system; Yima is the primal man of the old Erânic legend, which, however, had to change according to the system, although the paradisian state is found also here."

I proved the accuracy of this statement in my essay on the subject in question[2] by comparing the Zend texts and Bundehesh with each other. The resemblance of the two heroes is so manifest that we may trace back their close relationship to a common source of cosmogonic conceptions. Naturally it stands to reason that the common features have some incongruities in proportion to the different shades of thought even within the boundaries of Indo-Germanic circles of ideas. How much more must their comparison with the Jewish conception produce a discrepancy in the shaping and colouring of the legendary Adam. The Persian account corresponds nevertheless substantially

---

[1] *Mithra, ein Beitrag zur Mythengeschichte des Orients*, p. 76.

[2] *Zeitschrift der D. M. G.*, vol. xxv., p. 69 ff.

with that in the Talmud and Midrash, only that we must needs consider the strange ideas borrowed from Parsism in the light of a particular Jewish point of view. This borrowed idea had to undergo many changes in order to become an integral Jewish property; it had to be stripped of its strange garment, and to be clad in Jewish robes. The polytheistic or dualistic diction underlying the idea had to be purified sevenfold before it was regarded worthy of being acclimatised, and, in the hands of the teachers of the Haggada, made pliable enough to be read into, or deduced from the holy text.

But coming to the point, a comparison of the different original texts will show, more than any introduction can, the agreement or disagreement of the two conceptions.

A. The Yima Account.

I arrange the points to be compared in the following groups:—

1. Yima's constant *epitheton ornans* in the Zend texts[1] is "Khshaêtô," the *shining one*. He is also called, *par excellence*, "Çrîrô," the *beautiful*, or "Quarenanhaçtemô," the *sunny*, or "Hvaredareçô mashyânãm," *he who gazes on the sun more than any other man*. And being radiant with sunbeams, he is named Yamshid.[2] In a similar manner the Haggada dwells on a lengthy description of Adam's beauty, lustre and brightness. "The beauty of our ancestor Jacob was that of the primal man."[3]

"As R. Benaah arrived at the cave of the primal man a heavenly voice was heard saying, 'Even if thou beholdest the image of my face thou canst not see my face itself.'"[4]

---

[1] Cf. *Vendidad*, II., 20, 23, 31, 43; xix. 132; *Yaçna*, ix. 13; *Yt*, 5, 25, 98; 15, 15; 17, 28; 19, 31, 35; 23, 3.

[2] Cf. *Journal Asiat.*, xi. p. 154 ff. and p. 279.

[3] *B. Mezia*, 84*a*; *B. Bathra*, 58*a*, and to it the commentary of R. Samuel ben Meir.

[4] *B. Bathra*, l. c.

The comparison is taken from the sun, as in the passage referring to Yima. Hence we understand the other saying of R. Benaah[1]: "I have seen the two heels of Adam; they resemble two spheres of the sun."

"Eve's beauty is said to have been in proportion to that of Adam as an ape's beauty is to that of man."[2] Adam was radiant with brightness, for "in the light which was created on the first day he saw from one end of the earth to the other[3]"; and Adam is, therefore, called "the light of the world."[4]

2. Like Yima,[5] Adam was destined to be the propagator of the Law. "R. Jehuda, son of Simon, said, Adam would have been worthy of being entrusted with the revelation of the Law."[6] But, as with Yima,[7] Adam also became unfit for this mission. "If thou couldst not exist with the six commandments I have given thee, how shouldst thou exist with the 613? said God."[8]

3. Like Yima, again,[9] Adam is said to have cultivated the soil. "Every region where Adam, according to God's commandment, settled, was cultivated.[10] God seized Adam, carrying him around the earth, and telling him here should be a plantation, here a corn-field, and thus it is written: 'A land that none passed through, and where no man dwelt,'[11] was cultivated by Adam."

4. Yima, before he succumbed to sin, was destined for immortality. "For on account of his reign men and cattle were immortal, waters not drying up, trees not withering, eatable food inexhaustible. In Yima's wide government there was no cold, no heat, no age, no death, no envy created by the Devas."[12] This golden epoch of prosperity

---

[1] *B. Bathra*, l. c., see also *Levit. Rabba*, ch. 20. [2] *B. Bath.*, l. c.

[3] *Chag.*, 12*a*. [4] *Jer. Shabb.*, II., 5*b*; *Genes. Rabb.*, ch. 14.

[5] *Vend.*, II., 8. [6] *Gen. Rabba*, ch. 20.

[7] *Vend.*, II., 10. [8] *Gen. Rabba*, l. c.

[9] *Vend.*, II., 13. [10] *Berach*, 31*a*; *Sota*, 46*b*. [11] *Jerem.* ii. 6.

[12] *Yaçna*, IX., 16, 17, 18.

and bountiful gifts is described also in other passages.[1] A similar picture is presented in Jewish sources. Adam's pre-determined immortality is asserted in the following account[2]: "The verse,[3] 'Art not thou from everlasting, O Lord my God, mine holy one, we shall not die,' is to be referred to Adam before eating of the fruit; had he not eaten it he would never have died, but, having transgressed thy commandment, thou didst bring death upon him." "Should any one ask, If Adam had not committed sin how was he to live for ever? then do you answer that Elijah, who did not sin, lives indeed to eternity."[4]

"Why was death pronounced upon Adam? I have commanded him do a little thing, and he did not consider it."[5] "The strength that the holy one bestowed upon Adam would have lasted for ever; as he, however, forsook the purpose of the holy one, and followed the advice of the serpent, 'Thou changest his countenance and sendest him away.'"[6]

That before Adam's Fall Nature's gifts had been bountifully bestowed is taught as follows: "Although the world was created for plenitude, this was diminished with the Fall of Adam."[7]

5. In regard to the Fall of Yima we are told,[8] "As he began to make use of lying speech, the untrue one, the Majesty fled from him visibly. And no longer seeing the Majesty, Yima the supreme, the shining one, with good assembly, ill-humoured cast himself toward the bad thinker, horrified he fell down on the earth." So Adam's fall was caused by falsehood, "The expression 'Neither shall ye touch it'[9] is to be compared with the words[10] 'Add thou

---

[1] *Ram yt*, 16; *Ashi yt*, 29, 31; *Zamy. yt*, 32; *Gosh yt*, 10, and other places.

[2] *Exod. Rabb.*, beginning of ch. 38. [3] Habak. i. 12.

[4] *Levit. Rabba*, ch. 27. [5] *Shabb.*, 55*b*; *Erub.*, 18*b*; *Ab. Zara*, 8*a*.

[6] *Gen. Rab.*, ch. 21, with reference to Job xiv. 20. [7] *Gen. R.*, ch. 12.

[8] *Zamy. yt*, 34. [9] Genes. iii. 3. [10] Prov. xxx. 6.

not unto his words lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.' R. Chiya said, Do not make the fence higher than the main thing (the garden), that it may not fall down and destroy the plantations, and thus said the Holy One, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,'[1] but Eve recited God's word thus, Ye shall not eat thereof, *neither touch it.*"[2] "Adam became an unbeliever — an apostate denying the principles."[3] God's Majesty left him by degrees,[4] "As Adam sinned the Majesty raised itself to the first heaven; with the sin of Cain to the second heaven," etc.[5]

That Adam's stature, like Yima's sublimity, was diminished, is conveyed thus,[6] "What do the words Gen. iii. 8 refer to? To the fact that with Adam's sin his height was diminished." In other places the height of Adam is also spoken of.[7] This trait is, however, missing in the Yima legend. According to the Zend[8] it belonged, on the contrary, to Yima's blessed time that[9] "there was no stature which outgrew the measure of the body." In the Meshia legend this feature, however, is to be found, as we are told[10] that Ahuramazda created the first man in the shape of a young man of fifteen years, bright and tall. Arabian sources[11] assure us that Adam's height, at his creation, was sixty yards.

Adam, as well as Yima, was said to have been deprived of his brightness.

"In consequence of his sin Adam lost six things, viz., his lustre, his strength, his height, the enjoyment of the produce of the field and the fruit of the trees and the splendour of his face."[12] In agreement with this statement regarding

---

[1] Gen. ii. 17. [2] *Genes. Rabb.*, ch. 19. [3] *Synhedrin*, 38*b*.

[4] That the majesty left Yima by degrees is shown in *Zamy. yt*, l. c. and following verses, so also in the Midrash.

[5] *Genes. Rabba*, ch. 19, and *Num. R.*, ch. 13.

[6] *Gen. Rabb.*, ch. 21. [7] *Synh.*, 38, *Chag.* 12*a*. [8] *Farg.*, ii. 121.

[9] Mâ paêsô yô vitaretô tanus. [10] *Bundehesh*, iii. 10.

[11] *Sojûthi's al-Gâmi al-sagîr*, § 3689.

[12] *Gen. R.*, ch. 12, see also ch. 11; *Num. R.*, ch. 13; *Yalk. Ruth*, § 609.

the loss of the taste to enjoy food is the similar assertion of the Bundehesh, as we shall see later on; while, on the contrary, of the blessed period of Yima's government it is said: "In his government food imperishable for the body, water inexhaustible and fruits of trees were enjoyed."[1]

6. There is a difference of opinion as to what the lie of Yima consisted in. Some say in his haughtiness. Firdûsi says that in his self-conceit Yima refused to worship God, and demanded this worship for himself.

A similar view is adduced in the Haggada.

"R. Tanhum, son of Abba, said, it is written,[2] 'A man's pride shall bring him low;' this is said in regard to Adam. After having fallen into sin he ought to have repented, which he did not do. No sooner, however, was the sentence uttered against him, than he began to swear and blaspheme."[3] "The trees cried out, There goes the thief, who cheated the intentions of God! To this is to be referred, 'Let not the foot of pride come against me'[4]—the foot of the first man who did exalt himself against his Creator."[5] In another place[6] we read of the self-adoration of Adam. "Adam would have been worthy to escape the taste of death; why, then, was he punished? In order not to adore himself, as God foresaw that Nebuchadnezzar and Hiram, King of Tyre, would declare themselves gods." According to another opinion,[7] the angels wished to worship Adam. Still another passage[8] states, the angels came down from heaven to wait on Adam, but God seized him and brought him under his wings. According to the Koran[9] the angels, on the contrary, were commanded to worship Adam.

---

[1] *Zamy. yt*, 33, cf. *yt*, 15, 16; *Yaçna*, ix. 14-18. [2] Proverbs xxix. 23.

[3] *Gen. Rabba*, ch. 15, cf. ch. 21, and *Yalk. Psalm* § 727.

[4] Psalm xxxvi. 11. [5] *Genes. Rabba*, ch. 15. [6] *Genes. R.*, ch. 9.

[7] *Genes. R.*, ch. 8; *Yalk. Isaiah*, § 261; see also Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, i. 239, and iv. 82. [8] *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ch. i.

[9] See *Sure* ii. v. 34; xv. 30, 31; xvii. 62; xviii. 51; xx. 114, cf. also *Sajûthi*, §§ 2082, 3689. Peculiar is the serious disputation of the fathers of the Church whether angels are to be considered as being created in the image of God. See *Zeitschrift d. d. M. G.*, vol. xxiv. 284.

7. Yima, in trying to save his brother Tahmurath, touched Agromainyus, and became in consequence leprous.[1] And, according to Bundehesh,[2] the bad spirit contaminated the reason of the first men. With this statement is to be compared the saying of the Rabbis,[3] that, from touching the serpent (Satan-Samael), Eve became tainted.

8. Yima is spoken of having been sawn asunder (by Çpityura),[4] which is alluded to also in Zend text,[5] and the same is asserted in regard to the first man, who in the *Midrash* is described as androgynous.[6]

9. Later sources record the penitence of Yima, who in his distress regretted his sin. Parallel with this assertion we find the statement in the Talmud[7] that "the first man was very devout. Having heard of the verdict of his death penalty, he fasted for 130 years, and lived for the same number of years secluded from Eve." "Cain, on returning home after his penitent confession,[8] met Adam. 'What is thy penalty?' he asked the former. 'I repented, and am now forgiven.' Adam hereupon covered his face with both hands, saying, 'Is the power of repentance so great, and I should not have known it!' He instantly took courage and chanted hymns."[9] According to another reference,[10] Adam sacrificed a bull as a thank-offering. The Zend texts often mention the primal bull, together with the primal man, the genii of both being invoked.[11] In my former essay in this *Review* I have already referred to the fantastic conception of the Parsees,

---

[1] Spiegel, *Einleitung in d. Tr. Schr. der Parsen*, ii. 323 ff. [2] Ch. 15.

[3] *Shabb.*, 146*a*; *Jebam.*, 103*b*.; *Ab. Zara*, 22*b*. See Kohut, *Angelology*, etc., p. 66, note 3.

[4] *Bundehesh*, 77, 78. [5] *Zamy. yt*, 46.

[6] *Gen. R.*, ch. 8; *Yalk. Psalms*, § 887; *Yebam.*, 49*b* mentions Isaiah's being sawn asunder by Manasseh.

[7] Cf. Mugmil in *Journ. Asiat.*, xi. 154 ff. 279; *Z. d. d. M. G.*, iv. 423.

[8] Gen. iv. 15, 16. [9] *Gen. Rabba*, ch. 22.

[10] *Aboda Zara*, 8*a*; *Shabb.*, 28*b*; *Chullin*, 60*a*. [11] *Yaçna*, xiii. 7; xxvi. 13.

who assume that Ormuzd created the great primal bull, in the body of which he deposited the germ seeds of all living creatures, and that, consequently, Gayomarth, the first man, came out of the bull's right shoulder. Ahriman thereupon entered the body of the bull and destroyed it.[1] The Jewish conception is incomparably higher, and has obviously a polemic tendency, as the primal bull is killed as a thank-offering by the primal man.

10. The six festivals of the year called Gahanbârs,[2] reminding of the creation of the world are ascribed to Yima.[3] The institution is fully described in *Sadder P.*, xciv.[4] This has some similarity with the Talmudical account[5] speaking of Adam having established festivals reminding of the creation of the world and its phenomena.

The passage reads as follows :—"Adam, seeing that the day was getting shorter and shorter (in the autumn), said, 'Woe unto me, perhaps on account of my fault the world becomes dark and returns to chaos, and this seems to be the death penalty to which I am sentenced,' and Adam fasted eight days.[6] As he observed, however, that the days grew longer (in the spring), he said unto himself, 'This is then a natural phenomenon'! He thereupon celebrated eight days with solemnity, and the following year he instituted those days as festivals, and, moreover, brought sacrifices." As Yima is said to have instituted the times of the Gâthas to offer prayers on them,[7] so, too, Adam pointed out certain days with the purpose of offering certain prayers on them."[8]

11. Yima is said[9] to have been invested with the dignity of a *Herbed* (priest), or[10] *Mobed* (high priest). And so we

---

[1] *Bund.*, ch. 4, 10 and 15. [2] Invoked in *Vispered*, i. 2, 7.
[3] Spiegel, *Einleitung*, etc., ii. 82.
[4] Spiegel, Introduction to the Translation of Avesta, ii. p. C., note 2.
[5] *Aboda Zara*, 8*a*.
[6] So did Yima, also cf. *Sadder P.* l. c. Gjemshîdo coram Deo ingemiscente.
[7] Spiegel, *Einleitung*, etc., ii. 82. [8] *Aboth de R. Nathan.*
[9] Spiegel, *Commentary to Vend.* ii. 16. [10] *Firdûsi*, iv. 6.

read of Adam also,[1] "As Adam brought his sacrifice he put on the vestments of a high priest." "In the Holy Writ it is said, 'God created man in his image,' it means Adam, who was anointed as a high priest, and designated to serve his Maker."[2]

12. Yima is held to be an inventor of many things. He is said to have molten iron and manufactured weapons for fifty years. In another fifty years he invented linen, silk, wool, beaver skin, etc.; in short, he was well versed in all kinds of arts.[3] And so is Adam also credited with knowing all sorts of handicraft and arts.[4]

13. Finally, there is an agreement in the Persian and Jewish sources as to the origin of deformed beings. We read regarding Yima,[5] "As to the qualities of apes and bears it is said, As the splendour left Yem, he took unto him, out of fear of the demons, a she-demon, and Gemk, who was his sister, was given to a demon as wife. Hereupon apes, longtailed bears and other noxious beings have risen from them." A similar origin for the demons and other harmful beings is given also in Talmud and Midrash.[6] In perfect accord with the Zend,[7] the Talmud[8] also maintains that pollution leads to the birth of demons.

B.—The Meshia Account.

It is not only Zend texts, treating of features of Yima, that furnish us with corresponding matter in regard to the Adam legend, but also the *Bundehesh*, which, although of a more recent date, is, nevertheless, known to be a compilation of old traditions. Windischman and Spiegel have fully

---

[1] *Num. R.*, ch. 4. [2] *Tanchuma Pikude* (beginning).
[3] Cf. *Zeitsch. d. d. M. G.*, vol. ii. 255.
[4] *Genes. R.*, ch. 24; *Yalk. Genes.*, § 40. [5] *Bundehesh*, 56, 13.
[6] *Erub.*, 18*b*; *Genes. R.*, ch. 20; *Yalkut Genes.*, § 42. Cf. Kohut, *Angelology*, etc., p. 66 ff.
[7] *Fargard*, xviii. 101, 102. [8] *Erub.*, l.c.

proved this statement. I do not wish, therefore, to pursue this question of the composition of the *Bundehesh* at any length. I may be only allowed to call attention to one remark made by Professor Max Müller:[1]—"Before that time [the Sassanian dynasty, 226 C.E.] we may indeed infer that the doctrine of Zoroaster had been committed to writing; for Alexander is said to have destroyed the books of the Zoroastrians. Hermippas, of Alexandria, is said to have read them; but whether on the revival of the Persian religion and literature—that is to say, 500 years after Alexander—the works of Zoroaster were collected and restored from extant MSS. or from oral tradition, must remain uncertain, and the disturbed state of the phonetic system would rather lead us to suppose a long-continued influence of oral tradition." If, now, the oral tradition contributed a great deal—as it did—to the collection of Zoroastrian doctrines, and these were composed under the Sassanian dynasty, we certainly may assume that these oral traditions were added to by the continual intercourse of the Parsees with the Jews, as the establishment of Jewish schools by Rab (Abba Arekha) falls exactly in the same period. This circumstance seems to me to be the clue to the remarkable fact that Persian and Jewish ideas should have fallen into such undeniable agreement regarding legendary materials. To outline, however, the boundaries peculiar to the dominion of Persian or Jewish ideas, and to show clearly which is the giver and which the recipient, is a very difficult task, and can hardly be satisfactorily answered. For the present it will suffice to notice the bare existence of the resemblances. Our main Persian source in this regard is the fifteenth chapter of the *Bundehesh*.

Before commencing a research into its utterances, we must tarry for a moment or two at the outset with some remarks concerning the etymology of the name of the first man.

---

[1] *Chips*, Vol. I., pp. 87, 88.

The name of Gayômerethan, the primal man — as well as of his offspring, the first pair, Meshia and Meshiâne — means mortal life, mortal being.[1] While the genius of other Indo-germanic languages starts in naming the man from a higher conception, from man's mental abilities,[2] the Parsees take man's frailty into consideration, calling him mortal. So do the Hebrews, by deriving Adam from Adama—earth.[3] Based upon this etymology, the Haggada[4] beautifully remarks: "God constructed man from all parts of the earth, in order that no particle of earth should say, 'Thou dost not belong to me; the dust of thy body has not been taken from me; and, therefore, I will not receive thee into my lap.'"

Starting from the same idea, the Talmud[5] says:—"The lower parts of the body were taken from Babylon [the low land], the head [intelligence] from Palestine [the high land], and the other limbs from other lands."

Similar to this is the Arabic conception:[6]—"As God was about to create man of clay, he commanded, first Gabriel, then Michael, then Israphil, to bring handfuls of earth of seven colours. But, implored by the earth, the archangels came back with empty hands. Only after the Angel of Death had been sent out, and returned with earth of seven colours, man was created. The several races of men were contained in that seven-coloured earth. The white

---

[1] Cf. Windischman, *Fortschritte der Sprachkunde*, p. 23. See however Justi *Zendlexicon*, p. 230.

[2] So in Sanscrit *man* is derived from *man*, "to think"; and thus *manu*, *manuja*, *mânusha* (=Latin *mens*; German *mensch*) means "thinker." The Greek ἄνθρωπος, "man's picture"; the Latin *homo*, *i.e.* "caller," "endowed with speech," is based upon this nobler quality of man.

[3] Some think of אָדֹם "red," see Gesenius, *Thes.*, p. 25, and Josephus, *Antiq.*, I. i. 2. Regarding other fantastic Arabic etymologies, see my remark in the *Z. d. D. M. G.*, XXV. 83.

[4] *Tanch. Pikude;* simpler *Synh.* 38*a*; also *Yalk. Psalms* § 888; *Aboth de R. Nathan*, Ch. i. [5] *Synh.* 38*b*.

[6] So teaches *Dshelâleddin Rûmî* in *Mesnewi.*

earth is still to be recognised in the white race, the black in the negroes, the half-black in the Nubians and Barabras [Berbers], the yellow in the Mongols, the green in the olive-coloured Indians, the brown in the Arabians, the red in the different tribes of the savages."

The Parsic idea sets out, however, with an entirely different doctrine, teaching that the first man was created from the σπέρμα of Gayomerethan, created immediately by Ahura-mazda. And, as mentioned, it means mortal life, not only for the individual reason that Gayomerethan lived but thirty years,[1] but on the general principle of the shortness of human life.

From what primal element, however, Gayomarth himself, whose offspring were the first men, was made is to our regret, not mentioned in the texts. From an obscure passage of the *Bundehesh*,[2] we may infer that Gayomarth rose from the Khei, which means either saliva[3] or perspiration.[4] Haug says,[5] according to tradition it means a fabulous water. It would be worth examining closer into the matter, in order to determine whether the theory of the Gnostics that man was created from water is traceable. The Valentines and Ophites, for instance, accepted with regard to Gen. i. 2, the water, on account of its changeable nature, as the primal element, the *hyle*. The Parsic cosmogony might be based—at least in its later development—on the same notion.

In the same manner is explained the passage of Genesis i. 2, "And the spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the earth," as meaning the soul of the primal man.[6] In Palestine, where Parsic influence could find but scanty entrance, this statement was contradicted. There they

---

[1] *Bundehesh*, III. 11, 2. [2] *Bund.*, III., 10, 1, 14.

[3] In New Persian, خیو (Ch'yu).

[4] خوی (Ch'wu) cf. Windischman, *Mithra*, p. 75.

[5] *Pehlevi Sprache*, p. 42.

[6] *Tanchuma Tazria*; cf. *Genes. Talk.* § 4.

said,[1] "He who says water was the primal substance of the world is mistaken." The Midrash Genesis Rabba, reflecting Palestinian ideas, does not know, therefore, of the explanation quoted, but illustrates[2] Genesis i. 2 by saying, "that is, the spirit of the King Messiah." That man was created from water must have been a very popular imagination, as even amulets refer to it.[3] Finally we must bear in mind that to the genius of water, Apãm napâo, an enlivening, refreshing, and creating power was attributed.[4]

Having thus shown the agreements and discrepancies between Parsic and Jewish conception concerning man's creation, I return to the particulars enumerated in the fifteenth chapter of the *Bundehesh.*[5] The following are the characteristic traits in the parallelism that we may draw between the Parsic Meshia legend and the Jewish legend of Adam.

1. *Bundehesh*: "After a lapse of forty years Meshia and Meshiâne grew from the earth from the purified seed of Gayomarth, in the shape of a Reiva plant, one-stemmed, of an age of fifteen years, on Mithragân of the month of Mithra, in a way that their hands were slung around the ears, one was fastened on the other, they were of the same shape and appearance."

The principal idea, although bearing the stamp of Erânic imagination is, *mutatis mutandis,* to be found also in the Haggada, that teaches that the first man grew, *as it were* as a plant from the earth.[6] This, "as it were," makes, however, a world of difference, for in the Indo-germanic

---

[1] *Jer. Chag.* II. See however, Grätz, *Gnosticismus*, p. 30. [2] Ch. II.

[3] There was for instance in Lord Byron's *Persian Amulet* the following quotation: "He who has made man of foam." See Hammer, *Purgstall die Geisteslehre der Moslimen*, p. 37.

[4] Windischman, *Zoroastrische Studien*, i. p. 177 ff.

[5] I follow the second revision of Windischman's translation (*Zoroast. Studien*, p. 213 ff.).

[6] According to the Italic legend the primal man grew out of trees, cf. Virgil, *Aen.* viii. 131; Juv., *Sat.* vi. 11.

imagination the outgrowth is to be taken literally, while the Semitic conception ennobles the idea and turns it to moral purpose. The simile is as follows: "At the creation of man, Grace, Truth, Justice, and Peace raised a dispute. Grace said, 'May God create him, as he will perform works of charity.' 'Do not create him,' replied Truth, 'for he will commit deeds of falsehood.' 'Shape him,' cried Justice, 'for he will follow the inclination of Right.' 'Do not form him,' shouted Peace, 'for his propensities carry him toward hatred and strife.' Hereupon God seized Truth and threw her to earth in order that she might grow from it, as it is written,[1] 'Truth springeth out of the earth.'"[2]

The moral tendency is obvious. Man should raise himself despite his lowly birth, and strive heavenward by means of truth. The Parsic notion is grossly realistic. But that the Reiva plant should grow on the Mithra day has, perhaps, the ethical tendency of furthering truth, the representative of which is Mithra. And as to the oneness of the stem on which both Meshia and Meshiâne grew in perfect unity, whereby the androgynous nature of the first men is symbolized, the Adam legend knows of this feature also.[3]

2. *Bundehesh:* "As hereupon both grew from the shape of a plant into the shape of men, such a spiritual splendour came into them which is the soul, and thus the tree grew that it bore fruits, ten kinds of men."

The meaning of this obscure passage is, in my opinion, that the primal men, imagined as plants, contained the germs and the principal conditions for the development of coming generations, so that the first man bore already in himself the nature, character and inclination of his posterity.

---

[1] Psalm lxxxv. 11.

[2] *Genes. R.*, ch. 8; *Yalk. Psalms*, § 834, and other places.

[3] Cf. *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ch. I. *Berach.*, 61*a*; *Erub.*, 10*b*; *Synhed.*, 38*b*; cf. also *Genes. R.*, ch. 8, and *Yalk. Psalms*, § 834, with the additional remark that the primal men had to be sawn asunder. See above, p. 237, note 6.

The idea that the primal substance of the first men was the type of future generations has been often pointed out.[1]

3. *Bundehesh:* "Ahura said to Meshia and Meshiâne, 'Ye are men; origins of worlds ye are.'" This means, perhaps, Ye are citizens of two worlds. This is at least the Jewish interpretation of ויצר.[2] "In men are accomplished two creations showing the double nature of both heaven and earth, having the two-fold inclination to good and evil. Man should be created in the image of a heavenly being, but he must also contain earthy elements. Were I to create him after the model of heavenly beings he would never die, and if after the earthly ones, he would die without living (spiritually), so I create him after both. Let him be created for both, for this world and the world hereafter."[3]

4. *Bundehesh:* "Ye are by me created perfect and pure, so perform ye also in a perfect manner the deeds prescribed. Think good thoughts, speak good words, do good works, and do not sacrifice to the Devas."

To this sublime idea is to be found plenty of Haggadic support. I have already quoted[4] "Adam is the light of the world." "In this light he gazed from one end of the world to the other."[5] "Adam was the last and yet the first of creation."[6] "With Adam everything was created in a perfect manner, only his fall produced imperfection."[7] "'And God saw it was good'[8]: this means Adam.'"[9] "'Who is as the wise man?'"[10] This refers to Adam. "For he is wiser than all men"[11] is again said of Adam,[12] as his wisdom excelled even that of the angels.[13]

As in the *Bundehesh* so also in the Haggadah[14] the duty

---

[1] *Chag.*, 12*b*; *Synh.*, 38*b*; *Seder Olam R.*, ch. 30; *Tanchuma Tissa*, § 12; *Pessiktha R.*, ch. 28; *Genes. R.*, ch. 8, 21, 24; *Yalk. Psalms*, § 887; *Yalk. Chron.*, § 1072. [2] Genes. ii. 7. [3] *Genes. R.*, ch. 14.

[4] See note 10, and *Num. R.*, ch. 4. [5] *Chag.*, 12*b*.

[6] *Gen. R.*, ch. 8; *Tanch. Tazria.* [7] *Genes. R.*, ch. 12; *Exod. R.*, ch. 30. [8] Gen. i. 10. [9] *Genes. R.*, ch. 9. [10] Eccles. viii. 1.

[11] 1 Kings v. 11. [12] *Num. R.*, ch. 19. [13] *Ibidem.*

[14] *Chag.*, 12*b*; *B. Bathra*, 75*a*; *Genes. R.*, ch. 24.

of performing God's commandments is brought in close connection with the wisdom of the first man.

"'And the Lord took the man,'[1] means Adam apprehended his calling. Here the verb *take* is used with the meaning of 'take with you words and return unto the Lord.'[2] The words, 'And put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it,'[3] means Adam was the object of the divine care in order that he should keep and cultivate God's word; to 'keep and to dress the garden' cannot be thus understood, that he had to cultivate the garden, to till the ground, to dig, or to plough, as everything grew there by itself, consequently the work to be done was of a spiritual nature."[4]

5. *Bundehesh:* "Both of them thought the same, they enjoyed each other's presence, that means to be man." The mutual completion of each other, and the consciousness of it, made them to fully understand their being.

And thus the Rabbis teach also: "He who has no wife is no (perfect) man";[5] "He who lives without a wife lives without joy, happiness and blessing."[6]

6. Jewish legends[7] agree with the *Bundehesh* in effecting this union on the first day after the creation.

7. *Bundehesh:* "And this was their first talk. Ahura has created water, earth, plants, animals, stars, moon, and sun, and all good things manifested by purity, everything altogether."

According to the Midrash[8] Adam also gave names to all ceatures, and recognised God's wisdom and grace. Here we may add the evidence of another Haggada[9]: "When the angels first saw Adam they wanted to worship him, in the belief that he had created them. Adam, however, rebuked them, saying, 'Not before me should you bend the knees, but before him who made the creations, before the Holy

---

[1] Gen. ii. 15. [2] Hosea xiv. 3. [3] Gen. l.c.
[4] *Genes. R.*, ch. 16. [5] *Yebam*, 63*a*; *Yalk.*, *Genes.*, §23. [6] *Ibidem.*
[7] *Genes. R.*, ch. 22. *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ch. i.; cf. *Synh.*, 38*b*.
[8] *Genes. R.*, ch. 19. [9] *Tanchuma Pikude.*

One.' And he chanted the hymn, 'O how great is thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee.'" [1]

8. *Bundehesh:* "Hereupon the adversary crossed their minds and contaminated [2] their thoughts, and then they falsely asserted that Ahriman had created water, earth, plants, animals, and all other things."

The possibility of Ahriman's bad influence was brought about by the fact that the first pair delayed the expression of their gratitude to their Creator.[3]

The Midrash [4] finds also fault with Adam that he did not chant hymns immediately after his creation,[5] and thus the verse is applied to him, 'He hath violently taken away his hedge,' [6] that is, Adam's safety was withheld on account of his ingratitude.[7]

Analogous with the expression of the *Bundehesh*, that Ahriman contaminated the thoughts of the first men [8] is also the statement of the Talmud,[9] that Satan, whose emblem, like that of Ahriman, is the serpent,[10] touching Eve contaminated her.

Bundehesh: "Their souls are in hell until resurrection. The sin of the first men is not atoned for until the resurrection arrives, but at that time the bones of Gayomarth will arise first, then that of Meshia and Meshiâne, and at last that of the other men." [11] Also it is said: "The light which is with the sun makes manifest half way Gayomarth, and half way the other men."

This goes to show that though the first men became

---

[1] Psalm xxxi. 20.

[2] "Ahokinit" according to the reading of Spiegel.

[3] See Windischman, *Zor. Stud.*, 218. [4] *Exod. R.*, ch. 23.

[5] In *Ab. Zara*, 8*a*, Adam is also said to have chanted hymns only after being terrified by natural phenomena.

[6] Lament. ii. 6. [7] *Echa Rabbathi* to this verse.

[8] The same, with some variation in *Bundehesh*, 11, 12.

[9] See Note 3, p. 237. [10] *Aji Dahâka.* [11] See *Bund.*, ch. 31, p. 72, 11.

wicked [1] through their sins, they will be nevertheless amongst the first to be restored.

The same is also said in the Midrash [2]: 'As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness' [3] is thus paraphrased: "Only when *he* shall arise, who is formed in thy image, the Messiah,[4] shall I, Adam, behold thy face."

In accordance with the Parsic conception that I illustrated in another place,[5] Adam will be one of the fifteen chosen ones to co-operate in the resurrection. In like manner Adam is brought in close connection with Messiah, who is imagined to be the final link in the chain of human development.[6] It is also quite usual to combine the first man with the last Redeemer, saying from Gayomaratha until Çaoshyan'ç (from creation until resurrection).[7]

9. *Bundehesh:* "Hereupon they went for thirty days without food, and dressed themselves in black clothes."

The thirty days of fasting as a sign of mourning correspond with the thirty mourning prayers [8] prescribed for the pious ones,[9] and this is indicated also by dressing in black.[10] Adam also is said to have fasted for many years,[11] and put on for the sake of mourning, a girdle made of leaves of the fig tree.[12]

10. *Bundehesh:* "The Devas rushed on them and deprived them of food, so that of hundred portions there remained only one particle."

---

[1] *Darvnd.* Should דִּרָאוֹן Isaiah lxvi. 24, Dan. xii. 2, be explained by this Persian word?

[2] *Genes. R.*, ch. 21. [3] Psalm xvii. 15.

[4] It has been already mentioned that Gen. i. 2, was interpreted as referring to the Spirit of Messiah. [5] *Zeitschr. d. D.M.G.* xxi., 574 ff.

[6] Cf. *Gen. Rabba.*, 12, 13, 24.

[7] *Yaçna*, xxvi. 33; *Yt*, 13, 145, and other places.

[8] *Farg.*, xii. 3, 4. [9] *Dahmananm.*

[10] Black dresses (*πενθίμην ἐσθῆτα*) as sign of mourning, already mentioned by Diodorus, xi. 57.

[11] According to *Ab. Zara*, 8*a*, only eight days, the regular mourning time. [12] *Erub.*, 18*b.*; *Yalk.*, *Genes.* §42.

If Meshia and Meshiâne already manifested their apostasy by abandoning their original food, the fruits of the tree,[1] and by indulging in animal food, viz., milk, then their wickedness became all the greater, as they expressed their joy in it, saying, "I feel a greater delight now by enjoying it." But no sooner did they say so than the Devas deprived them of their taste for palatable food.[2] In like manner Adam, who was also forbidden animal food,[3] is recorded to have lost, in consequence of his sin, the sense of tasting seasoned and savoury food.

"Hadst thou not committed sin thou couldst have gathered the herbs from Eden, to enjoy in them all the aromas of the earth, but now thou hast fallen into sin thou must eat of the herbs of the field."[4]

"When Adam heard of his punishment, 'And thou shalt eat the herb of the field,'[5] his eyes were moist with tears, saying, 'Is there for me and my ass one food—shall I eat with my ass together of one crib?"[6]

11. *Bundehesh:* "Hereupon, after the lapse of a thousand days and a thousand nights, they got a fat, white ram; they killed it, and brought down, according to the advice of the heavenly Yazatas, fire from the trees Kunner and Samsir which contained fire."

This legend, bringing down fire from heaven, reminds us of Prometheus, and, by the advice of angels, preparing their meals by this fire. This legend is also to be found in the Talmud.[7] "Adam sat in Eden, and angels roasted meat and cooled wine for him."

---

[1] Cf. p. 70, 13.

[2] Contrary to Râma-qâçtra (the genius of air), who makes food fragrant (Spiegel, *Avesta*, Introd. III., p. xxxiv.), the Devas spoil food. It is for that reason that Yima's government when Devas were powerless, is praised, and in that food was inexhaustible. [3] *Synh.*, 59*b*.

[4] *Genes. R.*, ch. 20. [5] Gen. iii. 19.

[6] *Pessach.*, 118*a*; *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ch. I. (end). An evident resemblance with the Persian legend is supplied by the Tibet-Mongolic narration. Cf. Rosenmüller, *Das alte und neue Morgenland*, I., 13.

[7] *Synh.*, 59*b*.

"The indulgence in wine caused Adam's fall."[1] According to another opinion,[2] the cause was to be sought in the envy which the serpent felt seeing Adam waited on by angels. Envy was also the cause of the fall of Meshia and Meshiâne,[3] while in Yima's golden era there was no envy to be experienced.

12. The Haggada[4] agrees, too, with the *Bundehesh* in stating that the first pair separated for a long period from one another.

13. *Bundehesh:* "Hereupon there were generated by them seven pairs, male and female, all brothers and sisters, man and wife." The same tradition is also to be met with in the Midrash,[5] where it is pointed out that all the children of the first men were born as twins, so that with Adam they were altogether seven. "Two came down to the earth, and they became seven. Cain with his twin, Abel with his two twins." A Persian influence is in this feature noticeable, since, in order to make up the number seven, Abel is born with *two* twins.

The *Bundehesh* closes the account of this significant fifteenth chapter with the enumeration of the twenty-five kinds of misshapen creatures born of the seed of Gayomarth. A similar legend occurs in regard to Adam, as I have already shown.[6]

ALEXANDER KOHUT.

---

[1] *Genes. R.*, ch. 15.

[2] *Synh.*, l.c.; *Aboth de R. Nath.*, l.c. [3] *Bund.*, ch. 15,

[4] *Erub.*, 18*b*.; *Gen. Rabba*, ch. 20; *Yalk. Genes.*, §§ 33, 40; Genes. iv. 1.

[5] *Genes. Rabba*, ch. 22; *Yalk. Genes.*, § 35.

[6] See the foot notes 6 and 7, p. 239.

RECENT CRITICISM UPON MOSES AND THE PENTATEUCHAL NARRATIVES OF THE DECALOGUE.[1]

I.

THE negative portion of the Pentateuchal criticism of the last half century has established the fact that Moses bore little, if any, share in the compilation of the five books which commonly bear his name. It was inevitable that such an absolute reversal of the traditional view should also carry with it a corresponding change of attitude with regard to the entire teaching and religious position of the ancient Hebrew lawgiver. The correctness of this last appellation may itself seem doubtful, when some criticism demurs to finding any relic whatever of Mosaic legislation in the Pentateuchal codes. It becomes of interest to trace, if we can, the lineaments of that Moses, whom criticism would substitute for the Moses of tradition.

The measure of difference between Ewald and Wellhausen shows us clearly how the conception of the Mosaic religion tends to contract in dignity and range as the various elements of the Pentateuch are removed further and further from the Mosaic age. With the book of Deuteronomy the product of the seventh century, and the priestly legislation the outcome of the sixth and fifth, the legislative (as distinct from the judicial) activity of Moses becomes narrowed to a minimum. And although there are left over the two "prophetical" narrators who (together with fragments of early legislation embodied mainly in the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant) tell us something of

[1] The first part of this paper was read at a meeting of the Taylerian Society at Oxford on November 20th, 1890.

the life and work of Moses, relentless criticism has proved that their narratives were written many centuries after his death. In brief, the religion of Moses has become purely a matter of inference; we can no longer assume the Mosaic authorship of any statements or injunctions that are put into his mouth.

What are the materials for the inference? They are, in the first place, the prophetical writings of the eighth century; in the second, those portions of the Hexateuch and the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, which are anterior to the Prophets. It is often a matter of delicacy and difficulty to separate off these earlier sections of the Hexateuch and the Historical Books from those which may be contemporaneous with, or subsequent to, the Prophets of the eighth century. That the earlier documents have passed through frequent recensions and revisions is undoubted; it is the extent of these editorial operations which alone remains uncertain. But one fact is clear: the oldest portions express the crudest religion. Or, to put the same fact less one-sidedly, from portions which no critic would deny to be *among* the oldest, an immature phase of religious thought and practice is to be elicited in marked contrast to the religion of the prophets.

The question therefore is: What is the relation of the higher and lower religions to each other, and of both to the religion of Moses?

Before passing in review the answers of three celebrated theologians, it is perhaps advisable to recall to mind in merest outline the nature of the difference between the religion of the prophets and that contrasted religion which can be pieced together from the earliest documents of the Hexateuch and the Historical Books.

There are three salient features in the religious doctrine of the prophets.

1. Their religion is practically monotheistic. Without entering into the vexed question of the first appearance of *theoretic* monotheism in the religious history of Israel, it is

not denied, even by those who emphasize the view "that the absolute non-existence of 'the other gods' is not expressly taught before" the seventh century, that the doctrine of the earlier prophets constitutes a "monotheism *de facto*."[1] The heathen gods have not only no power or authority within Israel, but they have no power or authority beyond its borders. To Amos, Yahveh is the creator of the world and its omnipotent ruler. He punishes Moab as well as Israel. He brought up the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir, as well as the Israelites from Egypt. To Isaiah the Assyrian monarch is but the rod of Yahveh's anger; the idols are things of nought.

2. The prophetic religion is an *ethical* monotheism. Yahveh's action is based upon ethical motives, and his character contains no trace of an unethical residuum. He is utterly removed from the category of nature-gods. Israel is his chosen people, but for that very reason must suffer defeat and even exile because of its sins. The partial favour and the irrational wrath of a nature-god have given way to the conception of an ideal personality, whose action is governed by the qualities of righteousness and mercy, combined into a unity that is self-consistent and unalterable.

3. This unique God is to be served, according to the unwavering doctrine of the prophets, on the negative side by a complete renunciation of all idolatrous and superstitious practices; upon the positive side by the practice of social morality. Outward forms are idle; sacrifices were never specifically ordered by God. His will is made known by his priests and by his prophets, and this higher knowledge is acquired either traditionally or by the direct revelation of Yahveh. It is not to be gained by any magical rites. No material representation of Yahveh is to be tolerated.

The passages by which these headings of the pro-

[1] Kuenen, Hibbert Lectures, pp. 317, 319.

phetical religion can be substantiated are neither few nor doubtful. There can be no hesitation in asserting that the eighth century prophets taught a religion of this kind. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah have individual differences, some of which are by no means wanting in significance and value, but in its main outlines the teaching of one represents the teaching of all.

To these three features of the prophetic religion, passages taken from the oldest sections of the Historical Books offer significant contrast.

Though Yahveh may have been the only God whom David thought it right to worship, he did not conceive the range of that God's influence as extending beyond Palestine. To be driven from abiding in the inheritance of Yahveh is tantamount to the enforced worship of "other gods" (1 Sam. xxvi. 19). Jephthah in a famous passage (Judges xi. 24) closely assimilates Yahveh with Chemosh. If Stade and Wellhausen interpret rightly, an ancient chronicler relates how the power of a heathen deity in his own land was once experienced by an Israelite army to its great discomfiture (2 Kings iii. 27). While to the prophets the character of God is purely moral, there are considerable traces of the nature-god in the preprophetic period; God's wrath bursts forth upon mysterious or immaterial provocations, and he takes part in a purely natural (*i.e.*, non-ethical) manner in the struggles of Israel with its enemies (1 Sam. vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 7; xxiv. 1; Judges v. 11; vii. 20; 1 Sam. xviii. 17; xxv. 28; cf. Numbers xxi. 14). While the God of the prophets is served solely by the practice of morality and the abstention from idolatrous and heathen rites, in the preprophetic narratives of Judges, Samuel and Kings, the very leaders of the people seem to act upon a strangely different principle. To them sacrifice, sometimes even human sacrifice, may appease God's wrath. He is worshipped without hesitation under the symbol of a bull, perhaps even, though that is doubtful, in human shape. The pious David does

not object to Teraphim, household divinities of uncertain origin. Yahveh's will was made known by the superstitious method of casting a lot, and he himself was closely identified with a mysterious ark which, when carried into battle, was thought to indicate the divine presence among the army of Israel.

If the religion of the tenth and ninth centuries included elements such as these, must we not assume a still lower conception of Yahveh and his religion in the Mosaic age? The aid of Canaanite corruption—the traditional explanation of the contrast that has just been pointed out—must not be used too far. We cannot assume offhand that the religion of Moses and Joshua was in all essential points identical with the religion of the prophets, and that the intervening ages defiled this purer and spiritual teaching with Canaanite pollutions of polytheism and superstition. If the leaders in Israel upon the first settlement in Palestine—to say nothing of the people at large—had really "served the Lord," according to the statement of the redactor of Judges, in anything like the prophetic sense, the religion of David would scarcely have presented so marked a contrast to the religion of Isaiah. We should at least expect that the line of prophets to whom Amos alludes would be confirmed by history and reach back to the earliest times. But underneath the later recensions of the historical books, we can clearly trace a spiritual development in the annals of prophecy. There is no authentic evidence of any prophet before Samuel. And in the oldest story about Samuel he is depicted more as a soothsayer than as a prophet; Saul consults him upon the loss of his asses, and is prepared to reward him for his services with the fourth part of a shekel of silver. In this narrative Samuel does not by any means identify himself with the prophets, and when they first appear upon the scene, we can hardly imagine that a troop of semi-Bacchantic enthusiasts are the spiritual progenitors of Amos and Hosea (1 Samuel x. 5-13; xviii. 10; xix. 20-24). Gad

and Nathan were clearly men of a different stamp, and both of them are represented as reproving David during the full power of his monarchy in the true spirit of the eighth century prophets. But their close connection with the court, which is occasionally indicated, makes us doubt whether the independent fearlessness and moral grandeur of their speech can actually have reached so high a level. (Compare 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, where Gad is called David's seer; 1 Kings i. 11-27, Nathan and Bathsheba.) Even Elijah is a man of a less spiritual type than Isaiah; and Elisha, in more than one instance, falls back to the earliest stage of prophetic development (2 Kings iii. 15; xiii. 14-19).

In direct antithesis to the theory of corruption stands the view that the ethical monotheism of the prophets is almost wholly their own creation. In that case the religious teaching of Moses, though possibly of great historical importance and an advance upon the religion of his contemporaries, would nevertheless have not risen to, but rather have fallen below, the level of that preprophetic religion which is to be picked out of the Historical Books. There will have been a gradual development from the Mosaic to the prophetic era, and Moses will have stood upon the ladder's lowest rung, Amos upon its highest. Yet the texture, so to speak, of the prophetic rung would be materially different from all that were below it.

But the objections to this hypothesis are neither few nor slight.

The eighth century prophets never put forward what they have to say as a hitherto unheard of novelty. They appear to assume that what they preach is the legitimate religion of Israel, while the popular religion is an aberration and a falling away. The beginnings of nation and religion are alike assigned to the exodus from Egypt. Amos seems to speak of a series of prophetic teachers in the oldest times: "I brought you up," he makes God say, "from the land of Egypt, and led you forty years through the wilderness to

possess the land of the Amorite. And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazirites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel? But ye gave the Nazirites wine to drink, and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not." "I am Yahveh, thy God"—so runs the divine message in Hosea—"from the land of Egypt, and thou knowest no God but me." And elsewhere, Hosea refers to Moses directly, "By a prophet Yahveh brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet he was redeemed" (Amos ii. 10-12; Hosea xiii. 4; xii. 14). Isaiah alludes to the good old times when righteousness was wont to lodge in Jerusalem, and its counsellors were men of justice (i. 21, 26).[1] Again, Hosea speaks of the priests as having forgotten God's law, and of the people as having broken his covenant (Hosea iv. 6; viii. 1, 12, on which latter passage, see Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, ii. 1, page 469, for a good emendation of the text, and Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, section 10, n. 4, E. T., page 178). Amos prophesies the punishment of Judah, "because they have despised Yahveh's law, and have not kept his commandments." Jeremiah is in accordance with Hosea in his view of Israel's past history. The wilderness days, after the Exodus, are remembered by God with affectionate regret. "Israel was holiness unto the Lord" (Jer. ii. 2, 3).

It is true that it is possible to discount the value of this evidence. The prophetic idealisation of the past may be connected with the fact that the prosperity of the earlier kingdom could in their eyes have been only due to the greater purity of the national faith. Kuenen has brought forward this point of view very clearly in a notable passage in his *Religion of Israel*, where he has also shown how, in an age when the idea of development was unknown, "the new ideas were immediately regarded as old ones revived" (*Religion of Israel*, vol. i., p. 370). Thus while the fact that the prophets of the eighth century

[1] Compare Dillmann's Commentary upon these passages.

regard themselves not as originators, but as links in a chain extending back to the early days of Israel's settlement in Canaan—as the exponents, not of a new creed, but of the old and "orthodox" religion of Israel—must be allowed to carry with it a certain weight and significance, it is not strong enough to withstand a greater mass of evidence, substantiating the contrary hypothesis.

We are still confronted with the fact that the further back we go, the less spiritual and the less ethical the religion of Israel becomes. Shall we then affirm that up to the prophetical period its spiritual and ethical elements were not superior to those of the neighbouring heathen creeds? But it is not merely the sudden appearance and splendour of the prophets which upon this hypothesis becomes difficult of adequate solution. We find it hard to realise how the religion of the national God was preserved at all. If, when the Israelites entered Canaan, the Yahveh whom they worshipped was not superior to the gods of the Canaanites, one would have imagined that Yahveh would either have disappeared altogether, or that the monotheistic impulse would have entirely broken down. For the Canaanites were superior to the Israelites in external civilisation. The former were agriculturists and dwellers in cities; the new comers were nomads and shepherds. We know that the Israelites adopted a good many of the Canaanite rites; we know also that there went on a considerable process of assimilation between the two kindred races. Why did not the greater absorb the less? Why did not Yahveh succumb to Baal?

Such, in rude outline, are the difficulties which the critical theologians have had to face, and, if possible, to explain. What we may call the external and the internal evidence do not completely tally with each other. Is there, then, any theory in regard to the beginnings of the national faith, in other words, to the teaching of Moses, which will account at once for the maintenance of the Yahvistic religion in Canaan and for the origin of the

prophets on the one hand, for the phenomena of the "pre-prophetic religion" upon the other? Let us consider some solutions of the problem that have been suggested in the last twenty years by three of the greatest Old Testament critics now living—Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Stade. And although Professor Kuenen has largely modified his views of the early religious history of Israel since he published the *Religion of Israel*, it will be convenient to place the position then taken up by him in the forefront of our survey.

He begins with the Israelites in Goshen. They were then polytheists; that is to say, though they worshipped a common god, known as El Shaddai, and to a few of them as Yahveh, it was not regarded as an offence to this inter-tribal deity to adore other gods besides himself. Moses' nature was religious, and he "received a deep impression of the power and majesty of El Shaddai, that pure and awe-inspiring god." He feels convinced that if this god would help his people in the struggle with the Egyptians, the victory cannot be doubtful. When the event justified his assurance, his faith becomes doubly strong. As leader of the people, he proclaims El Shaddai under the comparatively unknown name of Yahveh; he chooses him for the sole object of his worship, assured that "the mighty tutelary God will tolerate no other gods beside himself," and he elevates his choice into a law for all Israel.

This El Shaddai, whom Moses revealed as Yahveh, was originally akin to certain heathen deities, more especially to Milkam of the Ammonites and to Milk of the Phœnicians. He was "the severe God of light, the bearer of the consuming fire of the sun." This connection with natural phenomena was also accepted by Moses. "To him light and fire had not yet become symbols; Yahveh's very essence seemed to him to manifest itself in them." Yahveh, nevertheless, was not merely a severe deity of light and fire; he was also a God who required a moral service from his worshippers.

"The great merit of Moses lies in the fact that he connected the religious idea with the moral life. Yahveh comes before his people with moral demands and commandments. . . . Yahveh is distinguished from the rest of the gods in this, that he will be served, not merely by sacrifices and feasts, but also, nay, in the first place, by the observance of the moral commandments which form the chief contents of the ten words." (Vol. I., 282-292.)

The deduction is inevitable: Yahveh, be his physical essence what it may, is essentially a moral God. In 1870 Kuenen accepted the Mosaic origin of the Ten Words in their original form, reckoning, with the modern Jews, the opening exordium as the first word, and omitting, as a later interpolation, the whole reference to image worship in the second. At the same time, he regarded it as not improbable that the ark of Yahveh was a kind of Mosaic substitute for an image, and that images of Yahveh did not fully harmonise with Moses' conception of Yahveh's nature and character (p. 289).

If the Decalogue be Mosaic, and if the religion of Moses had already reached an ethical level, how are we to account for the religious phenomena of the books of Judges and Samuel, the religious conceptions of a Jephthah or a David?

In the *Religion of Israel* this is effected by the simple and probable explanation that Moses could only impart his higher conception of Yahveh's nature and of his relation to Israel to a few chosen spirits; the popular religion remained in essentials the same as before. But under Canaanite influence, and after the borrowing of many an idolatrous idea and rite, this higher knowledge seems apparently to vanish altogether, or, at least, to be practically dormant. There existed, indeed, a vigorous Yahvistic party, who were also enthusiasts for the nomadic life. They objected to amalgamation with the Canaanites, but at least as much on political as on religious grounds. "Spiritual or universalistic notions we cannot ascribe to them" (pp. 312-319, vol. i.). Such are

the Nazirites at the close of the period of the Judges. Here the difficulty begins. One does not clearly understand why, if these men had *no* spiritual notions, they should have been zealous for the worship of Yahveh.[1] If Yahveh was not already at least semi-moralised in character, it is hard to believe that any amount of conflict between his votaries and those of Baal would have infused spiritual ideas into the conception of him. Nor would the troublous times of the ninth century have produced them, when, according to our historian, the better minds of the people began to find an explanation of the national adversity in the transgression of the Mosaic command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before my face." And Kuenen himself is quite aware of the difficulty of evolving the moral from the non-moral. "From the very beginning," he says, "Yahveh's character was conceived and represented differently from that of the nature-God." In other words, though Yahveh "was originally akin to Molech and Astarte," "spiritual notions" were from the very beginning connected with his character and worship (p. 368).

Is there not here a lack of intelligible sequence in the order of events? The point of difference "between Yahveh and the austere nature-gods lay in his moral character," and the perception or creation of this difference is regarded as the distinctive work of Moses. But the monolatry and moral elements of the Mosaic religion are not specified as the true cause of the opposition to the Canaanites. Even those who "like their forefathers wished to remain polytheists could also set themselves against the adoption of the foreign and Canaanite elements" (vol. i., p. 312). And the impression left after reading Kuenen's account of the origin of "the purer conception of Yahveh's being" in

---

[1] Yet what a semi-barbaric religion that seems to have been, when Samuel, its highest representative at the time, could hew Agag, the Amalekite king, in pieces before the face of Yahveh! But the complexity of the human mind may possibly account sufficiently for this difficulty.

the ninth century, of the issue of the conflict between Yahveh and the Tyrian Baal, and of the effect of national adversity upon the religious feelings of the higher minds, is that the teaching of the prophets was in no true sense a revival, but wholly a new creation (p. 371). There does not seem to be either room or necessity for the prior work of Moses; no room for it, because the period from Deborah to Samuel shows no traces of the existence of a religion in which there was a close and clear connection between the religious idea and the moral life; and no necessity for it, because the conflict with Baal and the subsequent calamities in the Syrian wars were sufficient motives to lay the foundation for the ethical monotheism of the prophets.

In the Hibbert Lectures (1882) a narrower estimate of Moses and his work is clearly implied, although, in the sketch of the origin of prophetic Yahvism, Moses is not mentioned.[1] But the difficulty of accounting in one continuous and consistent narrative for the lower elements of the pre-prophetic religion and the sudden purity and excellence of the prophetic teaching is again apparent in a curious diversity of language between the second and third lecture. In the second lecture Kuenen essays to prove, from the judicial and pedagogic functions of the priesthood and from the trustworthy evidence of Hosea, that Yahveh, even before the prophets of the eighth century, was not identical in nature with the gods of the "nations around." Hosea assumes that the acknowledged business of the priest, as the interpreter of Yahveh, "is to be the bearer and appointed upholder of *right*." Although the contemporary priests lamentably "failed to fulfil so fair a task," yet—

---

[1] In 1876 Kuenen could still "with his whole heart" adopt "the assertion that Mosaism, *i.e.*, the demand that Israel should worship a moral God, and him alone, carried in itself from the very first the *germs* of monotheism, so that (ethical) monotheism was at once its τέλος and its motive power." ("Yahveh and the other gods." *Theological Review*, July, 1876.)

The ideal of his calling, which Hosea holds up to him in reproof, still remains; and with it remains *the ethical character of Yahveh* to which it bears witness. I am not speaking, as yet, of the Yahveh whose word the prophets proclaimed, but of the God of Israel whom the people acknowledged and served. For it was to him that those priests belonged who were consulted by the masses, and who directed their sacrifices and feasts. Hosea unites them, and we must not separate them. Now this is enough to show that, however great the outward resemblance may have been between this Yahveh of the people and the gods who were worshipped at his side or by Israel's neighbours, yet he was not one of them. Unless the prophet completely lost sight of the reality when he uttered his denunciation, Yahveh is distinguished from the others, and towers above them as the God in whose name justice was administered, and of whom it could be said that he was not known where the laws of honour and of good faith were violated. We must, therefore, enrich our conception of the *popular Israelitish belief* by this trait.[1] All the rest remains, but we must add this one point to it—*the ethical character of Yahveh.* And to this one trait belongs the future (p. 90).

Thus in this passage an ethical character is asserted even for the pre-prophetic Yahveh. But in the third lecture this ethical conception of Yahveh's being is claimed as the creation of the canonical (*i.e.*, eighth century) prophets. A sketch is given (page 114) of the popular view of the relation of Israel to Yahveh, which one might imagine, from the evidence of the Moabite stone, would accurately describe King Mesa's view of the relation of Chemosh to Moab. This view, however,

is changed as soon as Yahveh has acquired, as he has in the minds of the canonical prophets, an ethical *character*. I use this expression designedly. Moral *attributes* are ascribed to him by the people also . . . But these attributes were only some amongst many. They were not regarded as dominating all else.

As Professor Kuenen in this second passage refers also to the earlier one, it is clear that he is alluding to the contrast, admitted upon all sides, between the grosser popular conception of the deity with that of the prophets. Yet whereas Yahveh's ethical character is here regarded

[1] The italics are mine.

as the creation of the eighth century, in the former passage such a conception is admitted to have been the possession of the higher minds in the pre-prophetic age.

The decisive originality of the prophetic teaching is strongly maintained, if only by implication, in the new edition of the *Onderzoek*. For the dates of the oldest Pentateuchal narratives are tested by the prophets, and where any passage shows agreement with the prophetical religion, it is supposed to bear the influence of their school, that is, to be at least not earlier than the eighth century. Thus, with respect to the ten words, now no longer Mosaic as in the *Religion of Israel*, he writes (*Hexateuch E. T.*, page 244) :—

> If we are to regard the writer who summarised Yahveh's commands in the Decalogue as an original and creative author, we must place him in the eighth century ; but if we are to suppose that he merely resumed what the prophets of Yahveh had already uttered, we must make him a contemporary of Manasseh. His ethical conception of the service of Yahveh finds its closest analogue in Micah vi.-vii. 6, which is in all probability a product of this latter period.[1]

Yahveh as the God of right, so taught and proven by the judicial functions of the priesthood, would appear to be the ethical residuum which we may ascribe to the national God of the pre-prophetic period. Thus Professor Kuenen's position approaches Wellhausen's, with which we have now to deal; we cannot, however, clearly tell how far he would relegate these "ethical attributes" of Yahveh to the specific teaching of Moses, and still combine with them the doctrine of monolatry. It is earnestly to be hoped that a fresh statement of his views upon the Mosaic period may see the light before long.

At this stage let us once more call to mind the two main elements in the Prophetic teaching. The first is that Yahveh tolerates no other God beside him ; the second is

---

[1] For a criticism of this method, as applied to the ten words, see Wicksteed, in the *Christian Reformer* for 1887, p. 307, *seq.*

that he is a moral God, and demands a moral service. Is there any causal connection between these two principles? Or is the one capable of existing without the other? Is it likely that men would have come to believe that within his own land no other God must be worshipped, unless they believed also that this jealous deity was different in character from the other foreign deities, to whom even an inferior position must not be assigned? Or again, is it not because the God is conceived as different in character, that he is thought to claim an exclusive adoration? The problem is complicated by the introduction of evidence from other nations. If it can be proved that monolatry prevailed in other nations besides Israel, nations of whom we are unaware that they showed any tendency towards the formation of an "ethical monotheism," this phenomenon would show that such a monolatry by no means necessarily implies as its concomitant an exceptionally ethical conception of deity; or again, that it may represent a mere tribal custom and not a principle consciously adopted and of set purpose maintained. That these deductions are applicable to the earlier monolatry of Israel appears to be the view of Wellhausen, and his theories are all the more worthy of the utmost attention, because Kuenen has pointed to Wellhausen's *Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Judas*, as an excellent illustration of the way in which it is possible to give a connected and consistent account, without the help of any *deus ex machina*, of the growth of that ethical monotheism which differentiates the developed religion of Israel from the religion of any other nation in the world.[1]

The insufficiency of Wellhausen's explanation, to my own thinking, may be partly due to its compression. The Prolegomena does not deal directly with the origin and growth of the ethico-monotheistic idea, although there are

---

[1] *Theol. Tijd.*, 1885, in the essay *De critiek van den Hexateuch en de Geschiedenis van Israel's Godsdienst*, pp. 491-530.

numerous important hints and suggestions upon the subject (cf. the chapters, "The narrative of the Hexateuch," and "The Oral and the Written Torah.") The *Abriss*, unparalleled as it is in brilliancy, incisiveness and dramatic power, is almost bound to leave here and there an unsatisfactory impression upon the mind of a reader who has not already worked out for himself very similar results, when it is remembered that in 102 pages is compressed a sketch of Israel's outward and inward history from the beginning till the days of Ezra.

Moses, according to Wellhausen, was the author of Israel's political and religious unity; Yahveh was originally a family or tribal God, either of the family to which Moses belonged or of the tribe of Joseph.[1] Because Moses acted in the name of Yahveh, and attributed his own successful actions and the help rendered to Israel by nature or by accident as due to Yahveh's intervention, the united tribes adopted the God of Moses for their common deity. Yahveh became the God of Israel, Israel the people of Yahveh. But we are not told that the exclusive worship of Yahveh was the principle and turning point of the Mosaic religion. "Moses gave no new idea of God to his people" (*History of Israel*, p. 440). Indeed the monolatry which became characteristic of Israel was characteristic also of Israel's own belongings. For "Moab, Ammon and Edom, Israel's nearest kinsfolk and neighbours, were monotheists in precisely the same sense in which Israel itself was" (*History of Israel*, p. 440). What then, we ask, was the *specific* element in the religion of Moses? It consisted in this, that Moses was "the originator of the Torah in Israel." Moses exercised

[1] *History of Israel*, p. 433, n. 1. This note is not reprinted in the German edition of the *Abriss*, but though that edition frequently modifies the text of the *Encyc. Brit.*, reprinted in the *History of Israel*, it does not follow that any passage of the English omitted in the German contains views no longer maintained by the author, *e.g.*, the *excursus* on the Decalogue is omitted in the German edition, but is quoted by Wellhausen himself in the *Nachtræge* to the new edition of the *Composition des Hexateuchs*, etc. (1889).

judicial functions, and he connected these with the sanctuary and with Yahveh, who thus became not merely the God of Israel, but also the God of law and of justice (*History of Israel*, p. 474; and *Abriss*, p. 10). This office of Moses was continued by the priests, who were spiritually his heirs. Their authority rested in the last resort upon Yahveh, who was the author of the generally approved sense of right, and upon the spontaneous recognition of it among the people (*History of Israel*, pp. 436; *Abriss*, pp. 11, 12; cf. Prolegomena, p. 396). Justice and law were fundamental elements in the new religion. But we must not, as it would seem, assess this moral side of the religion at too high a rate, nor regard it, such as it was, as the exclusive possession of Israel. For, on the one hand (*History of Israel*, p. 439), "the entire series of religious personalities throughout the period of the Judges and the Kings—from Deborah, who praised Jael's treacherous act of murder, to David, who treated his prisoners of war with the utmost cruelty—make it very difficult to believe that the religion of Israel was from the outset one of a specifically moral character. The true spirit of the old religion may be gathered much more truly from Judges v., than from Exodus xx." (*i.e.*, from the Song of Deborah than from the Decalogue). On the other hand, "The religious starting point of the history of Israel was remarkable, not for its novelty, but for its normal character. In all ancient peoples there exists a relation between God and the affairs of the nation, and religion is employed as a motive for law and customary morality (*Recht und Sitte*); in none, however, did the relation exist, or was the motive employed, in such purity and power as in Israel."[1]

Apparently, therefore, it is far more accurate to recognise in this application of religion as a motive for morals and for law, the characteristic feature of the Mosaic religion

[1] I fancy that this sentence has been wrongly translated in the *History of Israel*, p. 437. As it stands in the *Abriss*, p. 13, it is more accurately rendered as above.

than in the principle, "Thou shalt have no other gods before my face."

Now, what influences were there to develop the religion of Amos, and of the author of Exodus xx., out of the religion of Deborah and of David? It can hardly have been due to the religious influence of the Canaanites; that induced the apostasy to Baal, through which the two deities, at first co-ordinated and worshipped together, were afterwards identified, a syncretism arising between Baal and Yahveh (*History of Israel*, p. 447; *Abriss*, p. 18). And yet we are told that "had the Israelites remained in the wilderness and in barbarism, the historical development they subsequently reached would hardly have been possible; their career would have been like that of Amalek, or at best, like those of Edom, Moab and Ammon." The Philistine oppression led, it is true, "in the first instance to a widespread exaltation of religious feeling." The spirit of this enthusiasm passed over upon Israel as a whole; but "the new kindled zeal had for its object, not the abolition of Baal worship, but resistance to the enemies of Israel. Religion and patriotism were then identical" (*History of Israel*, p. 449; *Abriss*, p. 20). Accordingly the contents of religious belief in the pre-prophetic period are scarcely superior to what we might imagine them to be in Moab during the reign of Mesa; they are certainly inferior to the religious belief implied in many an old Babylonian hymn.[1]

Nor is any indication given that any exceptional spirits, even before Elijah, had raised themselves above the level of the popular faith. The God of that faith was believed, it is true, to render retribution upon families and nations. He was a God who punished and rewarded. But so also was Chemosh. The relation between Israel and Yahveh was a natural one: it did not rest upon the conditions of an

[1] The amazing section *Gott, Welt und Leben im Alten Israel*, should be read in the revised German edition of the *Abriss*.

agreement, offered by Yahveh and accepted by Israel. The essence of the Godhead lay in his capacity to save. "Help in earthly matters was expected from Yahveh, not salvation in a Christian sense. The main point was that he should give rain and victory." It is precisely the antithesis of the prophetical God, of whom one can say, "Yahveh had unaccountable humours; he both made his face to shine and showed his anger, one knew not why. He created alike good and ill, he punished sin and incited to sin—Satan had robbed him as yet of no portion of his being" (*Abriss*, pp. 44-46). The student who is familiar with the oldest sections of the historical books will have no difficulty in substantiating these general *dicta* of Wellhausen's with illustrative quotations. But the question is whether they represent the highest level to which the religion had reached in every mind before the coming of Elijah. And we have to ask our brilliant critic, Was there nothing *more* than this in the religion of Moses? Was it this religion, and nothing *more and higher*, which enabled the Jews to absorb, and not to be absorbed by, the more elaborate Canaanite civilisation? And if this religion be in truth all, is not the teaching of Elijah and Amos a very remarkable jump upwards?

The estimate of Elijah is slightly lower in the *Abriss* than in the article in the Encyclopædia: but it is still significant enough. In both, Elijah's religion will not tolerate the service of any other god besides Yahveh: "to him there did not exist a variety of powers of equal justification and equally worthy of worship, but everywhere one principle of Holiness and one principle of Might only, which revealed itself not like Baal in the life of nature, but like Yahveh in the moral demands of the spirit" (*in den sittlichen Forderungen des Geistes. Abriss*, p. 33). Nothing can be better and more eloquent than the sketch of the religion of Amos and his successors, both in the Encyclopædia article and in the *Abriss* (they are not quite the same), but the main part of them consists in pointing out the startling contrast between

that religion and the popular faith. And this popular faith, according to Wellhausen, if I understand him rightly, exhausted the whole of Israel's spiritual possessions. There was not, and there had never been, any higher phase of religion outside it or beyond it. Elijah and Micaiah the son of Imlah, had been solitary exceptions,[1] who were neither imitated nor understood. "Amos was the founder and the purest expression of a new phase of prophecy" (*History of Israel*, p. 472; *Abriss*, p. 49). But in Wellhausen's sketch he is more than this. He is practically the founder of a new phase of religion, the antithesis in many respects of that religious phase which had preceded it. Is Baudissin so very wrong in urging that the historic development of ethical monotheism has not even yet been satisfactorily explained? I must confess that I am unable to agree with Kuenen's view that in Wellhausen's *Abriss* the thread of the historic development is never broken off. To my mind, between the pre-prophetic religion of Israel, as he conceives it, and the religious teaching of Amos there yawns a chasm, which all the charm and brilliancy of his narrative has not been able to bridge over or even permanently to conceal.

One of the latest, and, in many respects, one of the most interesting of Israel's historians, Bernhard Stade, though in critical and exegetical questions a close follower of Wellhausen, occupies, in his estimate of Moses, a peculiar and noteworthy position. No theologian of eminence goes further than Stade in his rejection of traditional views, or emphasises with more urgent insistance the measure of the difference between the pre-prophetic religion and the religion of the prophets. Thus, when Amos affirmed that the essential demand which Yahveh makes

[1] *History of Israel*, p. 461; *Abriss*, pp. 32-34. Is it an explanation of their appearance to say that "occasionally there arose among the Nebiïm a man in whom the spirit, which was cultivated within their circles, may be said to have risen to the explosive pitch"? For why should a non-moral spirit have exploded in ethical teaching? And we had not been told that there was *any* ethical element in these companies of religious enthusiasts.

upon his worshippers is a moral life, he laid down a principle "as yet unheard of in Israel" (*Geschichte*, I., p. 573). It is true that, even to the pre-prophetic Israel, Yahveh, as the god of the State, is the protector of "law and order," and the avenger of outraged custom. But in this conception there is nothing peculiar to Israel, for, as Prof. R. Smith points out, "law and custom are in every nation a part of religion, and have a sacred character." That wherein "the fundamental superiority of the Hebrew religion," according to Prof. R. Smith, consists, namely, "in the more absolute and self-consistent righteousness of the Divine Judges" would not apply to Stade's picture of the pre-prophetic Yahveh. He was not dissimilar in character from the heathen gods as described by Prof. R. Smith; we have merely to change the plural to the singular, and the quotation would sum up Stade's estimate of the earlier Yahveh. Yahveh is "the guardian of law, but something else at the same time; he is not wholly intent on righteousness, and righteousness is not the only path to his favour, which sometimes depends upon accidental partialities, or may be conciliated by acts of worship that have nothing to do with morality" (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 72). But Stade is almost as emphatic as any theologian of the traditional school, in accentuating the importance of Moses and his work. That work consisted in establishing the principle, that only Yahveh was Lord in Israel, and that only Yahveh must be worshipped by the Israelite. Stade's estimate of Moses must be taken in connection with his theory of Israel's pre-Mosaic religious condition. His contention is that Yahveh-worship, as introduced by Moses superseded not a polytheism of the usual Semitic type, but a far lower stage of religion, the cult of spirits and ancestors. Why Israel never entered the polytheistic stage can only be explained upon the assumption that when the adoration of Yahveh was adopted by Israel, Yahveh's character was conceived as essentially different from that of the polytheistic gods of Semitic heathenism. But this

difference was not ethical; it did not belong to the moral sphere at all; it consisted in the mere abstract principle that Yahveh is the sole God of Israel; and, consequently, that his worship wholly excludes the worship of other gods. This principle is the creation of Moses. For if it had not existed and been realised from the beginning, the polytheistic influences of Canaan would have brought about any other consequence rather than this. And since this principle is in violent contradiction to all that we find in other Semitic as well as in non-Semitic races, we can only assign it to the initiation of the Founder of Israel's religion himself.[1]

It was in the principle of monolatry that the superiority of Israel's religion lay over the religion of the Canaanites, not in the higher morality of its national God. And as Stade maintains that the Mosaic monolatry was unique even among the Semites, he could clearly not subscribe to the dictum of Wellhausen, that Moab, Ammon and Edom, were "monotheists in precisely the same sense in which Israel itself was." The paragraph about Moab in the frequently modified reprint of the first 160 pages of Vol. I. illustrates his zeal to maintain for Israel alone the principle of monolatry.[2] It was originally stated that the Moabites had advanced to a kind of monotheism, and that they stood to their god Chemosh in the same relation as the old Israelite to Yahveh. The combined deity Ishtar Chemosh mentioned on Mesa's stone was regarded as only a modification of Chemosh himself. "The conjecture seems close at hand that Chemosh was regarded as an androgynous divinity." The Moabite deity, Baal of Peor, mentioned in Numbers xxv. 3, was identified with Chemosh, who must have been worshipped at Shittim

[1] *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 439.

[2] I owe the knowledge of this modified reprint of pp. 1-160, which though not indicated in any way by the author, amounts to a second edition of those particular sheets, to Kamphausen's review in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1889. (The reprint has since been carried on to p. 304.)

under the name of Lord of Peor. For "all the accounts of the Old Testament agree that the Moabites worshipped one god only, namely, Chemosh." In the revised reprint this last sentence is omitted; the suggestion that the Lord of Peor was another god, different from Chemosh, is considered equally probable with their identification, and Ishtar Chemosh is explained to be the Astarte of Chemosh—an independent female divinity. "Thus Chemosh had by his side a female associate in the person of Astarte—a conception which runs directly counter to the fundamental principle of Israel's religion"[1] (*Geschichte*, pp. 113-114). Thus we see that the uniqueness of Israel's national religion is strongly maintained. But the *character* of Israel's one God is hardly different from the character of Chemosh. If he will tolerate no other deity but himself, one is inclined to ask what right has such a deity, as described by Stade, to so exalted a claim? One wonders how such a principle can have occurred to Moses, if the character of his God did not merit or suggest it. It is hard to see why the possession of this abstract principle should have been sufficient to enable the Israelites to resist the polytheistic influences with which they were surrounded in Canaan. Is there not cogency in Kamphausen's argument that the superiority of the Yahvistic religion must have consisted in the peculiar nature of Yahveh, and not in a mere dogmatic assertion of Semitic exclusiveness? We are driven back to the belief that there must be some causal connection between the jealous exclusiveness of Yahveh and his moral character. And once more, with a growing conviction of their substantial accuracy, we recall the words of Kuenen in the *Religion of Israel:* "The great merit of Moses lies in the fact that he connected the religious idea with the moral life."

[1] Cp., for this whole subject, Baethgen's *Beiträge zur semitischen Religions-geschichte*, and the reviews of his book by Kuenen in the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1888, and by Nöldeke in the *Zeitschrift der Deutsch-morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XLII.

The eighth century prophets, no less than the traditions of the Pentateuch, alike regard the age of the Exodus as the beginning of Israel's religion and of its national life. Apart from any direct evidence, the very course of Israel's history, as it passes out of legend into authentic record, argues for peculiar, if not unique, qualities in the character of its religion from the very first settlements in Canaan. For had not Israel's God already then been superior to Baal, no amount of antagonism between them could have evolved the Yahveh of the prophets. But if at the entry into Canaan this superiority existed, we may legitimately trust legend and tradition so far as to assign its origin to the age of Moses and to the person of the Founder. Since "the apostasy to Baal," even according to Wellhausen (*History of Israel*, p. 447; *Abriss*, p. 18), "on the part of the first generation which had quitted the wilderness and adopted a settled agricultural life, is attested alike by historical and prophetical tradition," a partial corruption of the Mosaic teaching becomes not only possible, but certain. To the age of young enthusiasm, uniting the newly emancipated tribes together, there succeeded, we have every reason to believe, an age of borrowing and adaptation, attended with a temporary phase of religious and political disintegration. The attainments of the Mosaic era were not wholly forgotten or utterly destroyed, but they suffered some measure of eclipse and distortion before they began, towards the close of the Judges, to advance slowly to wider issues and a purer form. We are, indeed, scarcely entitled with Kittel, in his valuable and suggestive chapter on Moses and his religion (*Geschichte der Hebräer*, I., § 24), to attempt a picture of the Mosaic age and of the Founder's work upon the basis of the Pentateuch. For of the Book of the Covenant, even in a shortened form, the Mosaic origin is exceedingly improbable, while of the Decalogue it is, at least, exceedingly uncertain. But Kittel's argument (p. 220) against allowing the evidence of the pre-prophetic religion to throw the spiritual and moral elements in the religion of

Moses overboard altogether, is worthy of serious attention. "I cannot," he says,

> accept the accuracy of that prevalent modern point of view in which the entire pre-prophetic period, thrown into one and regarded as a single whole, is contrasted with the period of the prophets. While it must unhesitatingly be acknowledged that Israel, in the ages of the Judges and of the earliest monarchy, adopted many elements of the Canaanite nature-religion, neither must the fact be ignored that those ages, when contrasted with the Mosaic era, show many symptoms of decline. If the popular faith and the institutions of the post-Mosaic age are made the standard of measurement for the so-called pre-prophetic period, and the Mosaic age itself is then represented on the same lines, its peculiar exaltation, and the original force and enthusiasm, undoubtedly present in it as in all great creative eras, are unjustifiably forgotten.

Is there any cogent necessity to except the Israelite religion, even in its earlier stages, from the law, so frequently exemplified in other religions, both of the East and of the West, that periods of imperfect absorption and partial decay follow upon epochs of creation and reform? Stade protests energetically against applying to the Old Testament religion a canon of Schleiermacher's that the peculiar essence (*Wesen*) of a religion is expressed most purely at its source. That, he says, is a false generalization from the single example of Christianity. No one, indeed, would now-a-days wish to assert that the religion of Moses equalled the religion of Amos in moral consistency and spiritual depth. But what our rough analysis of the latest criticism seems to prove is that every element in the religion of the eighth century prophets has its true root and origin in the creative teaching of the Founder.

The course of Israel's religious history between Moses and Amos would show, could we possess the whole of it, both advance and retrogression. If we confine our view to the person of Moses, the retrogression predominated, if we regard his age, the advance. Assuming, with Professor R. Smith (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 69), that there was always a remnant who silently, though imperfectly, carried forward

and handed down the true Mosaic tradition, we are confronted with the sayings and doings of Deborah, Jephthah, Samuel, Saul, David, and Jeroboam, when we assign to that tradition too spiritual and comprehensive an interpretation. But if, on the other hand, we limit the teaching of Moses to the bare principle, "No God but Yahveh," or to the pleading, "Yahveh is powerful to save and bless; therefore worship him alone," we can neither account sufficiently for the immense results of the Mosaic era nor for the evidence of the prophets. Between the two doctrines the truth must lie.

Kamphausen has, perhaps, summed up the position in which we must rest most accurately when he says "that history itself demands the postulate that Moses became the founder of Judaism by a permanent breach with the old nature-religions of heathenism, but that the proof of this postulate will never be capable of more than a partial realisation."

II.

IN the notes which are here appended to the foregoing paper, it is not proposed to discuss the arguments for and against the Mosaic authorship of the ten words. My purpose is merely to give a critical analysis of the Pentateuchal narratives, which constitute the framework of the Decalogue. The light which such an analysis may throw upon the complicated problem of its date will only be incidentally alluded to.

The familiar, traditional story of the Decalogue dates from Deuteronomy. The conception both in chapters i.-iv., and in v.-x. is one and the same.[1] Upon the basis of ten words

[1] The following pages are based upon, and to some extent assume a knowledge of, the following authorities:—Dillmann's *Commentary upon Exodus* (1880); Kuenen's *Hexateuch* (E. T., 1886) and essay in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1881, *Israel bij den Sinai;* Jülicher's Essay in *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*, 1882, "De Quellen von Exodus vii. 8—xxiv. 11"; Wellhausen's *Composition des Hexateuchs*, and *Nachträge* in the reprint of 1889; Kittel's *Geschichte der Hebräer.* (Part I., 1888.)

(our present Decalogue) God made a covenant with Israel at Horeb. Those ten Divine words and no more were heard by the whole people. They were written down by God upon two tables of stone, which were afterwards broken by Moses. They were then re-written by God upon fresh tables, hewn this time not by God but by Moses, and deposited in an ark made for the special purpose of receiving them. We have to notice that:

(1.) The words were ten in number: עשרת דברים, iv. 13, x. 4.

(2.) *These* ten words are the words contained in Exodus xx. 2-17, and it is *these* words which are written upon the tables, v. 19.

(3.) These ten words constitute the covenant made at Horeb, iv. 13, v. 2, ix. 9, 11, 15, לוחת הברית.

(4.) The two tables containing these words are deposited in an ark, which is often called the Ark of the Covenant of Yahveh, x. 5, 8.

Not one of the four propositions so clearly enunciated and even emphasised in Deuteronomy, can be plainly elicited from the older narrative in Exodus.[1] It can be argued that the second is implied; it is, at any rate, not definitely stated.

Possibly, however, too much stress must not be laid upon this difference between Deuteronomy and the "prophetic" narrators. For so far as can be gathered from the incomplete condition in which we have it, the Priestly chronicle (P) contained a less definite statement about the Decalogue than Deuteronomy (D). As P wrote later even than the author of Deut. i.-iv., we may assume, if we please, that he was able to take for granted much which D (whether D^1 or D^2) is anxious to emphasise. Whether the text of the Decalogue was included by P is uncertain. In our present Book of Exodus we have, till

[1] I have not forgotten Exodus xxxiv. 28, but must defer its consideration.

chap. xxv., only fragments of P's Sinaitic narrative, viz., xix. 1-2a; xxiv. 15-18a. When Moses, after seven days' pause, has gone up "into the midst of the cloud," God reveals to him the construction of the Tabernacle, etc. In xxv. 16, he says: "And thou shalt put into the Ark the testimony, עדת, that I shall give thee." What is this עדת? As xxxi. 18 and xxxiv. 29 seem to be fragments from P (and the "tables" are here called לחת העדת), it is generally supposed that the עדת of xxv. 16, 21 is nothing more nor less than the Decalogue graven upon the two tables. (Of renewed tables P does not speak; at any rate xxxiv. 29 joins on to xxxi. 18a.) Although the authorities (Kuenen and Wellhausen no less than Dillmann and Kittel) are nearly all agreed that the עדת deposited in the Ark (xl. 20) is identical with D's לחת האבנים or לחת הברית, upon which the ten words of Exodus xx. 2-17 were graven, it must be confessed that, if it were not for D, we should not be able to make these deductions with any security. When God says, in xxv. 16: "Thou shalt put into the ark the Testimony which I shall give thee," nobody reading the words for the first time could possibly grasp that this Testimony was a collection of ten words already proclaimed to the people at large. Why is the Decalogue called merely עדת in xxv. 16, 21 and xl. 20, and so much more definitely לחת העדת in xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29a, and xxxii. 15? It would seem probable that (Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, section 6, n. 13; and section 16, n. 12) we must assign xxxiv. 29-35, not to P^2, but to "one of the younger Diaskeuastæ"; and that the designation לחת העדת in xxxi. 18 and xxxii. 15, and possibly xxxiv. 29 also, is due not to P^2 but to R, who in this manner assimilates P's language and story with the language and story of JE. But if this be so, it seems to me still more hazardous to assume that the עדת of xxv. 16, 21 and xl. 20 is meant to be the Decalogue. There would appear to have been a difference of tradition as to what the Ark really contained. According to D there were inside it two stone tables, upon which the

words of Exodus xx. 2-17 were graven; according to P it was the receptacle of an עדת, the nature and contents of which he leaves wholly undefined.[1] Something depends upon the date of Deut. iv. and v., ix. and x.; if these chapters are all exilic, the interval of time between their composition and that of P^2 need not be so very great. In that case the views of the Deuteronomic chapters relative to the Decalogue may not have become so universally accepted and so generally known as to make my supposition that the עדת of Exodus xxv. and xl. is not identical with the לחת הברית of great unlikelihood. If, however, Deut. v. and x., and even Deut. iv., are pre-exilic, the identification becomes much more probable, but even then by no means absolutely assured.

This comparison of P with D has taught us little. We have now to retrace our steps, and examine the narratives of J and E.

The Decalogue of Exodus xx. is now undoubtedly a portion of E. Whether it was a portion of E from the beginning of E's existence is unfortunately another question. Into the details of the narratives we need not here enter, and thus, *e.g.*, the difficult partition of chap. xix. between E and J and JE may be passed over. We have to fix our attention upon the following points.

In the portions of the narrative which either in their present or in a shorter form belong to E, must be included:—

(*a.*) The Decalogue.

(*b.*) The Book of the Covenant (xx. 23—xxiii.).

(*c.*) The Making of the Covenant (xxiv. 3-8).[2]

(*d.*) The Giving of the Tables (xxiv. 12; compare xxxi. 18).

Now, two things are noticeable at first sight:—

---

[1] I am relieved to find that Nöldeke (*Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A.T.*, on p. 51, n. 1) adopts a similar view.

[2] Of course this does not imply that either the Book of the Covenant or the Decalogue were written by E, but merely that he incorporated them in his narrative.

(1.) If the Decalogue, as in our present Exodus text, is sharply separated off from the Book of the Covenant, then the Covenant in xxiv. 3-8 is made upon the basis of that Book, and not, as in Deuteronomy, upon the basis of the Decalogue. "All the words which the Lord has said," in verse 36, can only refer to the words and the judgments of Yahveh, which Moses had told the people in 3a. If xx. 18-21 are in their proper place, there was no need to tell them the Decalogue, as they had already heard it for themselves. How Kittel can think 3a and 7 sufficient to contradict this inference is more than I can imagine. Dillmann recognises the limitation of meaning in 3 and 7 clearly enough, but adds, all the same, "*dass der Bund die Verpflichtung auf den Dekalog mit umfasst* (*vgl.* xxxiv. 28b.), *sogar in erster Linie umfasst, versteht sich von selbst.*" Kuenen is not far wrong in his sarcastic remark, "Beware of conclusions which speak for themselves" (*Theol. Tijd.* xv. 193).

(2.) xxiv. 12 is confused, and coheres badly with 3-8; it is not directly stated, or even implied, that the "tables of stone" which God will give to Moses are to contain the words now recorded in Exodus xx. 2-17.

Kuenen's explanation of these phenomena must be studied in his long article in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for 1881, and in his *Onderzoek*. According to him the Book of the Covenant, together with xxiv. 3-8, were not originally connected with the revelation at Sinai. The Book of the Covenant filled the place now occupied by Deuteronomy. The judgments and statutes were delivered to Moses upon Sinai, but were not communicated to the people by Moses till forty years later in the field of Moab (see especially *Hexateuch*, E. T., page 258, and section 13, n. 32). The difficulty in the acceptance of this theory, which has many arguments in its favour, seems to me to lie in Exodus xxiv. 3-8. These verses show no appearance of having been "worked over," and they clearly imply that the words which Moses tells to the people had been revealed to him by God, not forty

years previously, but immediately before their repetition. Moses writes all the words of the Lord "in a book." Would the narrator have depicted him as waiting to do this till after the lapse of forty years? On the other hand, the twofold fact remains that the Book of the Covenant, together with xxiv. 3-8, fits in badly both with what precedes and what follows it. For xx. 22 is an awkward joint between xx. 21 (or 17, Kuenen, Jülicher) and 23, while the connection between xxiv. 8 and xxiv. 12 is, to put it mildly, very far from obvious. Whatever the true solution of these difficulties may be, it is plain that to E the Decalogue is not, as it is to D, the exclusive basis of the Covenant; for even if xxiv. 3-8 has been moved from another place, there is no trace that the Covenant there alluded to was not a first Covenant, but a second. Now Jülicher's theory is that the Decalogue must not be separated from the Book of the Covenant; when xx. 18-21 have been put after xix. 19 (so also Kuenen), and 22 and 23 removed (22 being regarded as an attempt to assimilate E with D, cp. Deut. iv. 36), then xx. 24 follows well upon xx. 17. Kuenen (*Hexateuch*, section 8, n. 12) rejects this theory, on the ground that in xxiv. 3-8 the Decalogue is not mentioned, and that in the original form of xxiv. 12 (see *Theol. Tijd.* xv., page 194) the stone tables destined for the Decalogue were alone alluded to, while the revelation of further laws and commandments was represented as still to come. As Jülicher's essays close with xxiv. 11, we do not know how he would have dealt with xxiv. 12. If the Decalogue was originally part and parcel of the Book of the Covenant, *then* the absence of its separate mention in xxiv. 3-8, no longer excites surprise. As regards xxiv. 12, the very point to my mind still *sub judice* is whether the לחת האבן were, according to this writer, destined to receive the Decalogue. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and I will give thee the tables of stone, and the law and the commandment which I have written for their instruction." Certainly this verse as it

stands is quite unintelligible. Colenso (Pentateuch vi., p. 159) has pointed out that, "the law and the commandment" in this larger sense are words peculiar to D. He regards the whole verse as an insertion from D. But this is objectionable on various grounds; among others, because D would never have made God speak of having himself written other laws besides the Decalogue. The Hebrew does not allow our taking "the law and the commandment" as epexegetical of the Tables. If we omit the three words, והתורה and והמצוה and להורתם as a Deuteronomistic addition, the difficulty is not removed. For it is very strange that the Deuteronomistic or any later redactor should have added words by which it would appear as if God wrote more than the precise contents of the Tables. Nor is it even easy to exclude the words אשר כתבתי from the interpolation. For "the tables of stone which I have written" seems a scarcely possible construction. Even Kuenen's hypothesis does not clearly account for all these peculiarities. But whatever the correct explanation may be, if the verse, either in its first half (Kuenen) or as a whole (Dillmann), originally ran, "And I will give thee the tables of stone," it did not state and it scarcely implied that the Divine writing upon these stones (xxxi. 18b; xxxii. 15-16) was the Decalogue of Exodus xx. 2-17. May we infer (because of the אֵת) that in a passage now omitted, God had said that he would write the Decalogue upon stone tables? But would J E, or even R, have omitted so important a passage? In our present text, at any rate, E implies by no word either here or at xxxi. 18b (or at xxxii. 15b, 16, if these verses belong to him) that the writing upon the tables, whose very number he does not mention, was no other than the words now contained in Exodus xx. 2-17.

Putting chapter xxxiv. for the present aside, and contrasting the vagueness of the statements in Exodus xix., xxiv., xxxi. 18, xxxii. with the definiteness and emphasis of those in Deut. iv., v., ix. 10, the inference seems to be that

considerable uncertainty prevailed in respect to what was really written upon the tables, as well as to their precise number. We have seen that D is the first to state that the tables were located in the ark (compare Kuenen, *Theol. Tijd.* xv., page 206); was he also the first writer to definitely identify the writing upon the tables with the Decalogue of Exodus xx. 2-17?

The Decalogue in D occupies a far more exalted position than in E. The fact that the covenant in E's story is not based upon the Decalogue, and the uncertainty whether the Decalogue was inscribed upon the tables, go some way towards diminishing the authority and the probable antiquity of these famous "words." Less ancient than the Book of the Covenant itself, they, however, can scarcely be. Jülicher's theory connecting the one with the other has been already referred to. I do not think it has been entirely disproved by Kuenen.[1] If Exodus xx. 18-21 stood originally just after xix. 19, is it not possible that D in v. 19-23 attempted to heighten the immense importance he assigned to the Decalogue by assuming that the people expressed their fear of God's voice, after they had heard the ten words, and not before the revelation had begun?[2]

In this case D would be responsible for one more addition

---

[1] Cp. Professor Carpenter's review of Kuenen's *Hexateuch* in the *Christian Reformer*, 1886, p. 179. Professor Carpenter omits the addition "and all the judgments" in xxiv. 3 as a gloss, and the "words" which the people pledge themselves to carry out are, according to him, the Decalogue in xx. 2-17, together with xx. 23-26. Thus xxiv. 3-8 would have nothing to do with xxi.-xxiii. (*i.e.*, with the Book of the Covenant). I do not think that this theory (which really also implies the relegation of xx. 18-21 after xix. 19) can easily be maintained, but at any rate the last four words of xxiv. 8 strongly recall xx. 1. In Jülicher's hypothesis this resemblance is accounted for.

[2] This would imply that the dislocation of Exodus xx. 18-21 is later than D. It may, perhaps, with Jülicher, be assigned to JE. At any rate, Jülicher seems to me right in maintaining that if xx. 18-21 originally followed xix. 19, the people did not hear the actual words spoken by God.

to the Decalogue story of E. The new elements in his narrative include:—

(1.) The definite title of "ten words."

(2.) The ten words as the sole basis of the Covenant.

(3.) The definite statement that it was the ten words which were graven upon the two tables.

(4.) The deposition of the tables in the ark.

Possibly also:

(5.) The audible pronouncement of the ten words to the whole people by the Divine voice from heaven. (This last point might, however, be due to JE, if JE were earlier than D. But see note 2, p. 283.)

Although the conclusion of this part of our inquiry leads us to infer that D or JE set the Decalogue in a far more striking framework than it had hitherto received, we are not by any means compelled to assume that the ten words, in their original form, are not more ancient than the narrative of E, in which they are now embedded. For one thing the lapidary brevity of the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments makes it more than probable that the ten words were only incorporated, and not composed by E. They are at least as old as the laws of the Book of the Covenant, which, in our present text, immediately follow them.

Kuenen's assignment of the Decalogue to the eighth or seventh century (*Hexateuch*, E. T., p. 244) has been already quoted. It is connected with his view of the repeated recensions which E has undergone, and that of the Sinaitic portion of the original narrative of E, scarcely more than xxxiii. 7-11, is left to us intact (*Hexateuch*, § 13, n. 25). "The Decalogue and the account of its proclamation, together with the associated story of the worship of the golden calf, were probably not incorporated till at least as late as Hezekiah's reign" (p. 251).

If this theory be true, the framework of the Decalogue is scarcely, if at all, younger than the ten words themselves. Is this probable? Surely not. If the Decalogue is not older than the eighth century, or even than the seventh, how

could it have won its authority so quickly? And if, as Kuenen himself holds, the tables of E were really inscribed with the Decalogue, would the writer have had the audacity to imply such a thing of a code, either of a contemporary or of his own? If E's tables were not intended for the Decalogue, and if the Ten Words were directly attached to the Book of the Covenant, E must surely have found this code already existing, at least in part, else would he have had the temerity to speak of Moses writing "all these words" in a book as the basis of a covenant between God and Israel? I am aware that this line of argument is susceptible of dangerous exaggeration, and has been used to prove the impossible, as, *e.g.*, the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. Still, I venture to think that the Decalogue, like the Book of the Covenant, stands on a different footing from other portions of the Pentateuch. Kittel's remark upon this point (*Geschichte*, I., p. 85), dealing more especially with the Book of the Covenant, but equally applicable to the Decalogue, is worthy of note. The precise date of the Book of the Covenant he will not venture to fix. "Yet the opinion," so he continues, "that similarities between the prophets of the eighth century with the Book of the Covenant and the Decalogue point to a contemporaneousness of origin seems to me exceedingly doubtful. E regards the Book as an ancient document, and as such introduces it to his readers; how inconceivably venturesome such a course would have been if the Book—as Kuenen holds—had only been compiled some few decades before!"

These considerations, however, are merely thrown out by the way. Returning to the critical analysis of the Pentateuchal narratives, we have now to ask whether J as well as E contained an account of the Revelation of Sinai? *A priori*, this would seem probable, and Dillmann, Kittel and Jülicher all agree that J's narrative, like E's, included a Sinaitic episode. Fragments of chapter xix., which cannot be E's, can fairly be assigned to J

(*e.g.*, 20, 21, 22, 23). Kuenen, however, doubts whether "J has contributed anything to the accounts of the Sinaitic legislation and the apostasy of the people" (*Hexateuch*, E. T., p. 142 and § 8, n. 18).

The question is connected with the interpretation that may be given of chap. xxxiv. The authorities differ widely in respect to the partition and meaning of this chapter. It is clearly made up of different elements. Beginning with a summons of God to Moses to hew two tables of stone and to bring them with him "to the top of the mount," that the misfortune of xxxii. 19 may be repaired, it passes on to describe a theophany, which in obviously close relation to the dialogue, xxxiii. 12-23, seems but loosely to cohere with the proposed object of the first verse, and continues with an announcement by God of a covenant which he will make between himself and Israel. There follows a short series of injunctions which are (27) to be written down by Moses as the basis of the covenant. Lastly, in verse 28 there seems to be a return to the original purpose of the chapter's opening, for we are told that "*he* (*i.e.*, presumably God) wrote upon the tables the Words of the Covenant, the ten words." Nor do the difficulties of these twenty-eight verses end here. Or is it a mere accident that xxxiv. 2, 3, and even 5 are so curiously parallel xix. 11, 12, 13, 18 (compare xix. 9, 20)?

In the *Hexateuch* Kuenen, like Dillmann and Kittel, regards 10-27 as the work of J, and as parallel to E's Book of the Covenant and Exodus xxiv. 3-8. But just as in E the Book of the Covenant and xxiv. 3-8 were not originally connected with the events at Sinai, so also did J's Words of the Covenant form no part of any Sinaitic revelation. Thus he says:—

(1.) The Words of the Covenant in their primitive form, and as they appeared in JE, contain nothing whatever which would compel us to regard them as having been Sinaitic from the first. (E. T., p. 262, § 13 n. 32 (6).

(2.) We may consider it probable, at any rate, that the

Words of the Covenant in their original form are very ancient, and were once part of a narrative of the foundation of Israel's national existence, possibly due to J. (E. T., p. 260, § 13, n. 32 (3); compare p. 158, § 8, n. 18, and p. 168, § 9, n. 4.)

Thus the Words of the Covenant are strictly parallel to the Book of the Covenant in E, and they occupied a similar position in the narrative — presumably J's — in which they were originally set. (*Hexateuch*, p. 168, § 9, n. 4. These words, it is there also stated, constituted a Ritual Decalogue.)

On the other hand, xxxiv. 1, 4, 28b, are assigned to E (*Hexateuch*, E.T., p. 153, § 8, n. 13), and are considered to relate how the Decalogue was re-written by Yahveh upon fresh tables of stone hewn by Moses. 2b (after the word "Sinai") and 6-8 belong to a later recension of E, being connected with xxxiii. 12b, 13, 17-23 (p. 247, § 13, n. 21).

This theory of xxxiv. 1-28 seems to me to add another difficulty to Kuenen's view that, in E as well as J, the Covenant was made, and its laws proclaimed (though not received), not at Sinai, but at a place and time which corresponded with the scene and occasion of Deuteronomy. For Kuenen seems to hold that the Covenant narratives of both E and J were taken up by JE and kept by him in their original places. Their present position is due to the Deuteronomic redactor (*Hexateuch*, E.T., p. 258). But how is it possible that JE should have included at one and the same time and place two separate covenant codes and two separate narratives of the making of one and the same covenant? Is such a repetition conceivable?

Nor does Kuenen's latest theory account for xxxiv. 2, 3, 5. In the *Tijdschrift*, these verses are connected with 10-27, and regarded as part of a separate narrative of the *Sinaitic* covenant; in the *Hexateuch* they are unexplained.

If Kuenen's theory be correct that J did not contain a *Sinaitic* narrative, J would also not have included the ten words of Exodus xx. 2-17, and the antiquity of the Deca-

logue becomes improbable. For had the Decalogue been in existence when J wrote, he would scarcely have omitted it from his book. It may here be added that, in the *Hexateuch* Kuenen has not accounted for Exodus xix. 20-25. That these verses are not E's is obvious, and has been proved in detail by Kuenen himself in the *Tijdschrift*. But if not E's, whose are they if not J's? In the article in the *Tijdschrift* they are regarded (together with xxiv. 1, 2, 9-11) as fragments of *another* account of Yahveh's revelations upon Sinai. (The connection between xix. 20-25 and xxiv. 1, 2, 9-11, is puzzling, for the latter words show traces of E's language rather than J's. But compare Dillmann *ad loc.*) In the *Hexateuch* Kuenen alludes to difficulties in respect to xix. 20-25, and xxiv. 1, 2, 9-11, but, so far as I see, does not deal with them in detail (p. 152, § 8, n. 12).

It is surely dangerous, for the sake of a fragment like xix. 20-25, to assume a third narrator beyond and above J and E. If these verses are J's, his narrative *did* embrace a *Sinaitic* revelation. Did it also include the Decalogue? This brings us to the theory of Wellhausen.

It is unnecessary to state Wellhausen's views, or the arguments by which he substantiates them, in detail, for his essay, first published in 1876, upon the composition of the *Hexateuch*, is in the hands of every student. Its conclusions have, however, been modified in the *Nachträge* to the second edition (1889) of the *Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (a reprint of the essay in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* together with the passages in Bleek's *Einleitung*, fourth ed., relating to Judges, Samuel and Kings).

Wellhausen's original theory was that the Book of Exodus contains portions of three stories relative to the Sinaitic revelation. There is E, there is J, and there is also a third narrator, whose relation in an amended and altered form is discoverable in chapter xxxiv. E's original narrative included xix. 10-19, xx. 1-17, 18-21, xxiv. 12-14, xxxi. 18, and

portions of the story of the golden calf and the breaking of the tables (*i.e.*, at least xxxii. 1-6, 15-20, 35, xxxiii. 1-11, partly). J's narrative included xix. 20-25 . . . . . xx. 23-26, xxi.-xxiii., xxiv. 3-8. J therefore had no Decalogue, whether moral or ritual; the Book of the Covenant is the sole constituent of the revelation and the covenant which were made at Sinai. Then, lastly, there is the third narrative in xxxiv. For, omit all the words after "stones" (אבנים) in verse 1, and the single word כראשנים (like unto the first) in verse 4, and you have in 1-5, 10-28, a narrative of the first revelation upon Sinai, parallel in many points to the others (cp. xxxiv. 2, 3, with xix. 11, 12), but yet independent. These parallelisms, and the difficulty in verse 5 (for, according to E and J, Yahveh has already been for some time upon the mountain), led Kuenen, as we have already seen, in his article in the *Tijdschrift*, to regard 2, 3, 5, 10-27, as fragments of an independent narrative of the Sinaitic covenant. Wellhausen does not separate these verses from 1, 4, and 28. In his view, therefore, Moses not only hews the tables, but *also* writes the covenant words upon them. The subject of ויכתב in 28b is not God, but Moses. Moreover, these words were originally a decalogue, and are called by this author עשרת דברים. In accordance with Goethe,[1] Wellhausen picks out ten commandments from xxxiv. 10-27, which ritual decalogue he considers to be far more ancient than the moral decalogue of E.

In Kuenen's essay in the *Tijdschrift* (1881) Wellhausen's entire theory is criticised, and, as we have indirectly learnt, only partially accepted. In the *Nachträge* Wellhausen criticises Kuenen, but, though only published in 1889, these additions do not refer to the new edition of the *Onderzoek*. Wellhausen now agrees with Kuenen that the Book of the Covenant (together, it must be assumed, with xxiv. 3-8) does not belong to J, but he still strongly main-

[1] In his *Zwo wichtige bisher unerörterte Biblische Fragen*, etc., Werke. Vol. XXXI. p. 269 (in the *Cotta 'sche Bibliothek der Weltliteratur* Edition).

tains his old view of xxxiv. 1-5, 10-28, the authorship of which he now assigns to J. The ritual decalogue is therefore J's, who in this, as in other things, shows his priority to E. The list of the ten commandments themselves is not now exactly the same as it was in 1876; it is made up of 14a, 17, 18a, 19a, 22a, 22b, 25a, 25b, 26a, 26b. Wellhausen is urgent against the separation of 4 from 5, and of 27 from 28. "In Kuenen's theory 27 stands in the air, and the command 'write' has no *sequitur*. The change of subject in (28) ויכתב is very hard, and, above all, very uncautious; it was especially necessary to supply the correct *nomen proprium* here, and not to allow the reader to fall into the error of assuming that Moses is the subject of ויכתב as well as of עשרת." As regards this point, it has been noticed by Kittel that a change of subject in J is not infrequent (p. 180, n. 3). Thus, in xxiv. 5, the subject of ויקרא, according to Wellhausen himself, is not Yahveh, but Moses. Again, omitting the "Jehovistic" insertion 6-9, in the ויאמר of 10, the subject is changed back from Moses to Yahveh. Moreover, verse 28, to my mind, shows signs of having been worked over or changed, when it was removed from its original place by the Deuteronomic reviser; we cannot be certain of the original text of it in J or E, to whichever of the two it may belong. For (1) the abstinence from bread and water is especially noted in D (ix. 9, 18). (2) The Decalogue is only for D the basis of the Covenant, and (3) the number of the words is there noted to have been precisely ten (iv. 13, x. 4).

A variety of difficulties suggest themselves as to Wellhausen's theory, even in the later form of it in the *Nachträge*.

(1.) If xxxiv. 1-5, without the editorial changes, belong to J, what is their relation to xix. 20-25?

(2.) In the story of J a covenant is made upon the basis of a ritual decalogue; in E the ritual decalogue is changed to a moral one, but a covenant is not made upon its basis. Would this important feature of the narrative have been omitted? If

E wished to emphasise the importance of *his* decalogue, would he not have made it the basis of the Divine covenant, if the tradition of a covenant upon the basis of *some* decalogue was already in existence ?

(3.) God says to Moses (27), "Write thou these words"; he does not say, "Write them upon the tablets."

(4.) xxxiv. 27 is surely parallel to xxiv. 4-8.

Thus the more probable explanation of xxxiv. will still remain that into the narrative, whether E's or J's, of the new tables (1-4, 28), there has been inserted in a curtailed form that portion of J which corresponded with E's Book of the Covenant and xxiv. 3-8 ; the resemblances of xxxiv. 2, 3, with xix. 11-13, may be either accounted for like Dillmann, or regarded as the work of a later redactor, possibly JE, to whom I would also assign xxxiv. 5.

In that case the view that J did not contain a version of the Decalogue we now possess in an enlarged form in Exodus xx. 2-17 and Deut. v. 6-18 is incapable of proof. If, for other reasons, we think it probable that that decalogue is considerably older than E, then it is even likely that J (assuming his priority to E) did not omit so important a document. The two main narratives of the revelation at Sinai have gone through so many recensions that it will not ever be possible to unravel many of the difficulties which the text of Exodus presents to us. xxiv. 12 is a most serious puzzle. xxxiv. 1-5, 10-28, whether we adopt the theories of Kuenen or of Dillmann, or of that modified form of Wellhausen (as regards 1-5), suggested by Kittel, will never be quite satisfactorily explained. xxiv. 3-8 is neither easily kept where it is, nor easily removed elsewhere. And there are many other minor obscurities. At the same time, the mere critical and literary analysis of the Sinaitic narratives is, upon the whole, not unfavourable to the view that the compilation of the Ten Commandments was considerably anterior to the narrative of which they now form part.

CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE.

JAIR CHAYIM BACHARACH:

A Biographical Sketch.

Even Fame has its accidents. It is not always the greatest minds, and certainly not the most important scholars concerning whom the history of literature furnishes us with information. In our every-day life, both complicated circumstances and trivial causes often work together to exclude a man, who is above the common level, from the position in which his brilliancy ought really to shine forth, and to pure accident, that most unconscientious of heirs, is left the task of dealing with the intellectual work that he leaves behind him as a heritage. But none of the heroes of Jewish literature have experienced so fully this fate, both in lifetime and after death, as that most learned, versatile, and original of the German Rabbis of the seventeenth century—R. Jair Chayim Bacharach.

The most gloomy century in the modern history of Judaism—the century that witnessed the horrors of the Thirty Years' War, the massacres by Bogdan Chmielnicki, the crimes of Sweden, Poland, and the Cossacks, as well as the spiritual plague-spots of the belief in Sabbatai Zebi, the spread of the Cabbala and general intellectual obscurity —this same century produced in Chayim Bacharach a man who was in advance of his time, and who, in full possession of all the knowledge and learning of his day, was unfettered by it, but rose high above it in full intellectual freedom. He might have become the founder of a true scientific spirit among the Jews of Germany and of other lands, the teacher of the exile in systematic study of the Talmud and the whole body of traditional literature: so complete was his command of this wide-spreading branch

of learning, so profound and independent was his intelligent and thorough grasp of it. He was orthodox, and strict in his adherence to the minutiæ of *German* observances and piety, yet in his knowledge of philosophy was equalled by but few of his contemporaries. Devotedly attached to the Cabbala, he busied himself, as far as the materials to hand permitted, in the study of natural science. Although he evinced remarkable acumen, both in the intricacies of the Halacha and the profound spirit of the Agada, he still found leisure to occupy himself seriously with mathematics and astronomy, and displayed ability in historical and critical studies. The highest degrees of receptivity and of productiveness were united in him. Although he was deeply absorbed in his main studies, he did not allow them to crush him to the ground. With a strength of mind which we alone, who now regard it from a distance, can fully appreciate, he shook himself free from the bonds of the self destructive Pilpul, which enthralled the intellect like an iron chain. Thus he was able to contemplate the phenomena of Talmudic dialectics with a keen, unclouded glance, and to catch the spirit of its laws. Whilst other men looked down with indifference or contempt upon all non-Talmudic subjects, and allowed the study of the Bible, grammar, and all historical knowledge to decay, and lie neglected, his untiring assiduity and zeal for inquiring into every branch of Jewish learning led him to collect whatever came to his hand, whether it consisted of notes upon the Massora or philosophy, upon the Agada or mathematics, upon the Halacha or natural science, whether it was an ancient poem, an historical remark, or a ritual practice. All this work was, in truth, the first revelation of a scientific spirit among the German Jews, the development of which has evolved for us the history and science of Judaism. In his diligence in collecting and tabulating information, I can compare him only to his great Italian contemporary, Abraham Joseph Solomon Graziano, except that he displayed more originality and independent research in his work, and did not rely upon borrowed or

purchased materials. In order, however, to comprehend this truly singular combination of profound erudition with a versatile scientific method, it is necessary to examine the soil upon which this rare mind flourished, to consider the circumstances which surrrounded him from his birth onwards, and to take a glance at the distinguished family of which he was the intellectual heir. It is said that nature gathers strength through several generations of a family, and ultimately to the astonishment of the world produces a creative mind. That this is sometimes true R. Chayim Bacharach furnishes a convincing proof.

At the head of this family, like a sun in the heavens, stands R. Jehuda Liva b. Bezalel, "the tall R. Löw," the most famous and most important Rabbi of his day. Through his eminent son-in-law, R. Isaac b. Samson Cohen and his wife, the rabbinically learned Fogele,[1] he became the ancestor of the house of Bacharach. Eve, the daughter of Isaac, in the year 1600,[2] became the second wife of R. Samuel b. Isaac. Brought up under the eyes of her grandfather, that light of the exile, at the side of her distinguished brothers, R. Chayim, afterwards Rabbi of Prague, Frankfurt-on-Main and Posen,[3] and R. Naphtali, afterwards Rabbi of Lublin, well educated by her illustrious parents, Eve grew to be one of the most extraordinary women of whom Jewish literature speaks. She was as well versed in the Scriptures and the Midrash as any learned man, and was, moreover, thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew and Aramaic. She read both Agadic works and the liturgical poetry of the Synagogue, without needing a commentary, and was ready with an explanation of passages that puzzled many a competent Rabbinical scholar.[4] Her husband, however, who was twenty years

---

[1] *Gal-Ed;* ed. Koppelmann Lieben, Nos. 84 and 91.

[2] בכורים, ed. N. Keller, i. 6; N. Grün, *Der hohe Rabbi Löw*, 22.

[3] Perles, *Geschichte der Juden in Posen*, 77; Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, ii. 25.

[4] *Memorbuch of Worms*, קבץ על יד, III., 15; חות יאיר, Preface.

of age when he married her, was worthy of her rare talents and ability. It was not long before the renown of the young and learned Rabbi, who received additional distinction by his union with a noble family, spread throughout the country. After acting as preacher in Prague and Rabbi in Jung-Bunzlau, in Bohemia, he was appointed to the important post of Rabbi in Worms, which had already been occupied by many celebrated Rabbis. Energetic in action, determined and self-conscious, with all his humility, he succeeded, in spite of his youth, in winning unbounded respect. Like his grandfather and teacher, the tall R. Löw, he boldly showed his contempt for calumny,[1] and allowed nothing to deter him from doing what he deemed to be right. But, in the midst of his peaceful and prosperous activity, a terrible misfortune befell him, which threatened to ruin his ancient and honoured community, and which, unhappily, cost him his life. One of those persecutions, which seemed indeed the very offspring of hell, broke out against the Jews of Worms, who took to flight in fear of the horrors that menaced them, leaving their most precious possessions, the Synagogue and the cemetery, to the fury of the savage mob. On Good Friday, the 7th of April, 1615, the roof of the Synagogue was torn off, the cemetery was laid waste, and the tombstones, regardless of their antiquity, were broken to pieces.[2] The Rabbi, Samuel, fled to Gernsheim on the Rhine. By the 24th of April, the Electoral Prince Palatine of Heidelberg had indeed suppressed the riot by force, but the victims who had fallen could not be restored to life; among them was R. Samuel. He died upon foreign soil in his fortieth year, and on the 26th of May, 1615, he was buried in the

---

[1] חוט השני, *Resp.* 27; N. Grün, *ib.*, 19. The *Responsum* of Samuel was written in the year of the death of the tall R. Löw, which took place on 17th September, 1709; this is seen from the addition of the letters הכ"מ to the name of R. Löw. R. Samuel addressed *Resp.* 49 to his grandfather-in-law and teacher, R. Löw.

[2] Khevenhiller, *Annalium Ferdinandeorum*, viii. 758.

cemetery of Alsbach on the Bergstrasse.[1] Although he died young, he left behind some valuable and learned writings, which, as they treat both of mathematics and astronomy, differ considerably from the usual tendency of works of that age. Thoroughly acquainted with the literature of the Talmud, and known as a widely-sought authority in answering Rabbinical questions, he laboured with great industry in a field generally neglected, viz., in preparing new critical commentaries[2] to the works of Maimuni upon the Jewish calendar, to the astronomical book of Abraham b. Chiya upon the form of the earth, and to other works of Jewish astronomers.

His unhappy wife, the high-minded and pious Eve, left Worms with her children, who were still of tender years, and returned to her parents and relatives in Prague. It was with a boy, eight years old, named Samson, and, as far as I can ascertain, with three daughters,[3] that the young widow sought her parents' home. Completely absorbed in

---

[1] As his tombstone was described by L. Lewysohn, in his נפשות צדיקים, No. 30, only fragmentarily, a copy of it, kindly procured for me by Mr. Max Ketsch, of Gernsheim on the Rhine, may not be out of place here :—

אוי

כי אבד כלי חמדה גנוז וטמון פה ה״ה הגאון הגדול מהו׳ שמואל שהי׳
גדול ליהודים אב״ד ור״מ דק״ק טורבין קעלין פארליין ובווירמזה הבירה והי׳
בקי בכל חדרי התורה שמין מנהו ה״ה כתובים כשו״ת חות יאיר שפתותיה
שושנים ובגירוש ווירמז בגולה הלך ולגערנסהיים נשאוהו רגליו הערבונים
וימת שמואל בן ארבעים שנים ונק׳ ביום ג׳ בחדש זיו זיו(ן)[ו] פְּנֵה אוֹרוֹ
כְּבָה לפק ת נ צ ב ה

The stone, which was only set up about a hundred years after the death of Samuel, contains the mistake of חות יאיר for חוט השני. From the explanation in חות יאיר, p. 272*b* to p. 228*b*, we also see that the sentence that denotes the year כְּבָה אורו refers to the 27th of Iyar; cp. Zunz, *Monatstage*, 29, and *Literaturgeschichte*, 429.

[2] חות יאיר, *Resp.* 146, at the end. Out of his works, most of which have been lost, his grandson could only save a few fragments : *vide* Cod. Oxford, 2149. About his poems, see Zunz, *L. G.* 429 ; his penitential poem אנא מארץ is found in Cod. Oxford 1154 (see Neubauer, p. 349).

[3] Levysohn, 53, only mentions Samson, and remarks, "whether he had any more children is unknown."

the education of her children, she passed her years of mourning in pious works and study, ever cherishing in undying love the fond memory of her deceased husband. No less a person than Isaiah Hurwitz, the famous author of the *Two Tables of the Covenant* (של"ה), who was revered almost as a saint, proposed in vain for her hand, and deeply deplored the fact of his being deemed unworthy of so holy a union.[1] Loved by all, and treated with the greatest reverence by her learned brothers,[2] Eve chose to pass her life as a widow, and as a mother devoted to her children. R. Chayim Cohen, her brother, the grandson of the tall R. Löw, who had married Bella,[3] the daughter of the Primator of Prague, Samuel b. Bezalel, his cousin, became the teacher of Samuel[4] (Samson?), in whom the talents of his father already displayed themselves. According to the custom of the time, he was chosen to be the son-in-law of some rich man, and went to Ungarisch-Brod, in Moravia, where, in 1627, he married Dobrusch, the daughter of the wealthy and distinguished Isaac b. Phœbus,[5] who, so as not to be confused with his brother-in-law, the Moravian district magistrate, Dick-Isaac, was called Dünn-Isaac. He had not yet intended to accept a Rabbinate, when the sufferings of the war of 1627 disturbed his new home; his father-in-law, as the head of the

---

[1] חות יאיר, Preface.

[2] *Ib.*, וא"א להפליג מחלוקת כבוד והדור שנתנו שני הגאונים הג"ל באחותם

[3] According to S. Hock, *Familienregister*, Bella died in Shebat, 1677, in Prague, surviving her husband about forty years. Cp. Meir Perles, מגילת יוחסין, ed. Lewin, p. 9*b*.

[4] *V.* Cod. Oxford, 746[2], where the annotations of R. Samson and his uncle and teacher, R. Chayim, are to be seen.

[5] חות יאיר, p. 272*b*; אונגרשין ברוד, as Bacharach writes it, is no error, but the dative form in German of the name of the place, upon which see Rudolf Hildebrand in the *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht*, III., 300. The town which is now called Ungarisch-Brod was then called Ungarschen-Brod. So also, according to Simcha b. Chayim, in Bills of Divorce the words must be written אלטי"ן אובן, as Alten Ofen is the same as Alt-Ofen; see שמות ס', p. 114*a*.

community, was dragged to prison, and could only be liberated upon the payment of a ransom of 10,000 gulden for himself and a fellow-prisoner.[1] Beneath the weight of these calamities his pecuniary resources began to fail, and Samson was compelled to accept the post of Rabbi at Göding, in Moravia, which was offered him.[2] An inscription, dated 1629, written upon an inner wall of the synagogue, and composed in the form of an acrostic of forty-three words, gives the full name of the Rabbi, who was then twenty-two years of age, and who seems to have inherited the art of making acrostics from his grandfather, R. Isaac b. Samson Cohen.[3] An insight into the untroubled state of his inner family life, in spite of his varying fortunes, is afforded us by a hymn that he composed for his wife on Purim, 1629, and which, being in a musical form, was sung and played by her every week on the coming in of the Sabbath.[4] Bereaved of gifted and promising children in their early years,[5] Samson's life was not of the happiest. In 1635 we find him in the ancient and famous Moravian congregation of Leipnik, paying diligent attention to perfecting his knowledge in Rabbinical learning.

It was in this town and in this year that he was admonished by his uncle, R. Naphtali Cohen, of Lublin, not to let the study of the law absorb him to the neglect of the claims of secular life and of his still unmarried sister.[6] His mother, Eve, had remained behind in Prague, where she had already given two of her daughters in marriage.

---

[1] חות יאיר, p. 277*b*.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 237*a*, בהיותי בן כ״ד שנים בק״ק גידונג רב ומורה.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 224*a*; another acrostic for the wall of the Synagogue he composed upon the deliverance of Ung.-Brod. from the troops of Mansfeld; *ib.*, p. 223*b*; cp. Zunz, *L. G.*, p. 437. Upon the acrostics of R. Isaac Cohen, see S. Hock, in *Gal-Ed*, p. 47.

[4] שומר ציון הנאמן, No. 66, p. קלב*b*., תקנתיו לכבוד אשתי שתנגן אותו בכלי זמר.

[5] חות יאיר, p. 237*b*; שבעתי מרורות בשיכול בנים לקברות ילדים נחמדים בצורות בוען מקטפין ידיעין ווכרות חכמה בפניהם מאירות.

[6] חוט השני, *Resp.*, 96, at the end.

The names of her sons-in-law are known. They are Liepmann Günzburg, of Prague,[1] whose full name was Liebermann b. Löb Darschan (his occupation was that of writer of scrolls of the Law),[2] whose wife, Hindel, died at Prague in 1641, and Moses Perez, called Sabele, Rabbi of Schnaittach, in Bavaria, whose wife Tebzel, was buried in 1669, in Prague.[3] The children of the last-named daughter of Eve afterwards settled in Prague, where they and their descendants deservedly enjoyed the highest esteem of their neighbours. Thus Simeon, the son of Sabele, had a son, Isaac Lovotiz (which name he adopted from that of his father-in-law, David Lovotiz), who became Primator of Prague.[4] Simeon was famed for his complete mastery over the whole Mishna, which he was able to recite by heart. He died in Adar II., 1729, at the age of eighty-two.

But the real star of the family was yet to rise. In 1638, a child was born in Leipnik to R. Samson, who was called Chayim, probably after his grand-uncle, the celebrated Rabbi of Posen, who had but recently died.[5] The name of Jair was added afterwards during a dangerous illness.[6] The period of his childhood was a dreary time, full of

---

[1] Mentioned upon the tombstone of his daughter Miriam, who died in 1680 (S. Hock).

[2] He is thus described upon the tombstone of his daughter Rebecca, who died in 1669 (S. Hock).

[3] תשרי ת״ל (S. Hock). *V.* Meir Perles, p. 11*b*. His grandson, who died in advanced years in Prague, on Saturday, 25 Kislev, 1734 (תצ״ה), assumed his name פרץ המכונה סבלא (S. Hock).

[4] Meir Perles, *ib.* When the latter wrote his *Genealogy of the tall R. Löw*, in 1727, Simeon was already over 80 years old. His wife, Rebecca, died in Elul, 1714 (S. Hock). The primator signs himself (20 August, 1725) Isak Lowetitz; see Frankel-Grätz, *Monatsschrift*, 1887, p. 213.

[5] בשנת ת״ך בן כ״ב, as R. Chayim describes himself in בכורים, I., 23, according to which in חות יאיר, p. 230*a*, the phrases בן כ״ד and בן כ״ג must be explained to refer to the beginning and end of his twenty-third year. R. Chayim Cohen died in 1635 in Posen; *v.* Perles, 77, note 31, and Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, 7, 154, note 4.

[6] In the Preface to חות יאיר, p. 2*a*, he states, ושמי אשר מן השמים ניתן לי בחוליי יאיר: וכך שמי מבטן קורא לי חיים.

sorrow and trouble. The horrors of the Swedish war came to a climax for Leipnik in 1643. In a letter to Axel Oxenstierna from the camp at Dobitschau, dated July 3rd, 1643, Torstensohn reckons "Leypenik" among the Moravian places he wishes to "impound"; shortly afterwards it was really invested by his Major-General Mortaigne. After being reduced to a state of starvation by a ten weeks' siege, the town was stormed and the inhabitants declared prisoners of war. But the people were so disheartened and harassed that bare existence seemed a gain to them, and R. Samson composed penitential hymns for his congregation that had escaped destruction which to the present day are recited there on the 17th of Tammuz.[1] In 1643, however, when these terrible sufferings had come to an end, he left Leipnik in order to fill the post of preacher in Prague, the home of his family, where his own youth had been passed.[2] The promising son of Samson was six years of age, when he was taken to Prague, where Eve was made happy by witnessing the gradual intellectual development of the most talented of all her descendants. But the distress caused by the Thirty Years' War, that ended so disastrously for Prague, played sad havoc with the happiness of this peaceful family. They fled from the town during the pestilence that broke out after the dreadful siege of the old and new town of Prague, lasting from the 26th of July to the 2nd of November, 1648, and for six months sought shelter in a small Bohemian village.[3] For

---

[1] חות יאיר, p. 237*b*; Zunz, *L. G.*, p. 438. In 1879 I obtained a copy of the poems from the parchment records of the Synagogue in Leipnik. The letters ת"ב are to be corrected to ת"נ. Cp. Dudick, *Schweden in Böhmen und Mähren*, 86, 90; also cp. שומר ציון הנאמן, No. 74, p. 148*d*, and No. 76, p. 152*c*.

[2] It may perhaps be allowed to see in his words in the חות יאיר, p. 237*a*, זמן דת נתנה לפרט a reference to the date 7th of Marcheshvan, 1643.

[3] *Ib.* 237*b*, ומישך שנה is not an exact date; cp. Juda Löb b. Joshua, in his מלחמה בשלום, ed. Wagenseil, *Exercitationes sex*, p. 102, *sqq.*, with the account given by S. Dudik, *Schweden in Böhmen und Mähren*, 1640-1650, p. 289-342, whose sources furnished by the Jewish eye-witness, Juda Löb

six years and a-half R. Samson continued to perform his functions as preacher week after week in Prague, until, in the summer of 1650, he achieved the highest happiness of his life—that of becoming the successor of his father, as chosen Rabbi of the community of Worms.[1] Eve's daughters were now all either dead or married, and she had no longer any reason for remaining in Prague. She therefore accompanied her son to his new home, where she had passed her young days with the husband whose memory she still cherished, and whose prosperous activity she had there witnessed. But it seemed as if she had only been desirous of awaiting her grandson's thirteenth birthday and its attendant festivities, before carrying into effect a desire she had long entertained—a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Thus, after remaining scarcely a year in Worms, we see her, a weak and aged woman, parting from her family with an heroic spirit to undertake a pilgrimage to Palestine. But she who had undergone so many trials through life was denied her last wish; in the middle of her journey death overtook her, and she was buried in the Bulgarian city of Sofia.[2]

Chayim Bacharach was thus thirteen years of age when he came to the famous town of Worms, about which he had heard his grandmother and his parents speak so much. His earliest impressions, however, which formed the germs of his ideals, took their root in Prague. He always remembered how, standing by the south wall of the Alt-Neusynagoge, near the Ark, where the seat of his father was, he used to have as a neighbour the revered R. Pinchas Hurwitz, the great student and interpreter of Asheri, who, as the

---

b. Joshua, contain valuable explanatory and additional notes, an excellent example of the importance of Hebrew sources that are yet to be utilised in general history. R. Samson himself wrote a few remarks, in verse, upon the siege as an introduction to his poem, שומר ציון הנאמן, No. 55, p. 110*b*.

[1] חות יאיר, p. 237*a*; ונתקבלתי לרב סוף שנת ת״י בווירמי״ש, and No. 123, p. 116*b*, סמוך לביאתו לק״ק ווירמיש שהיה סוף שנת ת״י.

[2] *Ib.*, Preface.

President of the Rabbinate in Prague, and a colleague of R. Simeon Spira, ended his days there, after having been Rabbi in the imperial town of Fulda.[1] This special devotion to Asheri's compendium of the Talmud was a tradition in Prague, which was a great help to studies and discoveries in the vast field of Talmudical lore. R. Samson was also a commentator of Asheri,[2] whilst another great-grandson of the tall R. Löw, named Simeon Brandeis,[3] was so thoroughly conversant with the writings of this renowned jurist that he was able to repeat them all off by heart. (This Simeon was an uncle of the worthy R. Meir Perles, of Prague, the chronicler of the family of R. Löw.) The young Chayim Bacharach followed in their footsteps. Carefully instructed by his father, as well as other teachers in the Bible, Mishna and Talmud, he had at the early age of thirteen already discovered the secret, that a diligent study of Alfasi, and further an intimate acquaintance with Asheri, would cause the gates of the Talmud to open wide before him. Even after he reached manhood, R. Chayim was still so thoroughly accustomed to the abridged Talmud by Asheri, that he marked at the side of his copy of this compilation, which was less handy an edition than that which we now possess, the corresponding pages of the Talmud, so that he could in an instant refer to the source of any extract contained in this his favourite work.[4] In his father, who excelled no less as a dis-

[1] *Ib.*, No. 123, p. 116*b*. He and Simeon Spira gave their approval (in 1650) of the collection of sermons that R. Samson Bacharach intended to publish on leaving Prague; *ib.*, p. 237*a*. The evidence of R. Samson and R. Chayim Bacharach confirms the statements upon his epitaph (see *Gal-Ed*, No. 138) as to the extraordinary erudition of this famous man, who died towards the end of 1653.

[2] The work called אבן הראשה, that was commenced in Leipnik, only contained R. Samson's commentary to twelve tractates, and was then broken off; see חוות יאיר, p. 237*a*, *b*.

[3] Meir Perles, p. 10*a*. Simeon was the grandson of Gütel, the daughter of the tall R. Löw, who died on Friday, 7th Tishri, 1634 (תצ"ה). He died Friday, 13th Tammuz, 1665 (S. Hock).

[4] חוות יאיר, No. 123, p. 116*b*.

tinguished scholar in the Halacha than as an eminent preacher, he had a splendid teacher, whose side he appears not to have left until, when still a youth, he entered the house of his future father-in-law. At the beginning of the year 1653, he married in Fulda,[1] Sarlan, the daughter of Sussman Brilin,[2] who, after the death of R. Samuel Aaron b. Eliakim, which had but recently taken place, was elected Rabbi in his stead. Through this union the descendant of the tall R. Löw became closely related to the most distinguished family in Germany, that had offshoots in all directions, viz., the family of Oppenheim. His brother-in-law, Isaac Brilin, the courageous and learned Rabbi, first of Hammelburg, and after the expulsion of the Jews from that town in the year 1670, of Mannheim, was the son-in-law of Simeon Wolf Oppenheim[3] in Worms, so that Abraham, the father of R. David Oppenheim, and Samuel,[4] the richest and most powerful financier among the Jews of Germany, who was the chief agent at the court of the Emperor Leopold in Vienna, were his brothers-in-law. R. Isaac, moreover, through his eldest daughter Hennele,[5] became the father-in-law of Wolf Oppenheim of Worms, and through his second, Frumet,[6]

---

[1] חוט השני, No. 81; בסוף שבט [ת״ד] בבואי לביתי מק״ק פולד שהייתי שם על חתונת בני שי׳.

[2] The *Memorbuch of Fulda*, p. 18*b*, contains the following information: יא״נ הגאון המופלג בחכמה מהרר שמואל אהרן בן מורינו רב רבי אליקים ז״ל שהיה פה ק״ק בולדא אב״ד וראש הישיבה והרביץ תורה בישראל עבור שנתנו יורשיו וכו׳ [נפטר יו׳ ה׳ ט׳ אייר תי״ב ונקבר ביו׳ הנ״ל]. The year of R. Sussman's death is not given; on p. 26*a* we read of him: יא״נ המאור הגדול הגאון החסיד ועניו מהורר משולם אליעזר זוסמן בר יצחק ז״ל ע״נ אי״ו עבור שהרביץ תורה בישראל והעמיד תלמידים הרבה והיה מורה צדק ואב ב״ד ור״י פה ק״ק בולדא וברוב קהילות במדינות אשכנז ועמד בפרץ ויסד ותיקן ברוב חכמתו צרכי רבים וביט(ו)ל גירושין גם בניו נתנו נדר וצדקה להקדש בשכר זה תנצב״ה עשצ״ו שבגע״א:

[3] קבץ על יד, III. 18; Kaufmann, *Samson Wertheimer*, p. 75.

[4] *Ib.* 3, note 1.

[5] קבץ על יד, III. 38.

[6] Kaufmann, *ib.*, 75, note 1.

of Samson Wertheimer, the chief agent and district Rabbi of Vienna. These illustrious relationships, however, were only to produce their effect in the future; for the immediate present, directly after his marriage, it was the erudition of the new family which he had joined rather than their brilliant relatives that was of service to Bacharach. We learn from R. Wolf Traub, the Rabbi of Witzenhausen, Mainz and Würzburg,[1] that the young son-in-law of Sussman Brilin became his most zealous pupil, and for many years continued to perfect his already marvellous knowledge under his guidance and in his house. Through his father-in-law and brothers-in-law, the inclination of Bacharach to obtain a mastery over the Talmud by the help of Alfâsi and Asheri, became strengthened.[2] Through R. Sussman, Chayim became also the nephew of the learned Rabbi of Heidingsfeld, R. Azriel Brilin.[3] More than six years were passed in study at the house of R. Sussman. Bacharach then felt himself sufficiently strong in his acquaintance with rabbinical literature to be independent, to desire authorisation to fill the post of Rabbi from one of the authorities of the time, and to leave his home to seek for a rabbinate. In the winter of 1659-60 he therefore made his way from the house of his father-in-law, in Fulda, back to the home of his parents in Worms.[4] As he himself tells us, he was slightly built, and of a weak constitution.[5] In 1660 he was ordained a Rabbi, by the celebrated Rabbi of Frankfurt, R. Mendel Bass, of Cracow, also called R. Mendel R. Isaac R.

---

[1] חות יאיר, p. 235*a*; cp. אבן השהם, *Resp.*, 58, where he also signs himself בניכין זאב ווייל, and also his approbation of the work חכם לב (Fürth, 1693).

[2] חות יאיר, No. 123, p. 116*b*.

[3] Kaufmann, *ib.*, 75, note 3. I would suggest that he is identical with the Azriel b. Isaac Berlin, of Frankfurt, who, owing to a dispute with R. Mendel Bass, was forced to surrender office (Horovitz ii. 44, note 3). He afterwards obtained another rabbinate.

[4] חות יאיר, No. 150, כאשר חזרתי לבדי מבית חמי מק״ק בולדא לביתי בק״ק ווירמיישא בחורף שנת ת״ך.

[5] *Ib.*

Abigdors.[1] From that time Bacharach, by means of regular correspondence, maintained a warm friendship with the son-in-law of R. Mendel, R. Meir Stern, Rabbinats-assessor in Frankfurt, and afterwards Rabbi of Fulda and Amsterdam. At the fairs held in Frankfurt, the public sermons of the young twenty-two-year-old Rabbi attracted a large amount of attention.[2] It was most probably about this time that Bacharach, after delivering several sermons by invitation in different towns of Germany, was appointed to the post of Rabbi in Mainz.[3] On the 11th of Adar, 1662, he lost his mother, who departed this life after an illness that had lasted ten years. Her husband, R. Samson, had for many years in vain prayed[4] for her recovery in the propitiatory hymn which he had himself composed, and which he recited on every day before the new moon; he stood now alone on the threshold of old age. Most of her children were already married when she died.[5] Her daughter Fögele, who bore the name of her great-grandmother, was already wedded, before her parents went to reside in Worms, to the Rabbinats-assessor of Prague, Salman Schulhof, surnamed Moschels, who was one of the victims in the burning of Prague, in 1689. Two of the most prominent rabbinical families in Germany were united

---

[1] *Ib.*, in the beginning of No. 159. At the end of his preface he speaks of the way R. Mendel sometimes wrote his name, whence I infer that Isaac R. Abigdor was the father-in-law of R. Mendel. Cp. Horovitz, ii. 40 *sqq.*, and Ch. N. Dembitzer, כלילת יופי, p. 51*b*.

[2] חות יאיר, p. 230*a*, and בכורים, I., 23.

[3] Upon his epitaph (Levysohn, p. 72) he is explicitly mentioned as Rabbi of Mainz. I would suggest that the correspondence with his father חוט השני (No. 83-92), and the remarks upon his practice as a Rabbi in the year 1664 (חות יאיר, No. 235) probably belong to the period he was in Mainz.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 272*b* and p. 225*b*.

[5] That R. Chayim was the only son is shown by, *e.g.*, חוט השני, Nos. 83, 92. The *Memorbuch of Worms* (קבץ על יד, III. 22) mentions a sister, Leah, who survived him, as well as another, Hendlin. R. Chayim himself makes mention of his brother-in-law, Löb Gunzburg, the son of R. Simon Schatel; see בכורים, v. 25; cp. Brüll, *ib.*, vii., 153.

in bonds of kinship by the marriage of Salman's son, Isaac, to the daughter of R. Ephraim Cohen, the far-famed Rabbi of Ofen. Isaac was taken prisoner in the storming of the town, in 1686, and after being ransomed by his relative, Samuel Oppenheim, in Vienna, became a Rabbi in Prague, from 1697 till 1733, when he died.[1]

The numerous branches of the family of R. Chayim Bacharach received an addition, when his father entered into a second marriage on Thursday, the 16th of Shebat, 1664 with Phega, the widow of Moses Cohen, Rabbi of Metz, and formerly of Nerol.[2] He thus became the brother-in-law of Dr. Tobias Cohen, surnamed Moschides,[3] who afterwards grew to be so renowned as a doctor and an author, and related to some of the best Polish families, which connections were destined in later years to tempt Bacharach to exchange Germany for Poland. But very soon afterwards, in the year 1666, Phega was snatched away by death from her second husband in an epidemic that raged in Worms, and to which a daughter of Bacharach also fell a victim.[4]

In this year R. Samson had the pleasure of seeing his son promoted to the Rabbinate of Coblentz.[5] They were disturbed times when R. Chayim began his new ministry. The waves of the Sabbatian movement now ran very high; there was not a single place in Germany but was affected by it. Just as on stormy nights the billows of the sea dash up even against the lighthouses, so the clearest intellects were obscured in this fearful spiritual excitement. R. Chayim Bacharach had penetrated too far into the mysteries

---

[1] Meir Perles, p. 12*a*, and Kaufmann, *ib.* 5.

[2] חוט השני, No. 91, and חות יאיר, p. 258*b*.

[3] Cp. Kaufmann, in *Révue des Etudes Juives*, XVIII., 294. Tobias was then eleven years old.

[4] Levysohn, *ib.* 62; קבין על יד, III., 15; about this terrible pestilence, cf. F. Solden, *Die Zerstörung der Stadt Worms im Jahre* 1689, p. 2. In fol. 49, in vol. XXIV. of the MSS. of R. Chayim Bacharach we read:—

מאורעי ופגעי א״א הגז״ל ברעש תכ״ו ובפרט מיתת אשתו ואחותי:

[5] חות יאיר, p. 230*a*, and p. 272*b*.

of the Cabbala to remain indifferent to, or to oppose, its victorious progress now that it was actively at work. The calculations based on the number of the verses in the Bible, the astounding revelations and prophecies that were extracted from the numerical value, and other combinations, permutations, and supposed coincidences of certain important Hebrew words, were no longer an academic sport, a pleasant exercise of harmless ingenuity, but life and reality, actual history strengthened by signs and wonders. With throbbing hearts the people listened to tidings from the East about the doings of Sabbatai the Messiah, and his prophet Nathan. From the South, from the scene of what was happening, from every place through which the news sped on as far as Amsterdam, where a veritable moral earthquake had turned every head, the tidings came to Worms. Here a complete series of records of the Sabbatian movement, in the originals and in copies, was collected in the house of R. Samson Bacharach and his son R. Chayim. In these papers might be read all the wonderful devices and verbal calculations by means of which the year of the appearance of the new Messiah and his exact name were ascertained beyond all manner of doubt.[1] All the Cabbalistic productions, the pious penitential prayers and utterances of Nathan Gazati, as they were promulgated through letters which he sent from Corfu to the Island of Zante and to Jassy, and even to Amsterdam, found their way hither. The report of the famous Polish preacher, R. Berech Darshan, who had betaken himself to Turkey in order to look upon the Messiah with his own eyes, and who gave his personal impressions of him in a very circumstantial pamphlet, was in the possession of Bacharach. Like his father before him, he kept up a correspondence with R. Eisik Deggingen,[2] the Rabbi of the German community in

[1] See the Appendix in Bacharach's Table of Contents to No. 35 of his MSS., from which all that follows is taken.

[2] Ch. N. Dembitzer, כלילת יופי, p. 96*b*.

Amsterdam, who sent faithful accounts of the letters that arrived there daily with news of the miracles performed in the south. Things had come to such a pass there, that a special prayer for the King Messiah was offered up in the synagogues. The town of Ofen, owing to its connection with Turkey and Austria, became a focus of the new agitation, and maintained a regular service of couriers in consequence of these events.[1] R. Moses Halevi had addressed a letter from Cracow to his brother-in-law Meir Isserls in Vienna,[2] on the subject of the Messiah, for the son and stepson of R. David Halevi, of Lemberg, had actually been with Sabbatai, and had returned to their father with a present and autograph letters from the Messiah. R. Löb b. Zechariah,[3] Rabbi of Cracow, and previously of Vienna, himself copied the letter that the Cabbalist Abraham Cohen had despatched to the Messiah. All these letters and pamphlets, that form a complete collection of the whole epistolary literature of this movement, and which must have been at the disposal of R. Jacob Sasportas, when writing his *Zizat Nobel Zebi* (The Fading Flower of the Messiah, Zebi), were in the possession of Bacharach, a testimony to his all-absorbing interest and personal participation in this affair. All the papers that we now possess form only an insignificant fraction of the mass of Sabbatian literature that he stored up in the course of these events. I have only been able to glance at a few pieces, which he bound up in the thirty-fifth volume of his collection of manuscripts, when the greater number of them had been lost or burnt. But these few well suffice to prove that he was not merely an observer, an annalist of this movement, but a participator in it—even one of its victims. The fact that, even when he had arrived at years of maturity, long after these occurrences, he never wrote the name of the Messiah without calling him Rabenu Sab-

---

[1] Cp. also Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung*, p. 91, note 3.

[2] *Ib.* 92, note 4. [3] *Ib.* 81, note 1, and J. M. Zunz, עיר הצדק, 116.

batei Zebi, is quite sufficient to show us his sentiments with regard to the originator of those sad events. But, besides this, he distinctly relates how thirteen scholars of the Talmud, in Coblentz, bound themselves to him by a written agreement to occupy themselves daily under his guidance in sanctifying themselves by pious study to receive the joyous news of the Redemption, and in preparing themselves in a becoming manner for the great event. He who knows what part "the thirteen" played in the cult of the Sabbatians will see that there was no accidental circumstance in the choice of this number. Finally, when we remember how one of the historians of this epidemic, the physician and step-brother of R. Chayim, Tobias Moschides,[1] laments that even learned Rabbis, whom he had much rather not name, were drawn into the net of this Sabbatian folly, the thought cannot help occurring to the mind that he was alluding to the son of his step-father when he broke out into this complaint. Just as after a devastating inundation, the highest point the waters of the flood reached in the distressed city is marked in order to be remembered by posterity, so history must place the high-water mark of the Sabbatian movement at the name of R. Jair Chayim Bacharach.

The new office to which R. Jair had been appointed was both a distinguished and a lucrative one. The Rabbinate of Coblentz in the Lower Archdeaconry of Trier[2] was one of the two Rabbinates which controlled the spiritual affairs of all the Jews in the lands of the Electorate of Trier. The Electoral Prince and Archbishop of the district was Karl Caspar von der Leyen, whose endeavour it was to

---

[1] ואפי׳ רבים מחכמי הארץ והרבני׳ הגדולי׳ הנקובים בשם אשר לא רציתי לפרסמם גם הם קבלו ליה לרב ומלכא עליהו, מעשה טוביה, p. 27*a*.

[2] Decree to the Jews by the Archdeacons and Electoral Prince of Trier of the 10th of May, 1723, p. 42. See E. Hecht in *Frankel's Monatsschrift*, 7, 190, בהיותי אב״ד ומ״ץ במדינת טריר בג״ת [בגליל חות יאיר, No. 112, תחתון] בק״ק קובלענץ.

heal the wounds that had been inflicted upon the land by the rule of his quarrelsome and intriguing predecessor, Philipp Christopher von Soetern. A period of good fortune seemed to await Bacharach in his new post. As in Mannheim and Heidelberg, so also elsewhere, the condition of the Jews had so much improved that neither in Coblentz nor Trier was there a Ghetto, and the people there breathed the air of freedom.[1] Ardently devoted to his Rabbinical functions and to the increase of his learning, free from all material cares, he had begun to feel used to the possession of ample means in the present, and to the prospect of an assured income for his family in the future, when all too suddenly a severe blow reminded him of the instability of the human lot. It was the custom in Coblentz, as well as in other communities on the Rhine, that the Rabbi had to be re-elected every three years, or at least his appointment had to be again confirmed. This law—which had been enforced by avaricious non-Jewish authorities, who exercised this power because certain taxes were attached to the office, a law by which the influence of the Rabbi was degraded and subverted—was now to be applied in all its force against Bacharach. His term of three years had barely closed, when the ratification of his re-appointment was refused, and he was suddenly left without a livelihood. He has not told us the names of his enemies and the exact circumstances of his humiliation.[2] Only one incident of his work in this community is preserved in his writings.[3] Ehrenbreitenstein, also called Thal, a town opposite Coblentz, on the west bank of the Rhine, had then no congregation. The only Jewish in-

---

[1] *Ib.*, No. 135.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 230*a*. The account of the hostility he drew down upon himself owing to his unsparing partisanship (p. 48*a*), probably also refers to his work at Coblentz.

[3] In No. 226, he mentions a question he addressed to his father from Coblentz. Limburg, whence Abraham Hess sent his questions (Nos. 33-36) to R. Jair, belonged to his rabbinate.

habitant was Bärmann Thal, a pious, respectable, and well-educated man, who was a butcher by trade, an occupation which, while prohibited to Jews in the towns of the Electorate of Trier, was permitted them in the country. He was in the habit of crossing the ship-bridge, when the Rhine was not frozen over, every Sabbath to come to divine service at the synagogue in Coblentz. Bacharach forbade him to make the passage in a boat on a Sabbath when the bridge was removed, in this decision following the practice of older authorities of the place.[1] Moreover, he refused to allow him to kill the animals himself, although he was well acquainted with the laws of Shechita (Jewish method of slaughtering animals), and though the governor of the fortress in Ehrenbreitenstein had commissioned him, under certain penalties, to provide meat for the inhabitants of the place, on the ground that for the requirements of Christians animals that were not killed in the strictly legal manner could also be used as food.[2]

Owing to his short stay in Coblentz, he was unable to carry on any uninterrupted activity. At the outbreak of the plague he had to depart from the town, and to withdraw to Limburg on the Lahn, leaving behind a valuable and indispensable part of his property, viz., his collection of books. This, however, did not hinder him from giving full expression from his store of knowledge to his views upon the disputed question about the inheritance of the rich Sanvel Kann, his opinion upon this point having been solicited.[3]

---

[1] No. 112. R. Jacob Cohen Popers (*v.* Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, II., 82 *sqq.*), when Rabbi of Coblentz in 1698, wished to allow the use of the ship-bridge on Sabbath, but was prevented from doing so by R. Gabriel Eskeles; *v.* שב יעקב, I. 16.

[2] No. 179, the end.

[3] In vol. IV. of his collected works, p. 129; according to the index in *Jair Nathib*, p. 51*a*, דיני ח״מ דף קכ״ט ק״ל: תשובה בענין שטר כחח״ז וירושת המנוח העשיר מופלג זנוויל קן הנקרא גויביצכאן · דפין גדולים נדפס ס״ג. Cp. חות יאיר, at end of *Resp.* 63, וכבר ידוע למכ״ת שאני פה לימבורג לע״ע נדחה מפני השעה רעה ורעש שבק״ק קובלענץ:

If there was any consolation for the sudden way in which he had been deprived of his Rabbinate, where he had worked with all his heart and strength, it lay in the thought that, by returning to Worms, he would again be brought nearer to his father. At the end of the year 1669, when the winter had just begun, he again took up his residence in Worms. But R. Samson was not long to experience the pain of seeing his son, who was worthy of any Rabbinical post in Israel, grieving for the loss of his office. On the 19th of April, 1670, after having ministered to the community at Worms for twenty years, he was gathered unto his fathers.[1] What animated him even in his dying moments was the hope and assurance that his son would be chosen his successor. Before his death he expressly prayed and adjured his congregation, both in writing and by word of mouth,[2] to let their choice fall upon his son, whom he could declare before God himself to be worthy and fitted to succeed him. It was in vain. Even the great reverence in which the tall R. Löw was held in Prague could not secure the election of his son R. Bezalel as his successor,[3] and the son of his great grandson was now to learn in Worms, that all the respect and obedience to authority could not establish a hereditary Rabbinate in Judaism.

Perhaps the settlement of R. Jair in Worms destroyed his chances of election; at least it seemed to be the impression that a native of a place, who resided there, could not be appointed Rabbi.[4] Again, their eyes were turned to Prague, where R. Aaron Teomim, the descendant of a

---

[1] Levysohn ; Zunz, *L. G.*, p. 437.

[2] חות יאיר, No. 31, and p. 230*b*. The expression ותחילת קיץ נשרף הבירה, by which R. Jair denotes the death of his father, Levysohn, p. 72, has been incorrectly applied to the burning of a part of the town of Worms. Cp. J. M. Zunz, *ib.* 146 *sq.*

[3] Meir Perles, מגילת יוחסין, p. 9*b*.

[4] חות יאיר, p. 230*b*., לא יעשה כן במקומינו למנות ב"ב בקהלתינו לרב מ"ץ עלינו. J. M. Zunz, *ib.* 147, has overlooked this point.

famous family, had, for the last eleven years, been making a great name for himself as a preacher. Unanimously elected [1] by the community of Worms to be their Rabbi, R. Aaron forthwith entered upon his new office, where he at once found favour by his great powers of eloquence. Additional means of uniting him with his new home was afforded by a marriage. Aaron Fränkel, of Fürth, the brother of R. Bärmann Fränkel, and nephew of R. Israel Fränkel, like Teomim a native of Vienna, became his son-in-law.[2] Bacharach had the pain of beholding a stranger dealing at his own will and pleasure with the regulations instituted by his father, and of being compelled as a private person to hold his peace and to obey another, when he himself should have been issuing commands.[3]

But this was not the only pang that the year of suffering, 1670, caused him. The expulsion of the Jews from Vienna was contemporaneous with their exile from Hammelburg and Fulda.[4] In the former town lived his brother-in-law, R. Isaac Brilin, and in the latter his friend, R. Meir Stern, who was chief of the Rabbinate. R. Isaac fled to Worms, whence he was summoned to the post of Rabbi in Mannheim.[5] R. Meir made his way to Frankfurt, where he remained for many years before the German community in Amsterdam elected him to be their ecclesiastical head.[6]

DAVID KAUFMANN.

(*To be continued.*)

---

[1] בגדי אהרן, Preface.

[2] Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung*, 194 *seq.*, 179, note 5, 182, note 6; Cp. also *Berliner's Magazin*, 1890.

[3] In No. 126 R. Jair informs us of a regulation that R. Samson had intended to bring into force, but had not succeeded in doing so. This was, that as the days of Chanuka were the only ones in the year when indulging in card-playing was tolerated, he would prefer that these days of pleasure be allotted instead to Christmas week. With the words חדש מקרוב בא, R. Jair alludes to Teomim.

[4] Kaufmann, *ib.* 226, Note 2.

[5] חות יאיר, No. 136.

[6] Ch. N. Dembitzer, *ib.*, p. 52*b*, note; p. 97*a*, note.

JEWISH LITERATURE IN 1890.

THOSE who have read recent accounts of the literary products of Continental nations, and have seen—notwithstanding the famous Universities, the rich libraries, and other large endowments which are at their disposal for the advancement of learning—how few of the books written during the past year are destined to make a mark in the progress of human intellect, will certainly not expect to meet with signs of any extraordinary advance in the field of rabbinic literature, the study of which is more or less confined to Jews, whose evil fortune it is to be still labouring, in many countries, under difficulties depriving them of both the means and the leisure necessary for the production of great and lasting works. We must, then, be satisfied with the little we have. But even of this little, my account can make no claim to completeness, partly owing to the fact that most of the books which are published in the East were quite inaccessible to me, and partly because even many of those that have reached me belong, in spite of the modern date which their title pages bear, to a class of books which was already obsolete at the beginning of the century. They do not increase our stock of information on a single point, and serve only as a warning example of the uselessness of learning that does not submit to the control of a sound scientific method.

A great dearth is to be noticed this year in the region of *Grammar* and *Lexicography*, and, except the essay of Dr. Barth, to which I shall again have occasion to refer, I have to notice here only the sixth volume of Dr. Kohut's *Aruch Completum*,[1] containing the letters

[1] *Aruch completum* ערוך השלם . . . auctore Nathan filio Jechielis edit. Dr. Alexander Kohut. Tomus Sextus. Viennæ: 1890.

ם, ע, and a part of פ, the philological merits of which, and its usefulness for the student of rabbinic, are now established facts, and need no further recommendation. In the face of this magnificent work, the הגהות הערוך (notes on the *Aruch*), forming a part of the book *Beth Aharon*,[1] by R. Aaron Fuld, become almost superfluous, as the author made no use of MSS., the only means of correcting old texts. The merits, however, of R. Aaron in the field of Jewish literature (best known from his additions to the *Shem Haggedolim*), his devotion to study and philanthropy fully justified his friends in saving for the world everything that issued from his pen. Dr. M. Horovitz's biographical sketch, with which the book is prefaced, gives us many interesting details of this noble life. One could have wished that the writer had not been so petty as to bereave R. Zacharias Frankel of the ז"ל with which he honours those who belong to his own party. One could also wish that Dr. Horovitz would strive after more correctness in his Hebrew style; as it is, we have in it a strange mixture of rabbinical and biblical Hebrew full of all sorts of Germanisms, only to be understood by a German.

A similar scarcity appears in the matter of *Commentaries on the Bible*, of which I have to mention here the following publications. First, the essay of Dr. Neubauer on "The Authorship and the Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish Authorities,"[2] for which every Biblical student will feel deeply grateful. For by the term "Jewish Authorities" the learned author not only understands the Rabbis, but also the earlier translators of the Bible, whose versions "must be counted as Jewish documents," as well as the comparatively later Rabbinic and Karaite commentators. The latter wrote mostly in Arabic, and the majority of their compositions are only extant in MSS., so that Dr. Neubauer had not only to collect the materials, but also to edit unknown

---

[1] *Beth Aharon* בית אהרן *R. Aharoni Fuld Responsa atque adnotationes in plerusque Talmud Babylonici, Aruch, Tischbi Meturgeman*, etc. Ediderunt filii auctoris. Frankfurt a. M.: 1890.

[2] Published in the second volume of the *Studia Biblica*. Oxford: 1890.

texts, and to translate them into English. And as "the subject has as yet made inconsiderable progress," the views of these earlier authorities can still be consulted with great profit. This is especially the case, I think, with the headings of the single chapters. Compare, for instance, the most recent commentary (Delitzsch) on the heading of Ps. ix. with the opinions given by Dr. Neubauer in page 40, and it will hardly be found that modern researches have advanced much further in this respect. I have next to note the book *Mayan Gannim*,[1] a commentary on Job, by R. Samuel ben Nissim Masnuth, edited from a Bodleian MS., by Herr Salomon Buber. The worth of Herr Buber's editions of rabbinical works is well known. I would call attention to the fact that the author often mentions the Targum to Job, of which he sometimes gives readings differing from ours (*e.g.*, pp. 7, 9, 15, 48, 72, and elsewhere). It is hardly necessary to remind the readers of this REVIEW that Herr Buber's results as to the date and country of the author have been contested by Dr. Neubauer. R. Saadiah's Arabic Translation of Isaiah, which M. Derenbourg has been giving in a new edition in Stade's *Zeitschrift*,[2] was also brought to an end this year. In the same periodical we have the first part of an excellent essay by Dr. Bacher on R. Solomon Ibn Parchon's Hebrew dictionary מחברת הערוך. The second part will, as it seems, contain variations from MSS. of this dictionary. Of Dr. H. Berger's dissertation on R. Benjamin b. Jehuda, and his commentary to Ezra and Nehemiah,[3] it is premature to speak before the text of this commentary has appeared, which he promises soon to edit from various MSS. But it may already be recommended for the sketch that Dr. Berger gives of the exegetical school in Italy. Dr. Josephsohn's pamphlet on the legends relating to the Wars of the Maccabees has some bearing on the Apocry-

---

[1] מעין גנים, edited by Solomon Buber, under the auspices of the Jewish Literary Society מקיצי נרדמים. Berlin: 1889.

[2] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, herausgegeben von D. Bernhard Stade. 1890.

[3] *R. Benjamin b. Jehuda, sein Commentar zu Ezra und Nehemia*, by Dr. Heinrich Berger. Breslau: 1889.

pha of the Old Testament.[1] The suggestion of the author to supply the gap in 2 Maccabees i. 18 by the parallels in Midrashim (p. 17) is worth considering, whilst less satisfactory are the reasons by which he tries to account for the confusion of the feast of Chanukah with that of Tabernacles. Here Geiger's hypothesis (see p. 19), will probably remain the best solution of the problem (cp. also Rapoport's ingenious theory on the שמחת בית השואבה וחנוכה in the *Hashachar*, iv. p. 432 seq.) Herr Weissmann's treatise on "Judith,"[2] is not devoid of some good suggestions towards restoring the lost Hebrew text (p. 18 seq.). Whether, however, it is necessary to alter the text (of xvi. 9) in the face of the phrase המסתכל בעקיבה של אשה, by which the Rabbis meant something less harmless than we understand (see *Nedarim* 20*a*), I leave undecided.

From late commentaries I pass to modern *editions* and *commentaries on ancient Rabbinical works.* Among these there is Dr. Schwartz's new edition of, and commentary on, the first order of the Tosefta,[3] the fourth volume of R. Eisler's *Notes on Rabbinical Language and Archæology*, the greatest part of which deals also with the text of the Tossefta,[4] and a new edition of, and commentary to, the third order of the same work by M. Friedlænder.[5] There can be no doubt that Dr. Schwartz's work is the most important contribution of the year. He thinks that the Tossefta in its present state represents nothing but a chaotic mass of various formations and layers dating from

---

[1] *Die Sagen über die Kämpfe der Makkabaeer gegen die Syrer nach griechischen und jüdisch-agadischen Quellen*, von Dr. Cæsar Josephsohn. Breslau: 1889.

[2] *Das Buch Judith, Historisch-kritish beleuchtet* von Arthur S. Weissmann. Wien: 1891.

[3] התוספתא לפי סדר המשניות עם פירוש הגיון אריה, or *Tosifta juxta Mischnarum Ordinem Recomposita et Commentaria Instructa* auctore Adolpho Schwarz Rabbino Karlsruhano. Pars I., Ordo Seraim. Vilnae: Typis et sumptibus viduae fratrumque Romm, 1890.

[4] *Beiträge zur RabbinischenSprach- und Alterthumskunde* von Rabb. Leopold Eisler. II. Theil. Wien: 1870. Commissions-Verlag von Ch. D. Lippe, Buchhandlung, II. Praterstrasse 13.

[5] תוספתא סדר נשים avec le commentaire Heschek Schlomoh. Presburg, 1890.

different periods and schools, which, owing to such revolutionary causes as the terrible persecutions of those times as well as to the ignorance and carelessness of the copyists, were thrown together into one shapeles conglomerate, without regard to order or chronology. Dr. Schwartz believes that our Tossefta was completed by the younger contemporaries of R. Jehudah Hannasi with the intention of saving from oblivion that complex of old Halachoth or Aggadoth, which the latter from one reason or another excluded from his official codex of the Mishnah. In this belief, then, he attempts to reconstruct the Tossefta with the aid of the given order of the Mishnah, on which it was based, and to which it was meant to be an *addition* (the literal translation of the word Tossefta). Dr. Schwartz does his work admirably, and the boldness which he shows in transposing whole sections which almost alter the face of the Tossefta will be envied by many a Bible critic. It is true that some of these transpositions admit of a difference of opinion. Compare, for instance, Tossefta *Berachoth*, c. 3 § 9 of our editions, which Dr. Schwartz puts after the section beginning ואיזה הוא, in conformity with the order in the Jerushalmi. But why should not the Tossefta, in this place, agree with the order in the Babli *Berachoth*, 31*a*, which —if we eliminate from it the passage given there in the name of R. Chiya, which is really missing in the MSS. (see Rabbinowitz, Variæ Lectiones)—there is reason to suppose is pretty near to the original text. This agreement is the more probable as the Tossefta has in this place the readings of the Babli, not of the Jerushalmi, which, by the way, ought to be corrected after the parallel in the *Aggadath Shemuel II.* But this minor point shows only how consistent Dr. Schwartz is in carrying out his suppositions. Certainly these suppositions themselves still leave room for discussion. One might ask, granting that the Tossefta was based on the Mishnah, on which Mishnah? For though the hypothesis of Dr. Zuckermandel, according to which the *Tossefta* represents the Halachic code of the Palestinian schools, whilst our *Mishnah* was compiled at a later date in Babylon, did not, as far as we know, find much acceptance

amongst scholars, it is, nevertheless, hardly to be expected that our Mishnah was exempt from the fate which befell all ancient Jewish productions. However, we had better postpone the discussion of this and similar points until Dr. Schwartz furnishes us with the treatise on the origin of the Tossefta, as well as the Boraithoth scattered over both the Talmuds, and their relation to the Mishnah, which he promises in the introduction to his book. Of a less ambitious character is Eisler's undertaking, which confines itself to verbal emendations in the text of the Tossefta. Though the book contains many good points, I am afraid that Eisler is sometimes too hasty in his emendations; perhaps he suffers from want of books. Thus he would hardly have corrected the text in Tossefta *Berachoth* c. vii. 1, if he had read the remarks of A. Krochmal (*Scholien*, p. 91) and Brüll (*Jahrb.* vii. 113) on the same passage. M. Friedlaender pursues the same method as in his commentary on *Seder Zeraim*, and there is nothing fresh to add to the verdict which was pronounced on the author's first production. (See this REVIEW, II., 194.) I might here express a wish that the scholars who devote themselves to the study of the Tossefta would make use of MS. Add. 27,296 in the British Museum, which contains the Tossefta of the whole of the second order (Moed) and tractate Chulin. The variations presented by this codex would probably prove of more critical value than those which are the result of mere guesswork. Considered from this point of view Professor Strack's edition of the Mishnah of the tractate *Sabbath*[1] deserves all praise, the editor having employed for his text all the MSS. and texts available. The glossary at the end will also make it useful for beginners. Lector M. Friedmann's *Hamaschneh*,[2] giving in short paragraphs the contents of all the tractates of the Mishnah, and his *Talmud Baba Mezia*,[3] containing extracts

[1] *Schabbath* . . . herausgegeben von Professor Hermann L. Strack. Leipzig: 1890.

[2] ספר המשנה (der Mishnah-Lehrer) von M. Friedmann. Vienna: 1890.

[3] בבא מציעא Zum Unterrichtsgebrauche von M. Friedmann. Vienna: 1890.

from this tractate, are also calculated to pave the way for the young student who wants to be introduced to the strange world of the Rabbis. All Jewish teachers, I hope, will not be slow to avail themselves of the wide learning and long experience of this famous scholar. Entirely new is the small tractate on Mourning (מסכת שמחות זוטרתי)[1] now edited for the first time from MSS. by Herr Horowitz in the second and third part of his collection of Ancient Boraithoth, extending from p. 28 to p. 40. One feels so grateful for this addition to the Minor Tractates that one can pardon him his long useless introductions and unnecessary glossaries. I may here add that at the head of the list of authorities who quoted this version of שמחות has to be placed the Gaon R. Samuel ben Chofni, as can be seen from his commentary to the Pentateuch (פרשת ויחי), ed. J. Israelsohn, in which three passages are given, which are only to be found in this tractate (28 and 31). R. Joseph Ibn Caspi's quotation ואמרו רבותינו ז"ל לא דברים ממיתים ולא דברים מחיים (see טעם זקנים by Ashkenazi, p. 53), also refers to this tractate. It is to be regretted that Dr. Klotz, in his new critical edition of the tractate *Semachoth*[2] (usually printed together with the other minor tractates), was unable to incorporate this small *Semachoth*, which would have made his work more complete. But the good use the editor has made of almost all the MSS. existing of this tractate—among them, also, of a very valuable MS. belonging to Dr. Adler—and the fulness of his references (see, for instance, p. 17, note 5, and p. 33, note 1), will partly compensate for this defect. The fourth part of Herr Horowitz's collection (פתחי נדה) forms an introduction to the text of the *Boraitha of Niddah*, to be edited in the fifth part of this collection. We must not anticipate our judgment before Herr Horovitz has fulfilled his promise. Of new editions of late Rabbinic works I have to mention here the first part

[1] תוספתא עתיקתא, or *Uralte Tosefta*, 2 und 3. Abtheilung by Chayim M. Horovitz. Mainz: 1890. Ditto, 4. Abtheilung. Frankfurt a. M.: 1890.

[2] Der Talmudische Tractat *Ebel Rabbithi* oder *S'machoth*, nach Handschriften und Parallelstellen bearbeitet, übersetzt, etc., von Dr. Moritz Klotz. Verlag J. Kauffmann.

of the *Machzor Vitri*,[1] emanating from the school of Rashi, edited from a Bodleian MS. by Rabbi S. Hurwitz for the Society Mekize Nirdamim. The editor will probably at the end of the work give us in an appendix a full description of his MS. and its relation to the other MSS. of the *Machzor Vitri* in the British Museum and Paris. Its authorship is also a matter which demands closer examination (see Dr. C. Taylor's remark in a note to the Introduction to his *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*). Dr. Hildesheimer, under the auspices of the same society, continues the Vatican *Halachoth Gedoloth*,[2] of which the second part has now appeared. A very meritorious task was the editing of the Arabic text of "The Letter of Consolation of Maimon ben Joseph"[3] (the father of Maimonides), and its translation into English by Mr. L. M. Simmons, of Manchester. The readers of this periodical had full opportunity to admire the saintliness and simplicity of the author (see especially p. 25, where the commentary to Ps. xc. begins), as well as to appreciate the learning and accuracy of the editor. I have only to add that this letter has now appeared in a pamphlet by itself, with some additional notes and corrections by Mr. Simmons. The "variæ lectiones" to Maimonides' Mishnah Torah,[4] according to a MS. now in the possession of Herr Julius Hamburger, will be cordially welcomed by students of this great code. We do not know whether the description offered of the MS. is trustworthy in all its parts. But even if the date given there (the beginning of the fourteenth century) be correct, we have in English libraries MSS. of this Code of an earlier date, especially in Oxford (see Catalogue, Neubauer, Nos. 538-614), and it would certainly repay the trouble of a student to collate them for the purpose of giving us at last a critical text of this classical work. Nor must I forget to notice

---

[1] מחזור ויטרי, *Machzor Vitri*, herausgegeben von S. Hurwitz. Berlin: 1889.

[2] הלכות גדולות *Halachoth Gedoloth, nach dem Texte der Handschrift der Vaticana.* Herausgegeben von Dr. Hildesheimer. Berlin: 1889.

[3] Reprinted from the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. II.

[4] שינוי נוסחאות וגירסאות לספר משנה תורה Frankfurt a. M.: 1. 1889.

here the following contributions to the Rabbinic literature, though they do not exactly fall under the heading of commentaries or editions. Thus Dr. Güdemann has devoted a whole monograph to the verses in Matt. v. 43,[1] and parallels in other parts of the New Testament as well as in the Rabbinic literature. It is, indeed, one of the best things written on the subject. (See Dr. L. Lazarus, *Zur Charakteristik der Talmudischen Ethik*, p. 10, where the literature is fairly put together, to which must be added *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, by Dr. C. Taylor, p. 8, *seq.*) It will have to be carefully read, both by students of the Old Testament and the New Testament. I can only hope to see it soon translated into English. Professor Bloch has given us a new compendium of the Mosaic-Talmudic Laws of Inheritance.[2] The author confines himself mostly to Jewish sources (see, however, p. 10 and p. 49, note 32), in which he is a complete master, and he rectifies Michaelis in some places (see pp. 7 and 8). Dr. Königsberger's pamphlet on the sources of the Halacha[3] is also worth mentioning on account of the few quotations he gives there from the Midrash Hagadol and other MSS. Whether, however, these MSS. or any MS. still to be discovered can prove the divinity of the Oral Law, and that it is coeval with the Torah itself, against the opinion of the "majority of the modern Jewish historians," is a question which the author would have done better to leave untouched. Such useless polemics—for surely the views of these historians are entirely independent of the existence or non-existence of a Mechilta more or less—ought to be avoided in any work which pretends to scientific treatment. Not unfitly I may mention here the Rev. S. Singer's English version of the prayer-book,[4] not merely because the Jewish liturgy

[1] *Nächstenliebe, ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Mathæus-Evangeliums* von Dr. M. Güdemann. Wien : 1890.

[2] *Das Mosaisch-Talmudische Erbrecht*, von Prof. Moses Bloch, published in the *B. Programm* of the Rabbinical Seminary in Buda-pest, 1890.

[3] *Die Quellen der Halachah*, von Dr. Königsberger. Berlin: Verlag H. Engel, 1890.

[4] *The authorised Daily Prayer-book*, with a new translation by the Rev. S. Singer. London : 1890.

is in the main a rabbinical production, but also on account of its containing a new translation of the Pirke Aboth. It requires only to take a glance at the older translations of the *Sidur* in this country to see the excellence of Mr. Singer's work, and I can only hope that a second edition will appear soon and meet with the same merited success as the first. Perhaps Mr. Singer will also use the opportunity to correct such trifles as, for instance, to leave out the note to § 15 in Aboth ch. ii. (p. 189). As may be seen from the parallels put together in the *Massecheth Aboth*, etc., by Noah Chayim, of Kabrin (32a), this passage has nothing to do with abusing one's higher gifts. Possibly Mr. Singer will justify his interpretation by a reference to the famous simile in Jerushalmi Chagigah (76*c*), where the Torah is also compared with fire, but in quite another sense. A most ingenious piece of work is the treatise of Dr. Rosenthal on the composition of the Mishnah,[1] whose method strongly recalls that with which we are familiar from the works of modern Bible critics (see, for instance, pp. 36, 87, and 89). By this method he thinks to discover in the Mishnah parts dating from before Hillel, which were composed with an anti-Sadducean tendency. As the author bases his hypothesis on the assumption that Geiger's and Wellhausen's theories on the origin of this sect are mistaken, it still remains to be seen how he will refute them as he promises to do in the second part.

I will now glance at *Bibliography and Biography*, whereby we shall gain some insight into what might still be done in the line of editing. I notice, first, Dr. Kayserling's Bibliographical Dictionary of works concerning Judaism written by Jewish authors in Spanish or Portuguese,[2] including Ladino, a sort of Jewish jargon of these languages. The book is prefaced by an excellent essay on the history and importance of this literature, and the appendix gives a collection of Spanish and Jewish proverbs. The pedigrees

[1] *Ueber den Zusammenhang der Mischna* . . . . von Dr. Ludwig A. Rosenthal. Strassburg: Verlag von K. J. Trübner, 1890.

[2] *Biblioteca Espanola-Portugueza-Judaica.* Par M. Kayserling. Strasbourg, Charles J. Trubner: 1890.

of various Jewish families scattered throughout the book will be found interesting by genealogists, whilst the Catalogue (page 114) of the controversial works by Jewish converts will probably prove useful both to the bibliographer and the historian. However, it could hardly be said that this literature equals either in quantity or quality the Judaica written in the German language (or in Jüdisch-Deutsch) by Jewish authors. Indeed, among the books published during this century I cannot discover in Dr. Kayserling's list a single production of great value, except perhaps the מעם לעז. Of far greater importance is the Catalogue of the MSS. in Herr Halberstam's Library.[1] The name of Halberstam is known far and wide. There is hardly any Jewish scholar of the younger generation who is not under obligations to Herr Halberstam, not merely for his suggestions, but also for the liberality with which he puts his collection of MSS. at the disposal of students. But no one had an adequate idea of the riches of this collection until the appearance of this Catalogue, compiled by Herr Halberstam himself. It is, in truth, the greatest Jewish private library in the world, comprising 411 MSS. Everything which has occupied the Jewish mind — Targum, grammar, Halacha, Hagada, liturgy, philosophy, Kabbalah, poetry, astronomy, history, and medicine—is represented there. From this Catalogue the student can see how much is still left for us to do. Herr Halberstam's collection contains many a treasure still waiting for the explorer to bring to light. Let the reader only glance over the liturgical part, which contains many Piyutim which remained unknown even to the great master Zunz, or at the description of MS. 345, which contains almost more references to the English Rabbis of the pre-expulsion period than all the other sources put together. The Commentaries to the Talmud, some of which are unique, would alone suffice to make this Library famous. However, greatly as I admire Herr Halberstam, who has so far made such excellent use of his collection, I cannot refrain from asking, What will

[1] קהלת שלמה *Catalog hebräischer Handschriften*, von S. J. Halberstam in Bielitz. Vienna : 1890.

become of all these treasures? Experience has taught us that the fate of all private libraries is to be scattered after a generation or two, and at such dispersions many valuable MSS. are lost for ever. May I not express the hope that in this country, which has hitherto shown itself so generous to Jewish literature, which has saved the libraries of Oppenheim, Michael, and Almanzi from dispersion—that in this country also the Halberstam collection will find a saviour who will preserve it to posterity. I do not in the least grudge Halberstam his treasures, but I think that he will agree with me that the cause of Jewish literature, which he has so much at heart, will be best served when his MSS. follow the way of all the great Jewish collections, which have found their last home in England. Dr. Müller's Introduction to the Responsa of the Geonim [1] might, on account of the bibliographical account it gives of the various collections of these Responsa, also be placed here. It is an admirable piece of work. Indeed, it previously seemed as if every newly discovered collection only added to the difficulties of the student of the period of the Geonim. For these collections, made at different ages, in various countries, without the least regard to each other, and even without much needed discretion, often repeat themselves, and are full of interpolations, in which the Mystics had also their share. On the other hand, there are many Responsa without headings; others, again, bear false ascriptions. It is by this work of Dr. Müller that we shall be able to examine critically the productions of the Geonim, which consist mostly in ritual decisions. It not only contains a detailed account of every collection, where every heading is closely investigated, but also a complete index of the Responsa (including those which are scattered over the works of the earlier authorities, *Rishonim*) of each Gaon, from R. Mari down to R. Hai, the last of the Geonim. And what is more is that this index is quite readable, giving the essence of all the Responsa attributed

[1] מפתח לתשובת הגאונים, *Einleitung in die Responsen Babylonischer Geonim*, von Joel Müller. H. Engel. Berlin: 1891.

to each Gaon, arranged in subjects, mostly after the system accepted by Maimonides in the Mishnah Torah. To this are added the Miscellanea, containing many interesting historical and philological items (see pp. 72, 92, 100, 103, 168, 205, 254, 265) which would be worthy of being collected and edited by themselves. I may remark here that the list of the MSS. of the British Museum has also a collection of the תשובת הגאונים (Add. 27,181, compare Halberstam, Introduction to the *Sefer Yetsirah*, p. xxi.), which might now, with the help of this introduction, easily be examined, so as to ascertain whether it contains inedited matter.

Bibliography and Biography bring us to *History*. In this country we have Dr. Neubauer's contribution, *Notes on the Jews in Oxford*,[1] which, in spite of its modest title, exhausts the subject in all its parts, there being no document or important note relating to the history of the Jews in this University town which Dr. Neubauer does not print or allude to. Especially grateful the student will feel for the new edition of the eighth volume of Professor Graetz's *History*[2] with corrections and additions in which the latest discoveries of Spanish scholars, of Dr. Neubauer, Halberstam, M. Lob, and others, have been utilised. One feels the more grateful for it as this part of Graetz's work deals with the period in which the great expulsions of the Jews from Spain, Portugal, and many cities in Germany, took place. Of books dealing with the earlier history of the Jews I have to mention here: Dr. Kaminka's *Studies on the History of Galilee*.[3] A critical history of the Jews in Galilee would, indeed, be an object of interest to the Jewish as well as to the Christian student. But Dr. Kaminka is certainly not the man to do it, as far as I can judge from

[1] Published in the *Collectanea*, vol. ii. of the Oxford Historical Society, 1890.

[2] *Geschichte der Juden*, VIII. Dritte verbesserte und stark vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: 1890.—I received this work at the very moment when this article had to be sent to press, otherwise I should have treated it with the fulness that a work by the father of Jewish history deserves.

[3] *Studien zur Geschichte Galiläas*, von Dr. Kaminka. Berlin: 1889. Verlag von Hermann Engel.

this pamphlet. His objections to the general assumption that Tiberias was avoided by noble Jewish families on account of uncleanliness caused by the lost graves in it are weak, and remind one of the ויש לדחוק ולהקשות ; his emendation (p. 24) of the word יבדא in the Jerushalmi into יברח is doubtful (see Levy, s.v. יבד), whilst the preference given by him to the Hebrew version (with regard to the story that R. Simon ben Jochai declared Tiberias to be clean) in Midrash Tehillim over the other six, because they are in Aramaic, is against the acknowledged critical rule that in such cases the claim for higher antiquity rests with the Aramaic versions, Aramaic having been the popular language in which the story was told. For the Hebrew version is to be regarded only as a translation from the original, and thus belonging to a later date. He commits also a bad blunder in referring, in hi sketch of R. Simon ben Jochai, to *Aboth* ii. 9 (p. 50), the R. Simon mentioned there being ר"ש בן נתנאל, the disciple of R. Jochanan ben Zakkai. More satisfactory is Dr. Rosen zweig's essay on *Jerusalem and Cæsarea.*[1] The author does not presume to advance new theories (excepting, perhaps, note 2, p. 16, about the genealogy of Paul), but puts together the passages in the Rabbinic literature relating to the antagonism between these two cities representing Judaism and heathenism, or Christianity at a later period. Perhaps I may also record here the third volume of Mr. Luncz's annual *Jerusalem*,[2] dealing with the history of the Holy Land, and chiefly with that of Jerusalem in ancient and modern times. It contains among other excellent matter a bibliographical account of works on the geography of Palestine by Dr. Steinschneider, an essay on the topography of Sodom and Gomorrah, according to Rabbinical sources by Lector Friedmann—a series of letters written by different Rabbis living in Jerusalem, dating from before the end of the seventeenth century, and edited from MSS. by Professor

[1] *Jerusalem und Cæsarea*, von Dr. Rosenzweig. Berlin : Mayer and Müller, 1890.

[2] ירושלים *Jerusalem Jahrbuch*, III. Jahrgang. Herausgegeben von A M. Luncz. Jerusalem : 1889.

Kaufmann, and, lastly, etymological researches on the names of various cities (Jerusalem, Jericho, etc., etc.), contributed by M. Joseph Halevy, of Paris. I have no doubt that the number will be found very instructive, and the editor deserves special gratitude and support from this country, where the interest in everything touching the Holy Land is so great. The following two books, *Matamim*,[1] by an anonymous writer, and *Tekanoth*, etc., by Herr Schück,[2] on Minhagim (religious usages and customs) ought to have some bearing on history by which alone Minhagim can be explained, but they have not. Of the former, who supplies us with 1,300 explanations of various Minhagim, suffice it to say that his work was suggested to him by passages in the לב העברי, and thus belongs to a school in which anything approaching to a knowledge of history (or anything worth knowing) is considered as a mortal sin. It requires only a glance at the book to see that the author remained true to the principle of his school. Some attempt at history is, indeed, made by Herr Schück, but he still belongs to the pre-scientific era. He takes, for instance, infinite trouble to reconcile the legend that Joshua composed the prayer עלינו with another story which attributes it to R. Jochanan ben Zakkai (p. 37*a*), but it never occurs to him to question the authenticity of these legends. At another place (8*b*) he tries to explain the institution of reading the 93rd Psalm every Friday by reason of modern discoveries in geology. Herr Schück is rather afraid that his critical views will be resented by certain hyper-orthodox people in his country. This would be, indeed, a gross injustice. Lastly, I have to notice here Dr. Lazarus' essay on the *Princes of the Captivity* in Babylon,[3] whose history has remained rather obscure till now. The last writer on the subject was the late Abraham Krochmal in his *Scholien*, which is full

---

[1] ספר מטעמים. Anonymous. Warsaw: 1890.

[2] תקנות ותפילות, *die Kirchlichen und bürgerlichen Gesetze des Judenthums vom Jahre* 2449 *bis* 5631, etc., von Salomon Schück. Muncacs: 1890.

[3] *Die Häupter der Vertriebenen*, etc. Von Dr. Felix Lazarus, published in volume x. of Dr. Brüll's Jahrbücher, occupying the whole of this number.

of the deepest researches and most ingenious remarks on this point, and to which Dr. Lazarus owes, I am inclined to think, a great deal. But Dr. Lazarus has the advantage of having made use of various MSS. of the text of the Small Chronicle (*Seder Olam Zuta*), the chief source for the succession of those princes, but previously known only in a very corrupt form. Dr. Lazarus now gives us, in an appendix, for the first time, a critical version of this chronicle, after MSS. and rare editions, and this enables him to elucidate many obscure points in the chronology of this part of Jewish history. It is not the place, in a general review to enter into a discussion of the details, which are of a most complicated nature, and I shall only remark that the obscure *formula* of which Dr. Lazarus speaks on p. 97, will be clear enough if he had read correctly בִּתְיָה (not בִּתְיָה) as the name of the daughter of Pharaoh (1 Chron. iv. 18), who, according to the Hagadah (*Megillah*, 13*a*, and elsewhere) saved Moses from the river, and brought him up, on which account he was considered as her son.

The study of *Jewish Philosophy* is represented this year by the following works: First, Dr. Spiegler's *History of the Philosophy of Judaism*.[1] But in spite of this promising title, I need not dwell long on it. Its worthlessness will be sufficiently indicated when I point out the fact that the greatest part of the work is taken up with the Zohar, which Dr. Spiegler thinks was composed by R. Simon ben Jochai and his school (p. 135). The golden age of the Cabbalah falls, according to the author, in the first century A.C., and R. Jochanan ben Zakkai and his school, especially R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, the author of the *Pirke drabi Eliezer* (*sic*), and Akilas, the author of our *Targum Onkelos*, are its greatest representatives (p. 140). The description the author gives us of Maimonides' philosophy, does not show any sign that he ever studied Prof. Kaufmann's *Attributenlehre*, or his work could not be so utterly empty and superficial. Of quite another stamp is Dr. Hœnig's

[1] *Geschichte der Philosophie des Judenthums.* Von Dr. Julius Spiegler. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Friedrich, 1890.

treatise on the Ophites[1], in which he tries to prove that Gnosticism is a Jewish production, and that this and the Ophites, the first Gnostic sect, represent accordingly a Jewish heresy. There are many ingenious points in this *brochure*, and the identification of the obscure term אפטוניות in *Midrash Koheleth* i. 8 with the Greek Ὀφίτης (p. 79) is worth noticing. But, on the other hand, the author has brought forward little evidence to establish the early origin of the Gnosis among the Jews, which is the chief point in his book. All the passages he quotes from Rabbinic literature were used by Graetz, Krochmal and others to prove that during the second century Gnostic views found their way into Judaism. Nor will many agree with the author, that the theory of the *Demiurge* could only arise among the Jews (p. 68). It is true that the old question, *Unde Malum*, forces itself on every mind, but it does not follow that the Jews would have answered it through the manufacture of a demi-god. Untouched by foreign influence, the answer of the Jewish mind, with its quick transitions from reason to emotion, and its commutations of both, would probably have resulted in a fervid prayer or in entire resignation to the will of God like the Hebrew prophets and psalmists of old, when they complained of the sufferings of the righteous. The quotations the author gives from the chapter of R. Eliezer are especially unfortunate, as this book dates from a very late period, and contains already Christian elements, as has only recently been proved by M. Israel Levi (see *Revue des Études Juives*). By the way, has Dr. Hœnig seen the late Bishop Lightfoot's "Essay on the Colossian Heresy," in his *Commentary to the Epistles of St. Paul* (Volume III., page 73, *seq.*)? Dr. Goitein's pamphlet on *Optimism and Pessimism in the Philosophy of Judaism*[2] is also worth reading. The various Theodicies, from the oldest times up to Maimonides, which the author puts together, deserve careful study, though the conclusion of the author with

[1] *Die Ophiten, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Gnosticismus*, von Dr. Adolf Hönig. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1889.

[2] *Der Optimismus und der Pessimismus in der judischen Religionsphilosophie*, von Dr. H. Goitein. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1890.

regard to the final influence of these two conflicting views on Judaism may be contested. A lecture by Dr. Schweinburg on "Jewish Pessimists"[1] may be regarded as a supplement to the preceding work. Whether every Jewish scholar who had a fit of depression and wrote in a pessimistic vein must be looked upon as a predecessor of Schopenhauer, is a question not permitting of closer examination in the presence of the fact that the latter philosopher is now the most fashionable thinker in Germany. Of a rather theosophic character is the lately edited correspondence of R. Jonathan Eibeschütz, from a MS. in the library of Dr. Jellinek.[2] The attempts of R. Jonathan to rationalise the Cabbalah, and to reconcile it with philosophy (p. 88), are not uninteresting. The old dispute among the Cabbalists, whether the Sephiroth are to be regarded as an integral part of the Deity, or only as an emanation, turns up here again. Perhaps this correspondence, when entirely published, will throw some light on the well-known controversy between the author and R. Jacob Emden. I may also in this section include Dr. L. Grossmann's book on *Judaism and the Science of Religion*,[3] which is written in a style worthy of the subject, and indicates an honest desire on the part of the author to be just to all. I am only afraid that he is too hasty in his application of general theories, or he would scarcely detect in such passages as "the Fathers are the Merkabah" a reminiscence of sun worship (p. 174). What Dr. Grossmann means by the reference to *Tossefta Yoma*, II. *b*, I am unable to understand. Are we really to suppose that every ancient Jew who looked at a sun-dial to see the time of day, or basked in the sunshine, is to be suspected of sun-worship? The well-known passage, "The Law is like two paths," etc., which, as it would seem, he attributes (in p. 176) to R. Akiba, is known to me only as anonymous. (Cp. *Jerushalmi Chagigah*, ii. 1,

[1] *Jüdische Pessimisten*, von S. Schweinburg. Verlag D. Lowy (Vienna).

[2] שם עולם כולל אגרות ותשובות לר' יונתן אייבשיטץ בחקירה אלהית. Wien: 1891.

[3] *Some Chapters on Judaism and the Science of Religion*, by Rabbi Luis Grossmann. New York and London: Putnam's. 1889.

and parallels on the margin.) Of a more satisfactory character in my judgment is Dr. Grossmann's *Lecture on Maimonides*, [1]which is a very fair and sympathetic appreciation of this great Jewish thinker.

In the region of *General Literature* I have only to record two books, both excellently done. Of Mr. Joseph Jacobs' admirable *Introduction to the Fables of Æsop*,[2] the results, as regards the part played by Judaism in preserving these fables, have been already noticed in this REVIEW. The second part of Herr Philipp's classical edition of *Jewish Poetry in the Middle Ages*[3] fully bears out the high reputation the author has acquired by his previous productions. From a prospectus I have lately received from Herr Philipp, I learn that he intends to continue editing the Divan of R. Jehudah Hallevi, and other poetical pieces which he copied last summer in the Bodleian in Oxford. It is to be hoped that he may succeed in this important undertaking. I may also express the wish that Herr Philipp will be a little more concise in his notes. There is hardly any need, for instance, to illustrate the sayings of the Gaon by passages in the Sanscrit literature. Dr. Rubin brings us this year a treatise on the origin of arts and sciences in the prehistoric ages,[4] which, like most of his other works, will prove very useful to those who are incapable of reading any other language except Hebrew. Of Dr. Maybaum's masterly treatise on Jewish Homiletics,[5] it is only necessary here to mention the title, as its merits have already been ably brought before the readers of this REVIEW.

The want of special works might, perhaps, be compensated for by the various *Miscellanea*, of which we have a great abundance. Paramount among them is the *Jubelschrift*,[6]

---

[1] *Maimonides : a Paper.* By Rabbi L. Grossmann. Putnam, 1890.

[2] *The Fables of Æsop*, now again edited by and induced by Joseph Jacobs. London: 1889. (D. Nutt.)

[3] בית הבחירה ח"ב • כולל כל שירי רב האי גאון, Krakau : 1889.

[4] עץ הדעת, Dr. S. Rubin. Wien : 1891.

[5] *Jüdische Homiletik.* Berlin : 1890.

[6] *Jubelschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, des Dr. Hildesheimer. Berlin : H. Engel, 1890.

containing a collection of essays by various scholars, dedicated to Dr. J. Hildesheimer on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. It opens with an exegetical study of Isaiah lxvi., by Dr. Feilchenfeld, Chief Rabbi of Posen, well known for many excellent essays on the Bible. I am afraid, however, that in this particular matter he has not been quite happy in his hypothesis. According to the author, Isaiah lxvi. forms a protest against a certain Jewish rationalistic sect, who, in their universalistic notions of the Jewish religion, for which they thought they found support in the older prophecies, refused to return to Jerusalem, pleaded for amalgamation with their heathen surroundings as a means of facilitating their missionary work to the Gentile world, and as the result of borrowing certain enlightened views from the Medo-Persic religion, protested against sacrificial worship. This view is in the main not entirely new (see Dillmann's *Isaiah*, p. 535). Considering that Isaiah lxvi., according to the opinions of most modern commentators, dates from about the end of the sixth century, it is not altogether impossible that the prophet's words were directed against a certain section of the Jews, who, lacking in patriotism, did not care much for the restoration of Jerusalem, preferring to have the temple built in Babylon. On the other hand, the views which Dr. Feilchenfeld attributes to this section are too rational for the time, and strongly recall the doctrines of Jewish sects at a very late period, whilst his exegesis is far-fetched. (See, for instance, his explanation of the word הֲאַתְּ, "Is it not, indeed?") But what makes matters worse is that Dr. Feilchenfeld assures us that his exposition is entirely independent of the question with regard to the age of the prophet (p. 9, note 1). Dr. Feilchenfeld is very successful in his explanation of the obscure passage in Tractate Sabbath, 67*b* (p. 23). Quite worthy of his position and his fame is the article contributed by Dr. Rosenthal, Rabbi at Breslau, on the Institutions תקנות of R. Gershon, the light of the Exile, the most important of which is the ordinance forbidding polygamy. As with everything coming to us from this remote period (the tenth century), the documents of these *Tekanoth* are in a most

corrupt state, and exist in different versions. Dr. Rosenthal tries to restore the original text, as well as to establish its authenticity by the use of MSS. and quotations in various Rabbinical words. Secular history, so far as it has any relation to these institutions, is also laid under contribution by the learned author. To judge from the heading of this essay, *Einiges über die*, etc., it would seem that Dr. Rosenthal intends to publish one day a larger treatise on this interesting subject. Perhaps he might then be able also to employ the MSS. in the British Museum, Or. 1989 (p. 91*b*. *seq.*), and Or. 1083 (26*b*), both of them containing versions of the תקנות דרי גרשום, the former of which would, we think, prove of special value (see *Monatsschrift*, 1855, p. 104 about this MS.) The Machsor Vitri in the same library (Add. 27,200, page 152*b*) contains also a paragraph תקנות הקהל, which might, I believe, throw some light on the subject. The group of *Tekanoth*, beginning with צין המטה, has also been published by Dr. Neubauer, from various MSS. in the *Revue des Études Juives*, No. XXXIII., p. 69 *seq.* Dr. M. Horovitz, one of the Rabbis in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, contributes a *Responsum* as to the validity of marriage in a certain given case. There is nothing fresh about it, either as regards method or line of argument. The only new feature is, perhaps, the fact that it is written in German, whilst any Polish or Russian Rabbi would have answered in Hebrew. I cannot deny that I prefer שו"ת in Hebrew, when written in a good rabbinical style. Dr. Munk, of Marburg, gives a very interesting essay on the constitution of the Jews in the Principality of Hesse, in Germany, as well as the Text of their *Tekanoth*. The excommunication pronounced there against dealing in false coin is worth noticing, showing that it was not only ritual matters over which the synagogue kept spiritual watch. Dr. Hofmann adorns the volume by an essay on the existence of a *Mechilta d'rabbi Ishmael on Deuteronomy*, fragments of which he discovers in the *Midrash Haggadol*. As the present writer is preparing an edition of this *Midrash*, he will soon find occasion to enlarge on the results of this admirable and thorough piece of work.

Dr. Olitzki's essay treats of the symbolical significance given by R. Abraham ben Ezra to certain numbers. The relation pointed out by the author between the symbolism of Aben Ezra and those of certain Greek as well as Jewish mystical schools, is not without interest. Dr. Friedlander and Dr. Bennet contribute new Hebrew translations from certain parts of Maimonides' *Commentary to the Mishnah;* the former, of the third chapter of the tractate *Rosh Hashanah*, the latter, of the first chapter of the *Sayings of the Fathers*. Dr. Lowenstein publishes, from a Merzbach MS., seven Jewish songs, composed by various German rabbis during the fifteenth century. They are mostly of a serious character, and the fact that they were adapted to airs of Gentile songs, which do not seem to have always been of a very edifying character, would prove that John Wesley was not the first who urged the principle that the best tunes should not be left to the devil. The song against games of chance (p. 138), deserves the special attention of the student of the history of morals in the Middle Ages. Professor Barth's researches on the *Passive Qual and its Participles* will undoubtedly be found very instructive by specialists, whilst Dr. Berliner's excellent essay *From Sad Times* forms a most interesting contribution to the history of the Jews in Italy. For the דרוש להר"אש על מזלזלי החורה, edited there by Herr Halberstam, from his own library, the student of Jewish theology will be very grateful, showing, as it does, the divergent opinions of the Jewish schools with regard to the position of rationalism in religion. Dr. Lerner's and Herr Hurwitz's Notes on some difficult Talmudical passages represent again in its best method that side of Jewish learning which was current a century ago.

Not less interesting, both for variety of matter and wide scholarship, are the collected essays and articles of the late Dr. Löw,[1] as well as those of the late M. Arsène Darmestetter.[2] The former may fairly be regarded as the greatest Talmudical scholar of the modern school. Though very liberally

[1] *Gesammelte Schriften von Leopold Löw.* Two vols. Szegedin: 1890. Verlag von Alexander Baba.

[2] *Reliques Scientifiques.* Paris: 1890. 2 vols.

inclined and highly accomplished in every branch of secular learning, he shows an acquaintance with the Possekin literature which would have been admired even in a Rabbi of the seventeenth century. This may be seen from his works "Lebensalter," "Die Jüdische Graphic," and in the first volume of this collection, where nothing escapes him which has the remotest reference to his subject even in the most obscure Responsum or Halachic Compendium. The present volume, however, is mainly taken up with historical studies, the most important being, in my judgment, the biography of the well-known R. Aaron Chorin, which deserves to be carefully read. It is certainly written in a partial spirit, as Löw was the disciple and friend of Chorin. But this man has already suffered so much from the prejudice of the opposite side that there will be no harm done if Löw's verdict should incline us to a more favourable judgment. The mere fact that Zunz received his התרת הוראה, Rabbinical diploma, from him would serve to prove that Chorin was held in high estimation by his contemporaries. Of a more strictly scientific nature is the work of M. Darmestetter, the first volume of which is almost entirely taken up with Jewish studies. The essay, *Le Talmud*, is perhaps one of the best of the kind, whilst the *Études Judéo-Françaises* contains an inexhaustible mine of philological and historical material, for which the scholarly world will feel the more grateful, seeing that the number of those who are equally familiar with the two languages is extremely small.

The new Hebrew annual, *Kenesseth Haggedolah*, edited by Herr Suvalski,[1] which is intended to become a kind of impartial periodical representing the view of all the different parties among the Jews in Russia, does not come up to the standard of such journals. I must say that I do not much care for this mixed multitude. There is much talk in it of nationality, of the importance of a national literature, of quarrels about *Shochetim* and similar topics, but very little of scientific value. The only articles worth reading

[1] כנסת הגדולה. Warsaw: 1890.

are the few notes by Reifmann, and the review by the editor himself of various books. Rather interesting is the pedigree Herr Friedstein gives us there (I., 103),—from a MS. bearing the signature of R. David, the son of the well-known author of the שלשלת הקבלה—of the Yachya family, beginning with Adam and going down to this R. David. As the Yachya family believed itself to be descended from David, and this pedigree thus includes also the enumeration of the princes of the captivity, Herr Friedstein's discovery gains especial importance for the historian. Entirely new is the statement that there was a ראש גולה חייא, the first Jewish exile who emigrated to Poland. It would be desirable if Herr Friedstein would give a fuller description of the MS. to which we are indebted for this information, there being indeed many reasons for suspecting this document (see the above-mentioned work by his father, pp. 29*a*, 53*b*). Much better is the *Haasif*, of which we now have the fifth volume,[1] containing historical articles by Weiss on Nachmanides, by Kaufmann on R. Sabbathai, Sopher of Premiszel, and by Oppenheim on the *Tendency of the Aggadoth*.

That indefatigable critic, Schorr, is still working. There is, indeed, much in the last number of his *Hechaluz*[2] which comes too late—a review of R. Z. Fränkel's *Mebo Hayerushalmi*, which appeared in 1870; but he gives also fresh matter on works published lately, as the *Halachoth Gedoloth* and the *Responsa of the Geonim*, whilst the lamentation on p. 109, which he publishes from a MS., offers a new document on the sad history of the *auto-da-fés* through which the Talmud has had to pass. Some important pieces will also be found in the last volume of the *Ozar Hassifruth*, edited by Herr Gräber.[3] For the republication of the ספר הפרדס, by R. Yedayah of Bedres, with supplements by Herr Halberstam, a work which was as rare as a manuscript, the editor deserves

---

[1] האסיף, by N. Sokolow. Warsaw: 1887. Weiss' article originally appeared in this REVIEW (I. 289 seq.).

[2] החלוץ, XIII., by H. Osias Schorr. Wien: 1889.

[3] אוצר הספרות, III.; 1889-90.

the special gratitude of the literary world. I understand that the next volume of the *Rabbins Français*, now passing through the press, will also treat of R. Yedayah's life and his works, and give a full description of the Pardes in its different versions. Professor Kaufmann again continues the publication of the minute-books in many Jewish communities, which render very valuable materials to Jewish history. This is also the case with the צוק העתים, an account by an eye-witness of the Chmelnizki persecution, which was prepared for the new edition by the late Dr. Gurland. And lastly I recommend Dr. Oppenheim's *Essay on Jewish Apostasy and its Causes* to the attention of all Jewish ministers. They cannot fail to profit by reading it.

S. SCHECHTER.

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing was written the fifth part of Herr Horovitz's collection תוספתא עתיקתא has appeared, containing the בריתא דמסכת נדה from a MS. in the library of Herr Halberstam. It is to be noticed that it is only a fragment, for the end of the Boraitha breaks off in the middle of a sentence. Now, I have already alluded to the fourth part of this collection פתחי נדה, which forms an introduction to the part which has now followed. But we miss there the name of Schorr, the editor of the Hechaluz, who was the first, I think, to draw the attention of students to the quotation from this Boraitha, as well as to throw some light on its exotic nature. Indeed, with all his diligence, Herr Horovitz was hardly able to add a single name to the list of the authorities who really saw this Boraitha, as given by Schorr in the *Hechaluz*, vol. VIII., page 50 (see also p. 160, the quotations from Nachmanides' *Derashah*), and Brüll in his *Jahrbücher* II., page 126. All the other writers we meet in Herr Horovitz's notes knew it only at second and third hand. I am also inclined to agree with Schorr, who, when the first chapter of this Boraitha was published in 1882 by Herr Horovitz, in his collection בית נכות, etc. (II., p. 24), declared it to be משובשים ומזויפים (*Hechaluz* XII., p. 100) *corrupt and forged.* A

similar verdict was given by Brüll (*ib.* 159). It is true that it contains certain passages with regard to the isolation of the Niddah which might have some claim to a higher antiquity when authorities were still more stringent in this respect (see *Sabbath*, 64*b*), but on the whole it makes the impression of a manufactured imitation of the *Tossephta* about the Geonaic period, when so many other pieces were forged. The attribution of the first Halachah to שמאי shows the desire of the author to imitate the existing tractate "Niddah," which begins with the words שמאי אומר. In the name of R. Eleazar ben Arach various Halachoth are given, whilst, except the saying in *Aboth* II. 12, and the fact that he was the disciple of R. Jochanan ben Zakkai, and afterwards neglected his study, the older Rabbinic literature knows nothing about him, and neither the *Talmud* nor the *Midrashim* contain a single sentence from him. It is only on the pseudo-epigraphic chapters of R. Eliezer that his name appears again. R. Chanina ben Dossa, who is more known as a saint than as a Halachic teacher, we also meet in this Boraitha (p. 11); but it is a bad anachronism to represent him putting a question to R. Chiya, who lived more than a century later. This reminds one of the anachronism in the before-mentioned chapters of R. Eliezer, in which Ben Azai gives an account of the life of R. Simon ben Lakish (ch. xliii.). The story on p. 6 about the death of the son of R. Abuha has about it an air of solemn mockery, which one meets occasionally in the Zohar. R. Nechunyah ben Hakanah, of whom a long story is given on p. 86, is also the hero of later forgeries as the Bahir. The denominative שנתנדת, or the verb קישו (p. 27) are strange to the Talmudic literature, which has instead of the former ראתה דם, and of the latter שאלו, except, perhaps, once in Genesis Rabba xxxv. § 3, in the way of a pun. The passage יצתה בת קול ואמרה · · · אלו ואלו דברי אלהים חיים אבל הלכה כדברי ב"ש looks like a parody of the story in Erubin 13*b*. But the preference given to the school of Shammai strengthens the suspicion of its Karaitic tendency, which also other passages suggest.

However, even if this Boraitha dates only from the Geonaic period, it is still old enough to be regarded as an

important contribution to ancient Jewish literature. Then, too, its very exotic nature makes it interesting enough to deserve a thorough study. Herr Horovitz himself felt that he was not always successful in his commentary. Indeed, it would seem that the sources of this Boraitha have rather to be sought in Karaitic and Samaritan writers than among the Rabbis. The following few extracts from MSS. might, however, prove not to be altogether useless to the student. I give first an extract from a MS. in the British Museum, Add. 27,129 (p. 131*b*), which bears the heading פרק נדה containing the greater part of פרק א׳ הלכה א׳, ב׳ and ה׳, פרק ב הלכה ד, but offers some different readings. On this follow the הלכות נדה as they are to be found in the לקוטי הפרדם לרש״י, and the דין יצירת הולד, concluding with the words סליק להו פרק נדה שבח לאל רם ונישא.

בית שמאי אומר גדולה היא הנדה שהיא מרחקת מן העבירה ומקרבת לגן עדן ולא עוד שהיא מרחקת מן הטומאה ומקרבתן לטהרה ואיזו היא המקרבת לטהרה האשה כשהיא מזהרת בעצמה · אימתי בזמן שהיא טובלת · אמר ר׳ חנינה בזמן שהיא טובלת חזרה ופגעה בכלב אם היתה חכמה ויש בה יראת שמים לא תניח לבעלה לשמש עמה באותה הלילה למה שלא יעמדו בניה מכוערין ופניהם דומין לכלב עד שתחזור ותטבול שניה · ואי טבלה ופגעה בחמור אין לה רשות לבוא עם בעלה למה שלא תקריב עצמה לעבירה ויעמדו בניה לבם טפש כלב החמור ותטבול שלישית ואפי׳ כשחזרה ופגעה בעם הארץ אסור לה לשמש עם בעלה עד שתחזור ותטבול חזרה ופגעה תעלה ותשמש · אלה הם שבניהן דומין לכלב ההולכין בשוק ואוכלין והרוק שלהן יורד על הזקן שלו ולשונו נפסק מלדבר אם ראית איש שהוא במדה זו דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו חזרה ופגעה בכלב · ואלה הן שדומין לחמור לבן טפש ואינן לומדין תורה מכוערין בהליכתן והדבבים מתקבצים על פניהם ואם ראית אדם במדה זו דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו חזרה ופגעה בחמור · ואלו הן שבניהם דומים לעמי הארץ מדברין ואינן נאים בדיבורן לומדין ומשכחין מהלכים בשוק והבריות משחקין בה אם ראית אדם במדה זו דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו חזרה ופגעה בעם הארץ · א״ר חייא אשריו ואשרי אביו ואשרי אמו שאמו טבלה ופגעת בסום בשעת הטבילה בניה נאים בהליכתן נאים בעמידתן נאים בדיבורן שומעין ומבינים למדין תורה ומשנה ולא עוד אלא שאימתן על הבריות · אם ראית אדם שהוא תם בדרכיו ומשפיל קומתו ומדבר ודבריו נשמעין במהרה דע שבשעה שטבלה אמו פגעה בסום ואם ראית אדם שהוא מחליף את לשונו מהפך את

ידיו לידיו דע שבשעה ששימש אביו עם אמו ונשקה היה הרוק יוצא מפיו : אלו הן שקוברות את בעליהן כל מי שאינה מזדהרת בנדתה וכמה תשמור כל ימי נדתה ר' עקיבא אומר שבעת ימים · אם כבסה בנדיה בשביעי וראתה טפה כחרדל בשמיני חוזרת ומכבסת בתשיעי ואם ראתה לאחר כביסה בעשירית חוזרת ומשמרת אחת עשר אם ראת באחד עשר טפה כחרדל משמרת שנים עשר : רבן יוחנן בן זכאי אומר אילו' ראתה למאה ימים משמרת שבעה נקיים · חמשמרת ימי את נדתה לא תבשל לבעלה ולא אופה ולא מרקדת ולא תפרוש את המטה ולא תשקה מים ולא מפנה מים מכלי חרש מפני שהיא מטמאה כל צורך : אמר ר' חנינא אפילו הרוק של נדה שהיא רוקקת על גבי המטה ודרסו בעלה או בניה נטמאין בכל צורך ואסורין להכנס בביה הכנסת עד שיטבילו את עצמן במים למה שהרוק בנדה ואמרו חכמים המשמשת את בעלה והיא נדה גורמת לבעלה שלא ינחלו תורה אפילו לעשרים דור בני בניה לוקין בצרעת · האיש אינו רשאי לשמש את אשתו לא לפני השמש ולא לפני הירח ולא לפני הכוכבים : כנגד השמש למה אם תתעבר באותו היום ויצאו בניה ביד אחד ולא עוד אלא שהיא גורמת לו ומלבישתו לבן ואיזהו לבן זה הבהר כנגד מאורו · ושל ירח למה שמא תתעבר ותלד סוף בניה לוקין בבהק ואל תאמר שסוף הבהק לצרעת נהפך · לפני הכוכבים למה שמא תתעבר ותלד ויצאו בניה מלגלגים בלשונם ולא עוד אלא שהיא גורמת לו ללקות ברוח · ולמה הולד יוצא ממעי אמו והוא אלם אלא כשנגע בה בעלה היתה מדברת ומחשבת באיש אחר · האשה ששמשה עם בעלה וראת דם ולא הכיר עד שתי שעות ביום האיך יבדוק מניח ירק בתוך המים והיא משטפת את ידיה אם יצאו המים מכוערין מטיפין עליהן שלש טיפין יין ומשקין את האשה אם יוצא ממנה זרע מרובה בלילה ראת ואם לא ביום ראת האשה שגבר עליה זובה מה עושין לה שיפסוק הדם מביאין לה מימי גרניר ומימי כרפס ושולקין למעלה מן האש ונותנין לתוכו זפת עד שתשים באש ואח"כ מביאין לו לבונה זכה ומשליכין לתוך המים ומשקין אותו לאשה מיד הדם נפסק ואמרו האשה האשה כשהיא נדה לא תקציץ צפורניה שמא יפול אחד מהם לארץ וידרוס בו אדם וסופו ללקות בשחין והעון בצווארה · א"ר יודן אסור לברך לפני הנדה שלא תהרהר ותאמר אמן · ונתחלל השם ואסור שאול בשלומה של נדה שמא החזור ויתחלל המקום · ר' נחמיה אומר אפילו הדיבור שיוצא מפיה טמא · א"ר יוחנן אסור אדם לילך אחר הנידה ולדרוס את אפרה שהוא טמא כמת כן עפרה של נדה טמא ואסור ליהנות ממעשי ידיה :

MS. Or. 1389 (p. 76), which I have already mentioned, contains also a large quotation from this פרק. In the passage

ואוכלים כשׁוֹר ואינם יודעים it adds ואלו שבניהם דומים לעם הארץ להבין בין טוב לרע. In another MS. in the same library, I find the following quotation from *Midrash* (חדישה ?) which might, perhaps, have proved the conclusion of this Boraitha ולמה נזר יולדת זכר ז׳ ויולדת נקבה י״ד דברי ימים כדי להזכיר אדם הראשון שנברא בו (?י׳) ימים והיה בשבת נוצר אדם שהוא יום ח׳ לכך טהרתן של זכר לאחר ז׳ ימים שיהיה יום שבת מטהרו שהוא ראיית פני מטרונא אך יצירת חוה לא היתה בשבת ראשונה עד שבת שנייה שהוא לאחר י״ד דברי ר׳ פנחס בן יאיר אבל חכמים אומרים שניהם נבראו ביום ו׳ וכו׳ From Oxford MSS. I may, perhaps, give here a quotation from Cod. 692 (Catalogue Neubauer), 137a, which has some relation to the subject.

כתוב בספר המקצועו׳ דרבי׳ חננאל סמך למניקה ולמעוברת שלא תינשא עד כ״ד חודש שנ׳ לא תבשל גדי מנין תִּבַּשֵּׁל בגימטריא כ״ד חודש חמה של ל״ל יום ובית ימים יתרין אחד ליום שנולד בו ואחד ליום שנתקדשה בו וכן מצאתי אני הכותב תשובה גאון וכתוב בה עוד ותני ר׳ חייא לא תסיג גבול עולם זו מעוברת חבירו ובשדה יתומים אל תבא זו מינקת מכתיבת ידו של רבי׳ אפרים מבונא העתקתיו :

Of more importance, however, is the following extract from Cod. 1101 (Catalogue Neubauer), fol. 209*a*, which is given in רוקח סימן שי״ח, with some variations in the name of the מעשה הגאונים :

(209*a*. מרב סעדיה גאון • המשמשת נדה לבעלה גורמת אפילו לכ׳ דורות שבוה לוקין בצרעת לא מפנה מים מן הכד ושותה אלא יהיה לה כלי לנידותה ולא תקציץ צפרניה פן ידרסו עליהן בעלה או אחרים וילקו בשחין • ר׳ אלעזר בן ערך אומר כשאיש משמש עם אשתו בליצנות ובניבול פה הק״בה אומר למלאך ולוקח דם נידותה ונותנה לתוך פיה ומיד לוקה הולד • הנידה אין לה רשות לישב על השולחן ואסור למלאות את הכוס ולהשקותה בו מפני שהיא טמאה • אמר ר׳ חלפתא אשריה ואשרי יולדתה המשמרת את בעלה מדינה של גיהנם ומביאתו לחיי עולם הבא : מעשה בתלמיד אחד שמרת ולא הלכו בני אדם אחר מטתו התחילו חביריו לבכותו ואמרו זו תורה וזו שכרה פקח הק״בה עיניו בחלומו ואמ׳ לו חבירך לא עבר עבירה מימיו כי אם פעם אחת עברה אשתו נידה ונגעה בבגדיו לכך תגבו העבירה ממנו • בלילה ראו הביריו מהלך בתוך הפרדס בתוך עיינות מים בגן עדן :

S. S.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Histoire du Peuple d'Israël, par Ernest Renan, Tome Troisième.

Is it worth while to review the *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël?* Who that is interested in the history of that people will not read for himself the representation of it set forth by such a master of style and scenic effect as M. Renan? Still, to indicate the character and charm of his latest volume, as well as to congratulate the veteran author upon its appearance, a few words from this REVIEW may not be out of place.

M. Renan's third volume deals with the best known and least disputed period of Old Testament history, that, namely, which lies between the fall of Samaria and the return from the Babylonian captivity (722-536 B.C.). From the critical point of view there is not much novelty possible. The Assyrian invasion, Isaiah's justified confidence, the reforms of Hezekiah, the reaction of Manasseh, the composition of Deuteronomy, the reform of Josiah, the preaching of Jeremiah, and then the two transportations, with the life of the exiles in Babylon and their two great teachers, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, constitute a definite bulk of ascertained material, out of which all historians must construct stories the outlines of which will always remain the same. And yet what extraordinary freshness there is in M. Renan's volume—not a single dull or superfluous page from first to last!

In addition to the fact of genius, which differentiates M. Renan's work from that of all other living writers upon Israel's history or religion, except, perhaps, from Wellhausen's, there are several other reasons for this wonderful freshness and charm. Some of these, indeed the most important of them, are both painful and questionable, but contribute none the less to the startling novelty and suggestiveness of the whole. But apart from them, how often do M. Renan's matchless gifts of style, his wide knowledge of Oriental life, his penetrating intelligence and imagination, suffice to throw new light upon, or bring new meaning into, old facts and records! Students will, I think, find much help-

fulness, for instance, in his account of the growth of the Jerusalem Temple in importance and esteem, of the prophetic *Midrashim* (p. 245) of Ezekiel and his legal visions, and of the teachings of Deutero-Isaiah. Very often they will find an old thought or fact reclad in new forms, which make one the better realize its importance. How frequently, *e.g.*, have we been told that the religious destinies of Europe hung upon the fortunes of that band of captives who were led away from their own land into the exile of Babylonia. M. Renan points out that an essential feature of the case was that the captives carried with them : "les vieilles écritures, formant un volume déjà considérable." And then he adds :

> Les exilés avaient sûrement des bagages, portés sur des ânes ou des chameaux. Le sort de l'humanité fut attaché durant quelques jours au pied plus ou moins sûr de la bête qui portait le livre sacré de l'avenir (p. 379).

M. Renan's critical position is peculiar. He is a *Grafianer*, but by no means accepts all the conclusions of the most advanced German and Dutch school. His point of view as regards the Pentateuch, by which (like Graf before Kuenen and Riehm had convinced him of his error) he separates the legislative from the narrative portion of the Priestly Chronicle, is already well known. Further odd mixtures of criticism will be noticed in the present volume. M. Renan, for example, accepts Stade's view that Hezekiah's reform did not extend to the removal of the *Bamoth ;* he is ready to assume a number of interpolations in Jeremiah, so that he even goes so far as to say : "Il a y un deutéro-Jérémie, comme il y a un deutéro-Isaïe." But, at the same time, he is able to accept the authenticity of Hezekiah's hymn and of Isaiah xii., to say nothing of xxxii. and xxxiii. Job is a part of the "travail littéraire" under Hezekiah, while an extended use is made of the Psalter for the whole period from Isaiah to the fall of Jerusalem. Thus, Psalms xx., xxi., xxv., ci., are assigned to the reign of Hezekiah ; xxii., xxxvii., lxxiii., xciv., to that of Manasseh ; i., xxiii., lxxxiv., to that of Josiah. Zechariah xii.-xiv. is still retained for the interval between the death of Josiah and the end of the monarchy. It is needless to say that under the master hand of M. Renan these portions of Scripture which, to many of us, seem either of exilic or post-exilic origin, are made to fit most prettily into the place and the time that are assigned to them, but the final impression remains that the author's criticism is unsatisfactory and unequal.

M. Renan alludes in the preface to the blame which his second volume encountered, because he had too frequently made

> des rapprochements entre les antiques événements...et les mouvements des temps modernes.

But he declares that he must persist in the practice. For there is no better example than the history of ancient Judaism of the

essential contrariety and opposition between the demands of politics and of socialism. So in his third volume the past is frequently illustrated by the present, or the present criticised by the lessons of the past. Sometimes the parallels are only hypothetical. Thus Jeremiah, in his fierce opposition to the "national" party of resistance against the Chaldæan oppression is compared to

un publiciste français qui, à bonne intention, en 1870, eût appelé les Prussiens les ministres de Dieu, eût applaudi aux défaites amenées par nos fautes, eût prédit pour l'avenir dix fois pis encore si l'on ne s'améliorait (p. 289).

The laws of the Priests drawn up in Babylon were the result of dreamy speculations and socialistic chimæras. They are plans

comme ceux qu'on pouvait élaborer autour de M. le comte de Chambord ou ceux qu'on discute dans les clubs socialistes (p. 413).

M. Renan, indeed, is never weary of emphasizing the socialistic, and therefore impractical, requirements of the prophets and the later legislators. He admires them, while he pities them. They were beating against a rock, and yet humanity requires, and gains from, such a vain battle with necessity. It cannot, he says, be repeated too often that "le véritable analogue des prophètes, en notre temps, ce sont les journalistes du style le plus effréné" (p. 350). The most ancient advocates of the poor and the oppressed were the Prophets of Israel, and it is for this that they are to be assigned so eminent a place in the history of civilization. But their advocacy led them into impossibilities, and made them the destroyers of the State and the enemies of their country. The violence of these "prodigieux agitateurs," "fous sublimes," resembles that of

le démocrate extrême de nos jours, qui ne veut pas faire les dérogations au principe d'égalité nécessaires pour avoir une armée. Une société trop douce est faible ; le monde n'est pas composé de parfaits ; il y a des abus nécessaires (p. 279).

The Hellenism of M. Renan and his realistic instincts alike lead him to combat the ideals of the Prophets and the lawgivers, but yet in other respects he is drawn towards them by the attractive force of their pure morality. The see-saw in his mind is very interesting and stimulative to the reader. The Priestly law, he says,

est une loi de confrérie, non une loi de nation. Elle se rapproche des idées qui dominent dans certains cercles socialistes. Inutile de dire que nulle culture d'esprit, nul art, nulle science, nulle philosophie, aucune de ces fleurs exquises que la Grèce a fait éclore, ne pouvait sortir d'un tel régime (p. 426).

But, nevertheless, this ideal really demanded the protecting force of an empire like that of Persia, within the shadow of which the brotherhood might live out its dreams. The attitude of the "Jewish socialists" to the outer world fills M. Renan with indignation and

wonder. The world only exists for Israel, but Israel is too often careless of the world.

Quand l'empire qui lui servait d'abri s'écroule, il éclate de rire; il s'écrie que toutes les nations travaillent pour le feu, s'épuisent pour le vide. Il oublie que, sans cet abri d'une grande société civile et militaire, sa Thora serait inapplicable. Toutes les moineries en sont là (p. 427).

And yet this very phrase from Jeremiah (li. 58) moves him elsewhere to admiration.

La grande ironie, mêlée de pitié, qu'inspire au penseur ce que la pauvre humanité, amoureuse de ses bourreaux, appelle la gloire, ne s'est jamais exprimée par un trait plus énergique. La Grèce a merveilleusement compris les petits plaisirs enfantins de la vie intérieure des cités. Les ruines des grands empires, avec les colères et les larmes qu'elles provoquent; le sentiment supérieur, profondément triste, avec lequel l'homme pacifique contemple ces écroulements; la commisération qu'excite dans le cœur du sage le spectacle des peuples travaillant pour le vide, victimes de l'orgueil de quelques-uns; la vanité de toute chose, et le feu dernier juge des sociétés humaines (ce qui n'exclut pas la foi invincible en un avenir idéal) : voilà ce que la Grèce n'a pas su voir; voilà ce que les prophètes juifs ont exprimé avec une sagacité admirable (p. 458).

The figure of Jeremiah seems a perpetual astonishment to M. Renan, and he brings out with admirable force the strange mixture of the man, his weakness (to our modern eyes) as well as his strength. Jeremiah is a prince among "devots," leader of the "piétistes." Now "les dévots se montrent toujours incontentables. Ce qu'on fait pour eux leur était dû; ce qu'on ne fait pas est un crime" (p. 267). And "les piétistes sont essentiellement persécuteurs; ils se plaignent fort quand on les persécute; et pourtant ils trouvent très mauvais qu'on les empêche de persécuter les autres; ils sont si sûrs d'avoir raison!" (p. 120). The violence of Jeremiah's utterances, his imprecations, his perpetual predictions of carnage and destruction, his insistance upon cette horrible doctrine qu'on est coupable si l'on n'accepte pas la tyrannie du jour, censée commissionnée par Dieu" fill M. Renan's gentle heart with horror. He is appalled at

la sympathie que l'homme de Dieu a pour le Tamerlan, qui va tout mettre à feu et à sang. Le Jahvé exterminateur, ayant pour parfait serviteur Attila, voilà l'idéal de Jérémie (p. 287).

And yet this fanatic was a man "d'une moralite sévère." His religious genius was "sans égal"; without him the religious history of mankind "eût suivi un autre tour"; he is the man who "avant Jean-Baptiste" contributed the most "à la fondation du christianisme; il doit compter, malgré la distance des siècles, entre les précurseurs immédiats de Jésus" (p. 154, 251).

The Babylonian Isaiah is naturally of all the prophets the most sympathetic to M. Renan, as he is indeed to almost all of us. He

calls him "le premier des penseurs humanitaires. Nous tous, dont la religion est d'espérer un avenir où l'humanité se consolera enfin de ses souffrances, nous le saluons comme notre maître." The one thing which annoys him in Deutero-Isaiah is delightfully characteristic.

La seule chose qui blesse dans le Second Isaïe, c'est le nom de *Jahvé* (p. 504).

We are not spared in this volume a good deal of M. Renan's usual insistance upon the old, monotheistic Elohism of the nomad patriarchs, and of his usual bitterness against the false God Yahveh, the God who is "un grand orgueilleux, un jaloux," "un dieu provincial, souverainement injuste."

In this, as in other more fundamental matters, M. Renan's history is very different from the ordinary works of the critical school to which we are accustomed. His point of view is, indeed, I should imagine, different from that of almost any previous writer. There have been books written in open hostility to the Old Testament; there are others, and these are the most common, written more or less strongly from the Christian point of view, and full of "contrasts" between the Old Covenant and the New. M. Renan resembles neither. Again, even the ordinary run of critical historians, however far they may be removed from a dogmatic orthodoxy, all write with a decidedly Theistic and even Christian bias. But M. Renan is neither Christian nor Theist. To him the fundamental doctrine, common to both the Old Testament and the New, of a self-conscious God is an error and a delusion. Standing thus wholly outside the religious beliefs, whether of Isaiah or of Jesus, of Christian or of Jew, he is, in some respects, more capable of taking an impartial estimate both of the Old Covenant and the New. A person who does not believe in a self-conscious God is, perhaps, too distant from the writers of the Bible to thoroughly appreciate them, or do them perfect justice; but from his high platform, removed from the usual contentions of either party, he is yet able to take a wider, more comprehensive survey of the entire religious development from David to St. Paul. It is, at any rate, of extreme interest to learn the assessment placed upon the very various religious teachings of the Old Testament by one who is concerned neither to defend nor to attack; who seeks at most for "analogies," but not for "contrasts."

For M. Renan is thorough-going in his scepticism. The prophets of Israel, he tells us, demanded an unproved belief in their divine message, as superstitious as the superstitions they attacked. In this curious inconsistency they resemble the Protestants of the sixteenth century.

La raison est si faible qu'elle n'a le choix qu'entre les degrés divers de crédu-

lité. Les puritains israélites écartaient les pratiques les plus décidément niaises; ils riaient des gens assez sots pour chercher des révélations dans les voix censées venir du ventre, et ils tenaient pour inspirées les paroles de celui qui, sans un ombre de preuves, se donnait pour prophète de Jahvé. Les Protestants supprimaient les messes et les indulgences, mais gardaient, exagéraient même la révélation de la Bible, les mérites du sang de Jésus-Christ. Ces distinctions qui nous paraissent naïves, sont des conditions de force dans l'action. Pauvre espèce humaine! Comme elle veut le bien! Mais comme elle est, dans son ensemble, peu faite pour la vérité! (p. 188).

Jewish apologists are pained that there is no trace of any doctrine of the immortality of the soul in the Old Testament, and try to read it into all sorts of places which are wholly innocent of this conception. Christian theologians, ignoring the historical genesis and growth of the doctrine, point out in solemn and portentous tones the proper and intended difference between the Old Revelation and the New. M. Renan agrees with neither. To him the doctrine is a "chimère," the peculiar dream of the Aryan races. The Israelites were "advanced" enough to perceive its vanity.

Plus avancés par certains côtés que les autres peuples, les Beni-Israël virent bien que les récompenses et les châtiments d'outre-tombe sont chose vaine, sans réalité (p. 78).

At the same time M. Renan, with his usual curious see-saw (indicative of impartiality or indecision?), assigns to the doctrine an immense value. It is a chimæra, and yet a "chimère avec laquelle seule on fait de grandes choses." To its absence is due the curious fact that the ideal of the Second Isaiah, the man who was "ivre de justice," whose portraiture of the Servant of Yahveh shows us "l'abnégation poussée jusqu'au martyre," is nevertheless only "une vie plantureuse et la longévité." It is only the inherent genius "des grandes races" which has enabled the Semite to triumph over his ideal of "bien-être matériel," so that, in spite of it, his life, endowed with the gift of hope "qui n'appartient qu'à lui," has been "un acte de dévouement continu."

M. Renan's own belief is apparently a kind of mild Pantheism. He is convinced that

tous les systèmes qui aspirent à justifier le gouvernement temporel de la Providence sont condamnés à supposer Dieu inepte, féroce ou jaloux (p. 263).

Thus "autant vaut ne pas essayer de le justifier." M. Renan holds

qu'aucune volonté particulière ne gouverne le monde, et que ce qui arrive est le résultat d'un effort aveugle tendant en somme vers le bien (p. 85).

For "la raison suprême" is "inconscient," though of this fact the Hebrew had not "la moindre notion," since

la distinction du conscient et de l'inconscient dans le développement de l'univers ne pouvait être faite alors, puisque, de nos jours, elle est à peine comprise de l'immense majorité des hommes, même instruits (p. 179).

It is perfectly natural that with a theoretic belief such as this, crossed by the conviction that the great achievements of mankind have been owing to delusions and chimæras, there should be in M. Renan's writings a perpetual undercurrent of contemplative sadness. How much of human life is vanity! It must be so, for

> en réalité, les surfaces seules existent dans l'humanité; elles sont les apparences; or, en dehors de l'ordre scientifique pur, les choses humaines ne sont qu'apparences. La bataille gagnée est celle qu'on croit gagnée. L'opinion triomphante est celle qui, à une certaine heure, réussit à prouver qu'elle avait le droit de triompher (p. 27).

To combat the mournfulness of life, the disciples of M. Renan have narrow expedients. The main comforts of Aryan and Semite, the life beyond the tomb and the self-conscious God, are alike forbidden. Yet, here again, it is the Semite who has bequeathed to the modern spirit its final resource. It is that of the Psalmist :

> les larmes secrètes, l'épanchement du cœur avouant son trouble. Voilà pourquoi les Psaumes, quand tout le reste s'en va, restent notre livre de prières, notre chant intérieur, notre éternelle consolation (p. 253).

Yet, for the mass of mankind, hope, the gift of the Semite, hope, issuing in aspirations and dreams which console by imaginary paradises for the sorrows of reality, will never cease to be necessary, unless humanity should attain that condition of material well-being "qui rend le rêve inutile."

Such is the contradiction of life. What is M. Renan's "conclusion of the whole matter?"

> Au milieu de tant de contradictions, ne laissant que le choix de l'erreur, qui peut avoir la prétention d'être sans péché? Celui qui craint de se tromper, et ne traite personne d'aveugle; celui qui ne sait pas au juste quel est le but de l'humanité, et l'aime tout de même, elle et son œuvre; celui qui cherche le vrai avec doute et qui dit à son adversaire: "Peut-être vois-tu mieux que moi;" celui, en un mot, qui laisse aux autres la pleine liberté qu'il prend pour lui. Celui-là peut dormir tranquille et attendre en paix le jugement du monde, s'il y en a un (p. 279).

Solemn words from a noble soul. But perhaps the Aryan with his "chimère d'outre-tombe," and the Semite with his dream of a self-conscious God, saw better than M. Renan.

C. G. Montefiore.

November 7th, 1890.

DR. STEINTHAL'S ESSAYS.

Zu Bibel und Religionsphilosophie. By Professor H. STEINTHAL. (Berlin : Reimer. 1890.)

SOME time ago I drew up and published a list of the Jewish celebrities of the last century. I remember wondering at the time what would have been said if I had dared to place the living ones in what I thought to be their order of merit. But certainly among the first two or three would have come the name of H. Steinthal. He is, next to Wundt, the most distinguished psychologist in Germany. He is co-founder with Professor Lazarus of the science of *Völkerpsychologie.* He is the greatest living authority on the intricate question of the origin of language ; indeed, on the whole range of questions connected with the philosophical and psychological bases of Philology, he is the first authority in Europe. Besides this, he is the only writer on Ethics in contemporary Germany whose views are known or considered outside the Fatherland. In Old Testament criticism, again, he has made his mark ; in particular, his paper on the Samson saga is almost the sole relic of the celebrated sun-myth theory that still remains unassailed.

The papers collected in his latest work, the one before us, touch upon many sides of Steinthal's very many-sided activity ; but their title, *Zu Bibel und Religionsphilosophie*, indicate their main topics. Thus we have the Narrative Art of the Bible, the Sublime in the Scriptures, the Creative Myths of Genesis, besides special studies of Lamentations and Balaam, which are clearly contributions " zu Bibel." The other part of the title is represented by essays on Truth and Evolution, on Myth and Religion, and on the Origin and Meaning (*Wesen*) of Monotheism. But besides these essays, there are others, not so closely covered by the title, that seem to me to deserve even greater attention than any of these. Two of these are subtle and penetrating psychological studies on Devotion and on Humility ; the others are on Tolerance and on Prejudice. These form, both in style and matter, the gems of the collection, and give characteristic examples of Professor Steinthal's style and method.

Before, however, speaking more particularly of these, some words should be given to the other essays of the book which I only put in the second place, not because I admire them less, but because I consider the others more characteristic. It is always interesting to come across an expert on ground where he is somewhat less at home than in his specialty. One fancies one sees the man under such circumstances *an und für sich*, "as in himself he really is," to use Matthew Arnold's characteristic Englishing of the German technical phrase. And a

very pleasant acquaintance Professor Steinthal proves himself to be, when found off the beaten track. For one thing he writes a German that can be read, an almost unique phenomenon among German philosophers. It is, indeed, remarkable that almost the only German writers of note who have had anything of French grace and lucidity about them have been Jews. Mendelssohn, Börne, Heine, wherever the German tongue resounds, these carry off the palm for lucid and easy-flowing prose. Professor Steinthal shares in great measure in this Semitic lucidity, which not even anti-Semites will put down to the bad side of Jewish influence. Without any straining after epigram, Professor Steinthal's exposition is as clear as a running brook, and in like manner often deceives one as to the depth of the stream.

According to Professor Steinthal, this lucidity has been conspicuous among Jews from Bible times, at least as regards narrative style. He points out how effectively the Bible tells a story in the fewest possible words, selecting, as examples, the election of Jehu, the rumours of Joseph's death reaching Jacob, and the sacrifice of Isaac. For my own part, I think the epic skill of the Judaic narrators comes out still more strongly in a passage like that of the death of the Shunamite's son (II Kings, iv. 8-37). The cry of the sun-stricken lad, "My head! my head!" has always had a special appeal to me.

Another of Professor Steinthal's Biblical essays deals with the Biblical sublime, and here he shows that it is not for nought that he has gained such fame as a psychologist. English psychological language makes it almost impossible to render into English the four elements of the sublime, according to Steinthal:—"Ruhe des Gemüts, Idealität des Gefühls, Klarheit des Bewusstseins und Fülle bei Form des Inhalts." Perhaps we may paraphrase it somewhat as follows: —In presence of the sublime our mood is calmed, yet our spirits are aroused and our outlook widened, we see clearly, yet know we see not all. This is the sublime regarded from the subjective side; from the objective point of view a certain amount of simplicity and clearness of outline strikes Steinthal as one of the *sine quâ non*'s of "Das Erhabene," and then he goes on to give examples of this in the Bible. One of his most striking remarks is upon the religious use of phrases like "our God," "my God," which M. Renan found so henotheistic. Steinthal points out that the use is peculiar to the Hebrews; neither Greeks nor Germans ever speak of "our Jupiter," "our Odin."

These examples must suffice as specimens of Steinthal's Biblical literary criticism, a subject practically in its infancy. Overmuch as the Bible has been written about, its literary qualities are scarcely ever touched upon. Even Professor Cheyne, who shows in other respects so fine a literary taste and tact, rarely or never treats of the

Biblical books from the literary point of view. It would be well if he or others would touch on this side of the Bible's greatness, one of the secrets of its appeal to many folk who fail to be touched by forms of religious thought, so different from the contemporary, or requiring such historic imagination for its identity to be seen.

As a sample of Steinthal's philosophy of religion, to which we must now turn, the lecture on "Religion and Myth" will amply serve our turn. His views on religion are akin to those of Professor Seeley and the Broad Church generally. Religion is the feeling for the Infinite, for the Divinity within us, and for all without us that represents the Infinite or the Divine; hence it is the source of all pleasure in the ideal strivings of science, the symbols of art and the ideals of duty. *C'est magnifique mais ce n'est pas le dogme*, some will say, and indeed Professor Steinthal is here by no means so clear, let us say the word, by no means so sincere as is his wont. More harm is done to religion by such vague vapourings than by all the blasphemies that ever were. In opposition to this definition of religion stands out Steinthal's definition of myth as a *form* of thinking and expression ("Denk- und Darstellungsform"), which is gone through by all peoples and by all persons in their attempts to grasp the Infinite or the Divine. This enables Professor Steinthal to produce some pretty contrasts between the finite form of religion, the myth, and the eternal and infinite substance of it. Pretty, but somewhat vague and not too light-giving, is here the verdict towards which one is tempted.

But whether one agree with Professor Steinthal or not—and it will be observed that I dare to disagree with him at times—there can be no doubt about one thing. These essays put Professor Steinthal's meaning clearly and attractively. One knows at least what one is called upon to agree with. This is a rare enough quality in philosophic essays to call for grateful notice when one does meet with it. The distinctions may often be subtle, but they are always clear and clearly expressed, with pertinent examples and definite sign-posts in the argument.

These qualities are shown at their highest pitch of perfection in the four Essays I selected for special commendation at the beginning of this notice. They are specially interesting, I think, for their distinctly Jewish tone. Fortunately, for some reasons, unfortunately for others, men may write on the Bible, or on religious philosophy, without being Jews, or knowing much of what Jews think on such subjects. But no one but a Jew, I fancy, could have thought the thoughts and felt the feelings that find such clear expression in Professor Steinthal's essays on "Devotion, Humility, Tolerance, and Prejudice." The very titles are an epitome of Jewish history, and the feelings they

imply, are at the root of the special Jewish ἦθος. No wonder, perhaps, that so good a Jew as Professor Steinthal is at his best in dealing with such specifically Jewish subjects. I should be defeating my own object if I were to go into any detail with regard to these essays of Professor Steinthal. I hope to induce some of the readers of this REVIEW to become readers of the Essays. I shall not, therefore, attempt to put them in such a position that they can do without reading them. One word only I will say that will appeal to such of the Jewish clergymen of England as are interested in the art of sermon writing. These Essays of Professor Steinthal—and this remark applies to all of them, though more especially to the selected four—these Essays are something more than essays : they are lay sermons.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

HISTORICAL NOTICES,

I.

The Supposed Inscription upon "Joshua the Robber."

(Illustrated from Jewish Sources.)

The historian Procopius makes mention of a Phœnician inscription that was found near the town of Tingis, in Mauretania, and which, it was said, was set up by Phœnicians who were fugitives from Canaan. He quotes the Greek as follows: ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν οἱ φεύγοντες ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λῃστοῦ νἱοῦ Ναυῆ (*Vandall.* ii. 20). Suidas (s. v. Χαναάν) gives it thus: ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν Χαναναῖοι, οὓς ἐδίωξεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ λῃστής.[1] However unworthy of belief may be the notion of the existence of such an inscription, in which exiles from Canaan perpetuate the name of Joshua ben Nun, who expelled them, nevertheless the idea which it expresses is attested by Jewish sources of even a much earlier date than the sixth century. In the second century R. Simon b. Gamliel said (*Tosefta*, *Sabbath*, VII., 25, ed. Zuckermandel, p. 119): "No nation is more peaceable than the Amorites, for we find that, trusting in God, they made their way to Africa, where God gave them a land as fair as their own, while the land of Israel was still called after their name (Canaan)." What is here observed about the Amorites, was also said by a celebrated Agadist of the third century about another of the seven Canaanite nations. R. Samuel b. Nachman said (*Jer. Shebiith*, 36*a*; *Leviticus rabba*, c. 17; *Deuteron. rabba*, c. 5, towards the end): "Before entering the Holy Land Joshua promulgated a threefold decree (שלש פרוזדגמאות, πρόσταγμα). It ordained that whoever desired to leave the country was allowed to do so; whoever wished to make peace could do so; and whoever wished to wage war was at liberty to do so. The family of the Girgashites wandered forth, relying upon God, and went towards Africa; the Gibeonites contracted a peace; the thirty-one kings came out to fight." This historical fiction relating to the emigration of one of the seven nations of Canaan, explains the circumstance that in the Book of Joshua (xii. 8; cp. ix. 1) only six nations are mentioned as having been conquered; the

[1] The quotations are taken from Winer, Biblisches *Realwörterbuch* (Article, "Josua").

גרגשי (Girgashites) are omitted. At any rate, both the inscription spoken of by Procopius and the opinion of the Jewish sages, which, it has been shown, assumed two forms, rest upon the apparently same hypothesis, that the settlement of the Phœnicians in North Africa is connected with the conquest of Palestine by Joshua. But whilst in the utterances of the Jewish sages a noteworthy superiority over a narrow nationalism is displayed, inasmuch as "trust in God" is ascribed to the Canaanite nation, in reward for which, as is expressly stated in *Midrash Num. R.* c. xiv., the name of the Holy Land was always to be that of Canaan, even long after Israel had dwelt therein; the inscription of Procopius, on the other hand, by a single word manifests its hostile attitude against Israel, whose commander-in-chief, the conqueror of Palestine, it designates a "robber" (λῃστής). This word was, in fact, a favourite controversial phrase, hurled by heathens against Judaism. For this we have indisputable evidence in a well-known passage in the *Midrash*. In the beginning of *Genesis rabba*, it is said: "R. Levi (a famous Agadist of the beginning of the fourth century), explains the words of Psalm cxi. 6, 'He hath shewed his people the power of his works, that he may give them the heritage of the heathen,' to indicate that God commenced the Torah with the history of the Creation, in order to provide Israel with an argument against the attacks of the heathens. When the pagan nations should charge them with being a people of robbers (as having stolen Palestine from the Canaanites), the Israelites, by pointing to the account of the Creation and the early history of the world, could prove that the Canaanites originally had also not been in possession of the Holy Land." The words in which the reproaches of the heathens are contained, run thus in the Hebrew, שלא יהיו מונין את ישראל ואומרין להם הלא אומה של בזוזים אתם. The term מונין (from הונה to vex, by word or deed) implies the worst kind of attack that could be made by the heathens against the national honour of Israel; cp. *Gen. rabba*, c. 88, at the beginning (in a saying of R. Chama b. Chanina, of the third century) שלא יהו מונים את ישראל אומה של דווים וסחופים אתם; and also *Shir rabba*, to the *Song of Songs*, i. 6 (in a saying of R. Isaac, a contemporary of the above-named R. Levi, and also a famous Agadist) לפי שאומות העולם מונים את ישראל ואומרים אומה זו המירו כבודם In the *Midrash Tanchuma*, the exposition of Psalm cxi. 6 is given in a somewhat different form in the name of the same R. Isaac (in the edition of Buber, בראשית § 11, only the beginning of it is quoted), and from this place Rashi took it, and with these words commenced his *Commentary to the Pentateuch*. The passage that concerns us here in this version is as

follows: שאם יאמרו אומות העולם לישראל לסטים אתם שכבשתם ארצות שבעה גוים. Instead of the Aramaic expression בזוזים, (*Jalkut* to Ps. cxi. has the plural form בזוזות, cp. גָּרוֹסוֹת, Levy *Wörterbuch*, I., 362*a*), this version has the Greek לסטים, the same word as appears in the inscription of Procopius as an epithet of Joshua. That which, according to the evidence of the Agadists, was said of Israel, the conqueror of Palestine, that it was "a nation of robbers," is applied in the inscription to Joshua, the historical representative of that conquest, where he is entitled "the robber." A remarkable proof of the fact that the African descendants of the Phœnicians really asserted that Palestine had been acquired by Israel in an unlawful manner, and properly belonged to them (the Africans), is to be found in a story in the *Boraitha* (Sanhedrin, 91*a*), in which the Africans (בני אפריקא) appeal to Alexander the Great for their right of possessing Palestine, explaining that in the Pentateuch it is called "the land of Canaan," and Canaan was their ancestor. It can be at once seen that in this story the name of the land plays the same part as in the above-mentioned saying of Simon b. Gamliel.

The use of the term "robber" in a hostile sense, in reference to one of the conquerors of Canaan, is further supported by another passage in the traditional literature. In Sanhedrin, 106 *b*, we read: "A heretic (מינא, transformed by the censor into צדוקי) asked Rabbi Chanina (of the first half of the third century) whether he had heard how old Balaam was?" Chanina replied, "It is not recorded anywhere, but from the expression in the Psalm (lv. 23), 'Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days,' it may be assumed that he was thirty-three or thirty-four years of age" (and did not reach his thirty-fifth year, the half of the normal age of seventy years). Thereupon, remarked the heretic, "You are right! I have seen the writing-tablets (or the book) of Balaam, and therein it was written, Balaam the lame[1] was thirty-three years old when Phineas the robber slew him." בר תלתין ותלת שנין בלעם חגירא כד קטיל יתיה פינחס ליסטאה. It is a well-known and also plausible supposition of Geiger (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vi. 34), that in this anecdote, as well as in other places, Balaam is a typical name for Jesus, inasmuch as the age of thirty-three years here given agrees with that of the latter; but, notwithstanding this, the subject of the conversation between Chanina and the heretic, it must be noticed, is Balaam himself, the old heathen prophet, and the record, which the heretic declares he had seen, written in Aramaic, has an undeniable relationship with

[1] The epithet חגירא is derived probably from the interpretation of the word שפי, Num. xxiii. 3.

the Phœnician inscription of Procopius. Just as in the latter Joshua is designated λῃστής, robber, so also is Phineas, the leader of the war against Midian, in which Balaam was slain (*vide* Num. xxxi. 8; Joshua xiii. 22) given the same title in the former. The source, whence the information about the death of Balaam is taken, is called by the heretic פינקסיה דבלעם. This must have been a work upon Balaam with apocryphal additions to the Biblical narrative, and of an anti-Israelite tone, perhaps a production of the Gnostics, who were fond of distorting figures of the Old Testament, and glorifying just those very persons who are described in the holy writings of the Jews as being godless. The light that the analogy of the phrase Ἰησοῦς ὁ λῃστής casts upon the פנחם ליסטאה of the Talmud renders the conjecture of Perles (Grätz, *Monatschrift*, 1872, p. 267), that we have to read פינחם פליסטאה, which refers to Pontius Pilate, quite unnecessary.

In conclusion, attention must be called to a passage in Josephus "Against Apion," where among the reasons that he gives why the Jews for so long a time remained unknown to the Greeks, he brings forward this, that the forefathers of the Jews did not, as the Greeks did, become sea-robbers, nor did they engage in wars for the sole purpose of gaining more wealth (Contra Apionem, I. xii. 4). For piracy he employs the term that indicates robbery in general, λῃστεία, in the use of which he could hardly have had in mind any charges that had been hitherto levelled against the Jews that they were a "nation of robbers." The remark of Josephus just quoted is not so much apologetic as aggressive, upbraiding the Greeks, whose ancient history was sullied by piracy. It was only after the time of Josephus that it was sought to prove from their own historical sources that the Jews were a "nation of robbers," and from this antagonistic conception of the ancient history of Israel there also originated the inscription spoken of by Procopius which is ascribed to the Phœnician fugitives. It must be remembered that this historian came from Cæsarea, where hostility to the Jews was an old tradition among the inhabitants. This pseudo-inscription that is to be found in his works may at any rate be regarded as another ancient memorial of anti-Jewish feeling that strove to falsify history.

W. Bacher.

II.

The Church Father, Origen, and Rabbi Hoshaya.

In his essay on Hillel, the Patriarch's son, Graetz has hazarded the conjecture that the Jewish sage, from whom Origen, a resident of

Cæsarea, learnt the Mosaic origin of Psalms xc. to c., was his fellow-townsman, R. Hoshaya, a pupil of the patriarch Jehuda I., and one of the compilers of the *Tosefta*. (See *Monatsschrift*, xxx., 1881, p. 443.) This suggestion assumes a high degree of probability when we consider some of Hoshaya's utterances.

First, note a dialogue on circumcision which R. Hoshaya held with a philosopher. The latter asked : If the rite possessed such virtue, why did not God create the first man circumcised ? The Rabbi replies that man, equally with all things created on the first six days, needs improving and perfecting ; and circumcision conduces to perfection. Philosopher, here and elsewhere (compare *Sabbath*, 116 *a*), means a representative of Christianity.[1]

When it was considered that Origen, in his Scriptural exposition, so strenuously opposed the literal conception of Biblical precepts, and regarded circumcision especially as one of the impossibilities of the Old Testament, compelling one to allegorise,[2] we may well assume that he had a controversy about this rite with the most prominent representative of Judaism in Cæsarea. The question and reply, above quoted, may, therefore, be accepted as authentic.[3] The answer, indeed, looks like a satire on Origen—assuming him to have been the catechist. That Church father had submitted himself to an operation akin to circumcision, which, he thought, would further his progress in spirituality, but which the Jewish sages regarded differently.

If, again, the philosopher of our dialogue was Origen,[4] as seems probable, light is thrown on the origin of one of the best-known sayings of Hoshaya, which opens the *Midrash* on Genesis, and in consequence of which it has been ascribed to him. (*Gen. rab.* c. i., beginning.)

Hoshaya introduces his exposition of the story of the Creation

---

[1] *Genesis rabba* c. 11. *ad finem*. In *Pesikta*, c. 23 (116*b* ed. Friedmann), the name הושעיא is erroneously omitted after רבי.

[2] See Diestel, *Geschichte des alten Testaments in der Christlichen Kirche*, p. 37.

[3] The question and answer is found, somewhat varied, in the dialogue between R. Akiba and T. Rufus. *Tanchuma* תזריע at the beginning. See my *Agada der Tanaïten* I., 299 *seq.*

[4] Bar-Kappara, Hoshaya's teacher, who also taught at Cæsarea, had a question put to him by a philosopher, which was intended to show the absurdity of a legal enactment in connection with the observance of the Sabbath (*Mishna Sabbath*, III. 4). Possibly, Origen is here meant. If so, Bar-Kappara's answer to the Church Father is a sharp repartee. It begins with the counter question, whether a husband would be displeased at seeing his wife in a eunuch's arms.

with the interpretation of Proverbs viii. 30.[1] He interprets the word אמון in the sense of אומן architect. As a king employs an architect to draw plans of the palace he proposes to build, so God created the world with the aid of the Torah ראשית (Gen. i. 1; Prov. viii. 22). This figure, in which the Torah is represented, on the one hand, as the expression of divine wisdom, the personification of the divine creative faculty, as God's mason, and, on the other, as the architectural design of the universe, as the type of creation, recalls unmistakeably (1) Philo's ideal world, the archetype of the visible world, and (2) his simile of the king who employs an architect to draw plans of the city which he is about to build. Even the phrase כך הקב"ה מביט בתורה has its analogy in Philo's phrase *ἀποβλέπων εἰς τὸ παράδειγμα* and in the application to God *ἐνόησε πρότερον τοὺς τύπους αὐτῆς*. Is it not possible that Hoshaya, if he did not read Philo's writings, at least learnt some of his ideas from Origen, the most important champion of that philosopher's allegorical tendency.[2] The figure of the architect who is familiar with the most secret recesses of the city planned by himself, Hoshaya also employs in his gloss on Isaiah xxix. 15, etc., "God, who created man, knoweth all his secrets" (*Gen. R.* c. xxiv. beginning).

The following conceit of Hoshaya (*Gen. R.* c. viii. *ad finem* Kohelet vi. 10) is apparently an allusion to the Christian dogma of the Incarnation. When God created the first man in his image, the angels wished to sing the hymn "Holy! Holy! Holy!" in his honour. The Almighty caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and then all knew that he was mortal. What is this allegory, also illustrated by the simile of a king and his representative, but a protest against that dogma of Christianity which deifies a Man?

Origen makes a liberal use of allegory to nullify the binding authority of the Law. Hoshaya, in contrast to this tendency, emphasises the teaching that, at the millennium, the Noachides, *i.e.*, all Gentiles, would, according to Zechariah (iii. 9), practise all the precepts of Judaism (Talm. Jer. Aboda Zara, 40 *c*).

Two sentences of Hoshaya, one of them of an apologetic character, show an acquaintance with the libel, first invented by Manetho, and so often repeated since, that the Jews are descended from lepers driven out of Egypt.[3]

---

[1] In *Yalkut*, on Proverbs viii, ר' אושעיא רבא כד הוי דריש במעשה בראשית פתח; in Gen., ר' הושעיא רבא פתח

[2] Freudenthal has already pointed out the analogy between Philo's ideas and those expressed at the commencement of *Genesis rabba*, without however questioning Hoshaya's claim to originality in regard to them.

[3] *Pesikta*, 826. *Schir Haschirim rabba* on iv. 12, where the name ר' פינחס

Though, therefore, it is not absolutely certain that the anonymous Jewish sage, whom Origen questioned concerning the Mosaic origin of the Psalms, was Hoshaya, as it might also have been Joshua ben Levi, from whom we also have an utterance concerning these Psalms (Shocher Tob. Ps. xc. 1), and who used occasionally to visit Cæsarea ; still, after the arguments here adduced, it is highly probable that personal intercourse took place between Hoshaya and Origen, the foremost representatives of Judaism and Christianity in Cæsarea.

W. BACHER.

III.

CONFESSION OF FAITH OF THE ALMOHADES.

Professor Goldziher, of Vienna, has published, in a recent number[1] of the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society, a short confession of faith composed for the Almohades, or Unitarians, by Muhammed Ibn Tumart, of Magreb, the founder of the sect. In an earlier article[2] Prof. Goldziher published and translated the Tauhid formula, the Unitarian confession, characterising it "als Ausgangspunkt und gewissermassen Symbol einer der merkwürdigsten Bewegungen im magribinischen Islam immer werth, dem Wortlaute nach bekannt und bewahrt zu werden." Reference was made in the former article to a so-called "Murshida," but Prof. Goldziher could not state what was its exact nature.[3] He is now enabled to publish the Arabic text which exists among the Arabic MSS. in the Royal Library at Berlin. I am very glad, indeed, to give an English translation of the text. The confession is interesting from many points of view. It is interesting to the philosopher of religion as proving that, while strict Monotheism is necessarily spiritual, there is

---

should be supplemented as follows בשם ר' הושעיא. The saying springs out of a similar dictum by Joshua ben Levi, in which the charge takes the following form: לפי שהיו אומות העולם מונין לישראל ואומרין שהם בניהם של מצרים. About the term מונין, see above. The charge that the Jewish women in Egypt were faithless wives and cohabited with Egyptians, was providentially confuted. All the Jews born in Egypt showed unmistakably in their features that they were of pure Hebrew descent. See also *Levit. rabba* c. 18 *ad finem*. The lepers mentioned in Num. v. 2 were, according to the *Midrash*, so punished because they slandered Jewish families, asserting that they were descended from lepers.

[1] Vol. XLIV., page 168. [2] Vol. XLI., page 72. [3] *Ad loc. cit.*, page 79.

always a danger of its becoming Pantheistic. It is interesting to the student of Jewish history as helping to explain how it was that during the Unitarian persecution, Jews could easily become Moslems, and how it came to pass that many who attributed conversion to one so great as Maimonides felt that he had committed no act which disgraced him. The Moslem belief in the Unity of God is indeed as pure and as uncompromising as the Jewish. The confession is interesting to the student of the history of theology as showing that the nearness of religious belief is no safeguard against the spirit of persecution, and it also brings very clearly before us that it must have been the determination to remain faithful to "historical Judaism," rather than to adhere to certain dogmas or formulæ, which induced so many Jews to withstand the temptations to become followers of the "Apostle of God" in the latter half of the twelfth century.

The Confession, of which I publish the translation, is called the Murshida, from the prayer "Arshadana' llahu," "May God direct us in the right path," with which it begins. The title of the celebrated Caliph Haroun Ar-rashid will be familiar to the general reader as being connected with the same root.

I should like to call attention to the remarkable similarity there is between this formula and some of the Jewish hymns. The well-known 'Adon 'Olam in one verse takes up philosophical terms, "There is no conjunction, no separation," and then speaks of God as the Redeemer that liveth. In the Murshida, God is spoken of as "the Being of whom we can form no conception, but still the most loving of rulers, the tenderest of helpers, without whose knowledge not even a leaf falls to the ground."

[TRANSLATION.]

"In the name of God the Most Merciful, the Most Gracious. May Allah lead us and you in the right path. Know ye, then, that it is absolutely necessary for every Muslim to know that God, be he magnified and extolled, is One in his kingdom; that he is the Creator of the whole Universe, the heights and the depths, the throne,[1] the heavens

[1] The Throne: Two Arabic words are used here, *'Arsh* and *Kursiy*. The word *'Arsh* is translated "throne," but in a passage quoted in *Lane's Arabic Lexicon*, page 2000, it is distinctly said that the *'Arsh* of God is one of the things which mankind know not in reality, but only by name. If it were what the vulgar hold it to be, it would be a support to God and not supported by him. Maimon, in his "Letter of Consolation," comments on the throne of Ezekiel i. 22 and 26 in a similar fashion, "God carried the throne, but the throne did not carry him" (JEWISH QUARTERLY, Vol.

and the earth and all that is in them, and all that is between them. All creation is subject to his power. Not a mote is moved unless with his permission. He has no counsellor in his kingdom, no associate in the work of his creation.[1] He is living and ever-existing. To him appertaineth not slumber or sleep. He knoweth that which is hidden and that which is seen. Nought on earth or in heaven is concealed from him. He knoweth that which is on dry land and that which is in the sea. Not a leaf falls to the ground unless he knows it,[2] not a single grain in the darkest parts of the earth, neither a green thing nor a dry thing, that is not written in his clear book. He comprehends all things, with his knowledge. He counts all things according to their number. He doeth all that he desireth. He hath power over all that he wisheth to perform. To him is the kingdom, to him belongeth wealth. To him is power and might. To him appertaineth eternity. To him belongeth judgment. He maketh his decrees. To him belong praise and adoration. To him belong the best names.[3] None can hinder that which he decrees. None can prevent that which he ordains. He doeth in his creation that which he desires. He hopes for no reward and fears no punishment. He is subject to no decree, to no judgment. All his favours to us are acts of grace. Every punishment he inflicts upon us is just. None can say to him, "What doest thou?" but we can be asked as to our deeds. He was before all Creation. Of him we cannot attribute any direction in space. He is not above us nor below us, not at our right hand nor at our left, not before us nor at our back. The words whole and part

---

II., p. 62). Some have made the distinction between *'Arsh* and *Kursiy* by saying that *'Arsh* is the highest sphere, the empyrean, and the *Kursiy* is the sphere of the stars.

[1] "He has no counsellor in his kingdom, no associate in the work of his creation." These words seem almost like an echo of Isaiah xl. 13, 14.

[2] "Not a leaf falls to the ground . . . clear book." This beautiful expression of the Omniscience of God is taken from *The Qur'an, Sura* 6, 59. We might compare Matthew x. 29. Beidhawi, in his commentary on the passage, leaves it open whether the clear book is to be taken figuratively as parallel with "God knoweth it," or whether the clear book is not the same as the Lauh (לוח), on which the divine decrees are ordained, and which are sent down from heaven on the night of Al-Qadr during the Ramadhan. Jews, who know what is written about the book in which all events are written on the New Year will not assume that on account of such assertions *Muslims* are blind fatalists.

[3] The "best names" are the ninety-nine attributes of God which Muslims are in the habit of reciting. They are given and translated into English in Palmer's *Translation of the Qur'an*, Vol. I., Introduction lxvii.

are inapplicable to him. It cannot be said whence he came, or whither he goeth, or how he existeth. He is the former of space, the ordainer of time. Time does not contain him. Space does not hold him. No intelligence can grasp him, no intellect can comprehend him. No imagination can characterise him. No soul can form an image of his likeness. Nought is like unto him. But still he hears, and he sees. He is the tenderest of rulers, the most loving of helpers. Those who know him know him through his works ; but they deny all limit to his greatness. However our imaginations may conceive God, he the Exalted is different from our conception of him."

L. M. SIMMONS.

YORK SHETARS.

I. Mr. M. D. Davis, in his edition of "*Hebrew Deeds of English Jews before* 1290," Nos. 196 to 200, (London, 1888,) gives translations of York Deeds from 1237 to 1250, extracted from Rev. J. T. Fowler's essay in the *Yorkshire Arch. and Topogr. Journal*, III., pp. 57 to 63. Aaron, Delecress and Jornin, sons of Josce of Kent, are chiefly mentioned in them. There exists, however, a Shetar which was signed by Josce himself, in 1229, the facsimile of which was published in Mr. S. Davey's *Archivist and Autograph Review*, Oct., 1888, Vol. I., No. 3, p. 13. This document is composed first of a grant made by William Malebisse to Robert Neve, *circa* 1100 A.D.: "At a later date," says the writer in the *Archivist*, "has been attached a general release from Joceus de Frem (the right rendering is De Kent, as we shall see), a Jew of York, to Henry Neve, of Acastre, from the time the world began unto Tuesday next before St. Andrew the Apostle, 1229; confirmed by some few Hebrew words written at the foot by the said Joceus de Frem (De Kent)." The original document appearing to be in the possession of Mr. S. Davey, the editor of the *Archivist*, and therefore not easily accessible, I believe that the publication of the appended document will be a service to Anglo-Jewish history. The Latin text is as follows :—

"Omnibus visuris vel audituris literas istas Joceus de Kent, Judeus Ebor, Salutem. Noverit universitas vestra quod Henr. Neve de Acastre et heredes sui quieti sunt de omnibus debitis et demandis que unquam mihi vel heredibus meis debuerunt a principio mundi usque ad diem Martis proximum ante festum sancti Andree apostoli anno gratie MCC. vicesimo nono, et nominatim de plegio carte que loquitur de duodecim Marcis sub nomine Rob. de Holtebe, capellani, a principio mundi usque ad finem. Et in hujus rei testimonium huic scripto literam meam Hebraicam appossui " (*sic*).

The Hebrew confirmation runs as follows :—

אני יוסי דקינט מודה שכל מה שכתוב למעלה בלשון לטין
מכתיבת ריקרט פושרט ומפטור הנרי ניבא דאקשטרא עד קדש אונדרי
ק יֵן לפרט ומערבות (ערבות *above the line for* פטור) רוברט דהולטבי
לעולמי עד שהוא אמת :

"I, Josce of Kent, certify that all written above in Latin concerning the writing of Richard Posart, the release of Henry Neve, of Acastre, up to St. Andrew, date 190 A.M., and the security (*written above the word* release) of Robert of Holtebe for ever, is true."

In the Hebrew date, which in its complete form would be

4990 A.M. = תתקץ = 400 + 400 + 100 + 90, not only the thousands are omitted, but also the two 400, November 4990 A.M. = 1229, the Jewish new year having begun in that year on the 20th of September. In what way Richard Posart is concerned does not appear in the Latin deed. The Hebrew construction does not admit the translation "in the handwriting of Richard Posart."

II. The Rev. W. D. Macray, who drew my attention to the previous document, also pointed out to me the following deeds, which seem to be lost now. Francis Drake, in his work with the title *Eboracum; or The History and Antiquities of the City of York*, etc., London, 1736, Appendix, p. xv., writes as follows :—

Ex registro originali de *Fontibus* hoc tempore penes me, p. 465, GRENEHAMERTON.

(1.) "Omnibus hoc scriptum visuris vel audituris *Alanus* filius *Alexandri de Hamerton* salutem.

"Noveritis quod ego vendidi monachis de Fontibus duas bovatas terre in territorio de *Hamerton* cum toftis et croftis infra villam et extra; illas, scilicet, quas prius habuerunt de me ad terminum, pro decem marcis argenti quas pacaverunt pro me URSELLO JUDEO EBOR, cui obligatus eram. Ita quod si ego, vel heredes mei, aut aliquis alius, clamium vel calumpniam, gravamen vel molestiam, versus predictos monachos de predicta terra cum pertinentiis unquam . . licebit eisdem monachis cartam meam cum taliis de predicta pecunia, quas habent penes se, prefato Judeo vel heredibus suis reddere; licebit etiam eidem Judeo vel heredibus suis, sine aliqua contradictione, prefatam terram in manu sua saisire, donec de tanta pecunia eisdem monachis fuerit satisfact [um]. In cujus rei testimonium presenti scripto sigillum meum apposui.

"[Testibus] *Willielmo de Hamerton*, *Alano de Kyrkeby*, *Roberto de Muncketon*, *Christianis*, LEONE EPISCOPO, AARON ET JOCEIO JUDEIS EBOR. et multis aliis.

(2.) "Omnibus ad quos presens scriptum pervenerit URSELLUS filius SAMSONIS JUDEUS EBOR. salutem. Noveritis quod *Alanus* filius *Alexandri de Hamerton* et heredes sui sunt quieti de omnibus debitis et demandis in quibus idem *Alanus* unquam michi tenebatur ab initio seculi ad festum sancti *Michaelis* anno gratiae M.CC. tricesimo octavo, 1238.

"In cujus rei testimonium presens scriptum littera mea Hebraica consignavi.

(3.) "Omnibus ad quos presens scriptum pervenerit URSELLUS filius SAMSONIS JUDEUS EBOR. salutem. Noveritis me quietum clamasse de me et de heredibus meis in perpetuum, monachis de *Fontibus*, duas bovatas terræ cum pertinentiis in territorio de *Hamerton*, quas *Alanus*

filius *Alex. de Hamerton* eis vendidit. Ita quod ego vel heredes mei versus predictas duas bovatas nichil exigere possumus aliquo tempore occasione alicujus debiti quod predictus *Alanus* unquam nobis debuit ab initio seculi usque ad finem seculi.

"In cujus rei testimonium presens scriptum littera mea Ebrayca consignavi."

A. NEUBAUER.

Sleep and Death.—(The *Midrash* and the *Qur'an.*)—There is a very beautiful *Midrash* in Echa Rabbathi on the verse in Lamentations iii. 25: "They are new every morning, great is thy faithfulness." "We know from this," says a Talmudical teacher, "that just as God renews our life every morning after our sleep every night, so he will quicken the dead after their last sleep." We read, too, in the *Qur'an Sura* 6, verse 60: "It is he who causeth you to sleep by night, and knoweth what ye merit by day; he also awaketh you therein, that the fixed term of your lives may be fulfilled; then unto him shall ye return and he shall declare unto that which ye have wrought." Beidhawi, in his recognised commentary on the *Qur'an*, remarks on this passage that Mohammed uses the verb *Tawaffa*, which really means "to cause to die," in the sense of sleeping, and the verb "*Ba'atha*," which really means to "quicken the dead," in the sense of awaking from sleep, and he draws attention to the analogy which exists between sleep and death, our awakening every morning, and our resurrection to the life hereafter. We have no evidence of the borrowing of this passage. Men with their minds directed to the same subject over and over again attain the same results.

L. M. SIMMONS.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

APRIL, 1891.

THE JEWS OF FRANCE.

To give a tolerably exact idea of Judaism in France at the present day, of its tendencies, of its religious system, and of its charities, it is not necessary to go back to any very distant date. The history of the organisation of its religious system, as well as of its institutions, is entirely contained in the years following the civil emancipation of the Jews in France, more especially in the period nearest to the present day.

There were, as is well known, many Jews in France before the great revolution of 1789. They were tolerated, though they had to pay dearly for the air they breathed. They were treated as foreigners, and the authorities paid no attention to them or their religion except to molest the former and to fetter the free exercise of the latter. The Jewish inhabitants of every town formed a separate community, which had its own administration, unconnected with any other, and recognising no authority but its own.

On the morrow of the revolution, or rather, on the memorable days, the 28th of January, 1790 and the 27th of September, 1791, days which gave the French Jews the rights and duties of citizens, they were at last able to practise their religion and its ritual in the full light of day, and to give them all the publicity and splendour which they considered necessary.

It is, however, a mistake to suppose that the State immediately took the religion of its Jewish subjects under its protection, and placed it at once in the position to which the principles of equality would have entitled it. While other religions were recognised and supported by the State, Judaism continued to be self-administered as before. Each community followed its local habits and customs, without any connection with the Government, without any officially recognised status. This legal inferiority, in which Judaism, much to its detriment, continued to exist, was specially astonishing at a time when the great proclamation of the revolution—liberty, equality and fraternity—still re-echoed in every heart. It can be partly explained by the religious indifference affected by the State authorities, an indifference which made them consider the formal recognition of a new, or rather of a hitherto unrecognised, religion as unworthy of the new ideas of the age. The Republican Government was indeed constantly endeavouring to break the few remaining ties that still existed between it and religious systems in general; naturally, therefore, it saw no necessity for entering on a new connection with Judaism, and the general opinion was that enough had been done in giving full liberty of conscience to the followers of that religion. The moderation, or perhaps the timidity of the Jews themselves, who hardly ventured to claim full equality all along the line on the very day of their emancipation, may also partly explain this state of things. They were thankful to have found a country where they could claim the protection of the laws as a right, and no doubt thought that having received so much, they could not dream of demanding more.

It was Napoleon I. who conceived the idea of organising the Jewish religion on a legal basis, of making room for it side by side with other creeds, of placing corporate bodies and hierarchical religious functionaries at its head, of determining by law how these bodies and functionaries were to be appointed, and of defining their rights and their duties.

What motive induced the Emperor to devote so much attention to the organisation of Judaism, to the introduction of order and hierarchy into its system? In the first place, we must remember that the Emperor had entered upon a course of religious reaction, because in common with all thinking men, he saw in religion a strong element of power and authority. As a politician, he took care to remember this fact, and to make these elements of power and authority useful to the State by subjecting them to his control and to his immediate legislation. It is moreover well known that this great genius had a passion for order and discipline. After having reorganised Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, the former by means of the "Concordat," the latter by a special code of laws, he felt desirous of endowing Judaism with an equally complete and modern organisation.

As a result of these characteristic tendencies, he summoned all the most distinguished Jews of the empire to meet on July 15th, 1806, and the discussions and declarations of this general assembly greatly assisted in dispelling the prejudices that ignorance had so long maintained. Napoleon I. being thus re-assured with regard to the opinions of the Jews in general, the morality of their religious doctrines, and their social principles, took the further step (February 9th, 1807) of assembling the famous Synhedrin, whose mission it was to sanction these discussions and declarations. Finally he published a decree (March 17th, 1808) regulating the various institutions of Judaism, which was immediately to become law in every Jewish community throughout his empire. The history of French Judaism, and the successive transformations through which it has reached its present form, may be said to date from this epoch. The decree in question has, it is true, passed through many modifications of detail, but its general outline is unchanged, and still regulates Judaism in France.

It is a noteworthy circumstance that three non-Jewish commissioners were appointed by the Government to be

present at all the meetings of the assembly, summoned to discuss and reorganise the religious, moral and social doctrines of Judaism. These commissioners were to direct the debates, to ask questions, to prorogue the meetings, and it is possible that the presence and influence of these representatives of the Emperor strongly affected certain important points, those for instance concerning the Rabbinical hierarchy, which are foreign to the spirit of Judaism and recall the organisation of Roman Catholicism.

In order to avoid confusion and the constant mingling of administrative, religious, ritual, and philanthropic questions, I propose giving a brief sketch of each subject successively.

I.

According to the terms of the decree of March 17th, 1808, which, we must remember, is still the law of the land, a consistory and a consistorial synagogue can be established in every department containing two thousand persons professing the Mosaic faith. Not more than one consistory can be established in the same department. If, on the contrary, one department does not number two thousand Jewish inhabitants, the consistorial circumscription is to comprehend as many departments as will make up the requisite number, and the consistory together with the consistorial synagogue must be established in the town where the Jewish population is the most numerous.

The decree further states that there is to be a central consistory in Paris, with authority over those in the various departments, and to act as the medium through which Judaism enters into connection with the State.

This law has remained unaltered, but what seems strange at first sight is, that the number of consistories has but very slightly increased. There were then, and there are now, but few departments containing two thousand Jewish inhabitants. Although there were Jews in France as early as the sixth or even the fifth century, they were too often

banished for them to be very numerous or to have established themselves permanently. Then, too, the repressive and vexatious edicts to which they were constantly subjected before the Revolution, made residence in France unattractive to the Jews of other countries, and prevented any considerable number from settling there. On the other hand, when France broke down the barriers which had so long existed between her fellow-citizens of different creeds, other nations began to follow her example in ameliorating the condition of their Jewish subjects, so that the latter had no longer any reason for taking refuge in France and thus sensibly increasing the number of its Jewish population.

After the code of 1808 had been drawn up, the first business was the creation of thirteen consistories. Omitting the four consistories situated in the Rhenish Provinces, as well as the two Italian ones, we find only the small number of seven — Paris, Strasbourg (Alsace), Wintzenheim (Alsace), Metz (Lorraine), Nancy, Bordeaux, and Marseilles—and of these only four (Paris, Metz, Nancy, and Bordeaux) were situated in departments numbering each two thousand Jewish inhabitants. Even these four had to have joined to them several small departments, whose Jewish population was so scanty as to give them no right to have a separate consistory. The three other consistories (Wintzenheim, Strasbourg, and Marseilles) had to be composed of a number of departments in order to make up the requisite number of two thousand Jews in each.

The seven consistories, into which the Jewish population of France was thus divided, made up a total of 46,160 inhabitants; of this number 16,155 belonged to the department of the Lower Rhine, 10,000 to that of the Upper Rhine, and 20,005 to the rest of France.

But few changes have to be mentioned between 1808 and 1870. We must not, however, fail to observe that the Jewish population of France doubled its numbers during that period, and that two new consistories (Lyons, 1857,

and Bayonne, 1859) were established. When we have added that the seat of one of the other consistories was transferred from Wintzenheim to Colmar, and that three new ones were established in Algeria in 1845, we have said all that is necessary with regard to this period.

The cession of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany after the war of 1870 caused French Judaism a loss of three consistories (Strasbourg, Colmar, and Metz), and a large proportion of its Jewish population. But all was not entirely lost. In the first place, a powerful impulse towards France instantly made itself felt in the annexed Provinces. Secondly, the French Government considered it a binding duty to restore the Judaism of its Jewish subjects to the life and brilliancy which had been so seriously menaced by the loss of its three most populous consistorial circumscriptions. Three new consistories (Vesoul, Lille, and Besançon) were accordingly established, which, with the three in Algeria, made twelve in all, with a population of about 100,000 souls. Of this number about 80,000 live in Paris, including almost all the voluntary exiles from Alsace and Lorraine. The Jewish community in Paris is in fact the only one which steadily increases. Many others actually diminish in numbers, while some remain almost absolutely stationary. The Parisian community develops constantly in every way, for the very sufficient reason that the intensity of the intellectual life in the capital, and the wide field it offers to every branch of human activity, powerfully attracts both French and foreign Jews.

We have seen how the consistories were first established; we have now to enquire into their prerogatives and power, their constitution and election. The central consistory was not always composed in the same way as it is at the present day. Without speaking of the fact that the members of the first central consistory were elected by the Emperor himself from the famous Synhedrin, we have also to remark that the consistory consisted of three Chief Rabbis and two laymen. Since 1844, however, it has been

composed of one Chief Rabbi and as many laymen as there are departmental consistories. At first the central consistory itself nominated the Chief Rabbi who was to form part of it, while the laymen on the contrary were elected by the various consistories which they represented. At the present day, the central consistory is composed in the same way, but the method of election is changed. Instead of being nominated by the consistories they represent, the lay members of the central consistory are elected in the various departments by universal suffrage.

The central consistory has always had supreme control over all that concerns the ritual and its ministers. It submits to the Government its plans for the nomination of the various Rabbis, and, if necessary, for their transfer from one post to another. It has also the power of demanding the dismissal of a Rabbi, or of a member of a departmental consistory; but this weapon, which the law has confided to the central consistory, has never yet been used. Finally the central consistory, as its name indicates, centralises and transmits any local communications which the departmental consistories have to address to the Government.

It is hardly necessary to observe that the decisions of the central consistory are always promptly accepted by the other consistories, the communal authorities and the Rabbis. The Government, too, treats this important body with every consideration, and its demands are very rarely made in vain. The prestige enjoyed by the central consistory is not surprising, when we remember that this body, composed as it is of the most eminent Jews in France, has always kept with absolute and uncompromising severity to the principle of only admitting to its ranks men of unblemished character and stainless honour. An assembly, which has been successively presided over by men like Crémieux, Frank, Cerfbeer, Munk, and Alphonse de Rothschild, and which counts among its members men who have distinguished themselves in all the arts of peace and war,

as savants, lawyers, officers and authors, cannot fail, both by precept and example, to exercise a salutary influence upon the French Jews.

The provincial consistories exercise their functions in their respective departments under the control of the central authority. The decree of 1808 minutely prescribed the methods by which their members were to be elected, but this method has been gradually so much altered that nothing of the original remains. At first, twenty-five of the most pre-eminent Jews of the department (or departments) were chosen by the civil authorities to elect the members of the consistory. Later on (1844) the right of election was extended to the various civil and political functionaries. Two years later universal suffrage was introduced for political elections, and a large number of Jews, headed by their consistories, addressed the Government, requesting that the same electoral extension might be granted to the nomination of consistories. A law was then passed, by virtue of which every Jew who had attained the age of twenty-five, was placed on the list of electors. This method is employed at the present day. Thus the consistories, which before 1848 had only expressed the tendencies and opinions of a feeble minority, are now representative of the whole body of French Jews.

These modifications illustrate the change in the view held of Judaism by public opinion in France. "The function of the consistories," says the famous edict of 1808, "is to be on the watch to prevent the Rabbis from giving, either in public or private, any instruction or any explanation of the law which does not conform to the doctrinal decisions of the great Synhedrin." It was obviously a settled conviction that the Jews, in spite of the benefits of emancipation, still remained "a nation within a nation," with hearts and souls apart from those of their fellow-citizens, cherishing feelings of hatred, or at best of indifference, towards the State in the midst of which they lived. The spirit of these unjustifiable accusations,

accusations still proclaimed aloud from the tribune of the Chamber in December, 1830, is clearly visible in a document which leaves no doubt about the opinions held by Napoleon I. concerning the Jews. This document is the formula in which the members of the first Jewish consistory had to take the oaths before the civil authorities. "I vow and promise before God, on the holy Bible, to show obedience to the constitutions of the empire and loyalty to the Emperor. I promise also to make known anything that I may hear contrary to the interests of the sovereign or of the State." There is absolutely no question in this formula of any devotion to the interests of the Jews! It is very obvious that while such feelings animated the Emperor and the Government, they would not wish to leave the election of the members of the consistories in other hands than theirs. They were to be the functionaries of the Emperor and of the State, and nothing more.

But in 1848 popular ideas had greatly changed. They had risen on the powerful wings of intellectual progress above the prejudices of the Middle Ages. Moreover, the Jews, on their side, had made rapid strides onwards since they had been admitted to share the life and labours of their fellow-citizens. They had been able to prove the injustice of the charge of unsociability with which they had often been reproached. They had shown, and shown, too, not by word but by deed, that the religious dogmas of Judaism did not prevent their taking part in every branch of human activity. Thus, when the Revolution of 1848 occurred, the French had ceased to look on Judaism as a religion, the doctrines of which must be duly supervised and its adherents controlled. The consistories were therefore no longer considered "the guardians of the Synhedrin's declarations," and the humiliating oath, which was formerly compulsory on all their members, was entirely suppressed. From that date until the present day, there was and is no question of the consistories exercising any supervision over the Jewish ministers or their congregations. In the sight of the law

as well as in that of all classes of society, the Jews are fellow-citizens, whose attachment to their common country and loyalty to her institutions no Frenchman has either the wish or the right to suspect.

The consistories, then, are now merely the intermediaries between the Government and the Jews, and the official administrators of the interests of their religion. They have the duty of appointing the various communal officers (of whom we shall presently have occasion to speak), who, under the responsibility of the consistory, in whose jurisdiction they are, manage the financial business of their community, dispose of its resources, and maintain peace and order in the interior of the synagogues.

The powers of the consistories go still further; they have the right to submit to the central consistory (which, in its turn, submits them to the Government), the nomination, the transferment, and, if necessary, the suspension and re-installation of the Rabbis, Chief Rabbis, and Readers (Chazanim) of their department or departments. They have also the right of censuring the Rabbis, of ordering the synagogues to be closed, and of proclaiming special services in honour of any noteworthy event or solemnity.

Finally, the consistories play the part of guardians to the congregations, who, like minors, unable to act without their guardian's consent, cannot undertake any legal procedure, " without the authorisation and delegation of the consistory."

Synagogue Administration.

In the decree of 1808 we already find mention of an administrative committee, which was to be instituted in every congregation. The Government has never in any way concerned itself with these committees; they were, and are, elected by the consistories, either directly or indirectly, *i.e.*, by appealing to the suffrages of the congregation, and they act in the name, and under the responsi-

bility, of the consistories. The administrative committees are generally composed of five or six members, of whom one, at the suggestion of the rest, is made president by the consistory. The Paris consistory is now the only one which itself nominates the members of the committees in the various congregations under its jurisdiction. In all other consistories the method adopted is that of universal suffrage, and every individual contributing in any way towards the expenses of public worship has the right of voting. This is an excellent opportunity of bringing life and animation into the community, and the consistories act wisely in retaining it.

To be elected member of the administrative committee is a coveted honour, and we often see men distinguished neither by their piety, nor by their general interest in theological matters, seeking eagerly to obtain this post, and, it must be added, devoting themselves to its functions with great energy and scrupulous conscientiousness. These are mostly generous-hearted men, deeply attached to Judaism (which is, indeed, the case with almost all French Jews), and, at the same time, in sufficiently easy circumstances to permit them frequently to sacrifice both time and money in the interests of their creed. Such sacrifices are constantly needed in the many small French congregations scattered all over the country. France counts about ten large Jewish centres, of which the principal are Paris, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Lyons, Nancy, and Bayonne. But large congregations such as these are the exception, not the rule, and it is only just to say that the sacrifices made by the small congregations do them the greatest credit. No matter how scanty its numbers, each congregation endeavours to possess a synagogue, a Rabbi, a Reader, and, if an organ be impossible, a harmonium, which, on holidays, may enable them to distantly imitate the impressive services held in the great cities. But we must not forget that the cost of all this religious apparatus falls heavily on many a small congregation, whose members, in

spite of what the anti-Semites may say, are for the most part anything but rich, and who consequently have to make constant and heavy sacrifices to maintain their religious institutions. There exists, for instance, one such congregation composed of only twenty-five families, none of whom are wealthy, which, nevertheless, possesses a synagogue erected at the cost of 100,000 francs, a well-salaried Rabbi, besides a Chazan-schochet and a beadle both of whom live in ease and comfort. It is hardly necessary to point out the sacrifices made ungrudgingly by every member of this tiny congregation.

The administrative committees are composed entirely of laymen. Not that the law forbids the Rabbi to offer himself as a candidate, but the fact that it has not made him a member *ex officio*, has been sufficient to prevent any Rabbi from offering himself for election.

For a Rabbi to present himself for nomination, and thus stake his moral authority against the always doubtful chances of an election, would be wholly contrary to the dignity of a minister of religion. The French Rabbinate has always fully understood this elevated consideration, and not one of its members has ever sought, or, we may safely say, will ever seek, to obtain such a distinction.

It is, nevertheless, natural to ask why the central consistory, which has the power of making and unmaking laws, has not noticed this omission, or, if it has noticed it, why it has not rectified the matter by adding to the Rabbi's privileges that of being *ex officio* an acting member of the administrative committee. Appeals to that effect have not been wanting, and have been supported by many arguments that seem both just and reasonable. It has been suggested, for instance, that though these committees are entirely occupied with matters of administration, yet the administration of a synagogue is, in many ways, connected with the ritual, which is in its turn the province of the Rabbi. The introduction of an organ and a choir, the

choice of certain chants for weddings, etc., are these questions of administration, or are they part of the ritual? They are in reality connected with both, and it would certainly be wise and profitable if these and a hundred analogous questions could be settled by a combination of lay and religious authority.

The consequences of the present system, moreover, are often fraught with much unpleasantness to the Rabbis, for a committee composed exclusively of laymen, who are frequently very ignorant in religious matters, is not content with merely "deliberating" on questions connected both with administration and religious casuistry. A committee of this kind is very apt to come to a decision which it is anxious promptly to put into execution. But while these decisions sometimes partake of the nature of innovations which the Rabbi cannot accept without protest, it must be admitted that his advice is generally followed. The silence of the law, however, is often evaded by the committees voluntarily and as an act of courtesy inviting the Rabbi to be present.

The Rabbinate.

Before the year 1808 there were already Rabbis in all the towns numbering a certain proportion of Jewish inhabitants. The Emperor's functionaries had, therefore, only to make arrangements relating to the subsequent creation of new Rabbinates, to the establishment of a legal hierarchy within the Rabbinical body, and to the definition of the rights and duties of its members.

The hierarchy then established is the one still existing. It is composed of the Communal or Departmental Rabbis, the Chief Rabbis of the departmental consistories and the Chief Rabbi of the central consistory. A few words concerning these three dignitaries will be necessary.

Every congregation numbering 200 souls can obtain the establishment of a Rabbinate. The Rabbi has the title of Communal Rabbi. Where several congregations in separate

towns do not possess the number of Jewish inhabitants required by the law for the foundation of a Rabbinate, they can join together for the purpose, and the seat of the Rabbi is naturally fixed in the largest and most important congregation. He is then called a Departmental Rabbi, and the difference of title constitutes the only distinction between him and the Communal Rabbi.

In consequence of the small number of Jews in France there are many more Departmental than Communal Rabbis Even before the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, but few congregations possessed the requisite number of Jewish inhabitants. Those who do are generally surrounded by localities where this is not the case, and where the scanty congregation is consequently affiliated to the larger one. It is obvious, therefore, that not every congregation has a Rabbi.

In this state of things it might be supposed that every Departmental Rabbi would number many congregations in what we may venture to call his diocese. But this is not the case, and the Rabbi who rules over three congregations may consider himself favoured.[1] It is true that, besides the places in which the regular congregations are situated, there are Jews scattered about in almost all the little French towns, and even in the villages; but these are isolated groups of two or three families, unconnected by any common religious ties, ignoring each others' existence, and often unknown even to the Departmental Rabbi, until some occasion, such as a death, causes application to be made to him for his services. The fact of Jewish families inhabiting the same town, and being unconnected by any common tie, is doubtless regrettable from a religious point of view; but it is, we are bound to admit, the result of a certain great privilege, and represents, as it were, the "reverse of the medal"—the privilege of the sense of

[1] Before the cession of Alsace and Lorraine there were in France 130 congregations, divided among 63 Rabbis; now there are 89 congregations, divided among 33 Rabbis.

paternal toleration which animates all classes of Frenchmen. The Jews, who are now admitted to share in all respects the life of their fellow-citizens, and who enjoy the respect and sympathy of all classes of society, no longer feel the need of seeking strength and consolation in that sense of union which was so great a support to them in the days of persecution. Consequently we no longer see the gradual growth in all parts of the country of numerous congregations, whose at first scanty numbers were swelled by all the Jewish families in the surrounding district, gathered together by their religious needs as well as by their social instincts.

The method of nominating the Rabbis has undergone so many changes that a detailed account of them would run to too great a length. Suffice it to say that, after the election had been confided exclusively to the consistory in 1808, it was in 1823 handed over to the administrative committees, returned to the consistory in 1862, and committed ten years later to a certain number of delegates chosen by the consistory from among the members of the congregation or congregations within the jurisdiction of the Rabbinate in question. This was certainly a democratic measure, for though the delegates, no doubt, represented the real opinions of the congregations, it very much weakened the power of the consistory, upon which, after all, the Rabbi is dependent. An important change has, however, been made since 1872. The election has been again confided to the consistories, but a certain number of delegates from the various congregations is appointed to assist them in their choice. This appears to be a fair and equitable compromise, which respects the authority vested in the consistories without violating the dignity and the interests of the congregations, who through their delegates are thus able to state the motives of their selection, and to speak on behalf of the candidate they prefer.

When the consistory and the delegates have made their choice, the name of the successful candidate has to be sent

to the central consistory. The latter body, after confirming the selection, submits it to the Government for final ratification; but these processes are both merely formal in the strictest sense of the word. Both the central consistory and the Government have the right of annulling the choice of the departmental consistories, but it is a right which has hitherto never been exercised. The central consistory has never submitted to the Government any other candidate than the one previously chosen by the departmental consistory, and, as the French Rabbinate has on principle always avoided touching on the field of politics, the individuals selected to join its ranks are naturally a matter of indifference to the ministers, whose formal approval has to be obtained.

At the election of a Rabbi the central consistory is thus, of its own free will, merely the channel through which the decision of the other consistories is communicated to the Government, and, according to competent judges, this systematic neutrality is often not without its drawbacks. Frequently the electors, composed of the departmental consistory and delegates from its various synagogues, do not know what is to guide them in their choice; how to decide between a young Rabbi, who has not yet had time and opportunity to display his powers and talents, and an old one, who in spite of the affection and esteem by which he may have been surrounded in his former sphere of activity, is not known beyond the limits of his own congregation. Where and how are the delegates and the consistory to find the means of ascertaining that they are giving the post to the candidate who really deserves it the most? As it is impossible for them to ascertain this with anything like certainty, they have recourse to a method which is supposed, rightly or wrongly, and it appears to us more often wrongly, to be the least fallacious way of deciding, by selecting the candidate most distinguished for his oratorical powers. Each competitor is invited to preach on some Sabbath at the synagogue to which he desires to

be appointed, and on another Sabbath at the consistorial synagogue, so that both the consistory in general and the synagogue in particular have a specimen of his eloquence. Everybody must at once recognise the defects of this system, which is legitimately criticised both by ecclesiastics and laymen. Here is a man, who to-morrow will be the spiritual head of a congregation, over whom he will have no other authority than that given by the elevation of his character, the delicacy of his sentiments, and the integrity of his conduct; and the moral value of this man is to be judged by a display of rhetoric! The sermon has no doubt in our days become a very important part of the Rabbi's duties, but it is not the whole, nor even the chief part of them. His most impressive sermon is his work, and the inspiring example of his entire life.

Again, if this trial sermon gave proof positive of the candidate's powers as a preacher, it might be possible logically to defend the use of this test. But it is obvious that this is by no means the case. How often it happens that the best speakers are at times absolutely uninspired, and by no means on a level with their usual selves. On the other hand, a very inferior orator may chance for once to surpass himself, and to make a deep impression on his audience.[1]

The non-interference of the Government in the choice of a Rabbi is natural and reasonable, for the Rabbi, though a functionary of state, is nevertheless a purely religious one. Again, it is only to be expected that the departmental consistory, to whom all the candidates are probably equally unknown, should merely ratify the choice of the congregation to which the Rabbi is to be appointed. But these reasons do not hold good in the case of the central

[1] I was once speaking on this subject to the president of one of the largest French congregations. "Well," said he, "we selected our Rabbi in consequence of the excellence of his trial sermon. Since then we have found him to be possessed of every imaginable good quality—excepting that of eloquence."

consistory, which has every opportunity of knowing the candidates; and if, as seems the best plan, the selection were left to the central consistory, it could reasonably hope to "put the right man in the right place."

Each departmental consistory (one of which, as we have seen, is allotted to every department or departments containing a minimum of 2,000 Jewish inhabitants) has a so-called consistorial synagogue, at the head of which is the Departmental Chief Rabbi ("grand rabbin departemental ou régional"). He must be at least thirty years of age, and have been five years in the ministry. He is "ex officio" member of the consistory, and has the right of preaching in all the synagogues belonging to it, of directing what prayers are to be used by the Rabbis attached to those synagogues, and of censuring them if necessary.

The mode of electing the Departmental Chief Rabbi has undergone several changes since 1808, when it was in the hands of an assembly of notables, such as the lay members of the consistories. In 1862 the central consistory was called upon to select from a list of three candidates submitted to it by the departmental consistory in question, and since 1872 the latter body has been assisted in the selection of the three candidates by a certain number of delegates from the various Rabbinates in its circumscription. These delegates are chosen by universal suffrage from among the members of their respective congregations. The names of the three candidates are then submitted to the central consistory, which again preserves its neutrality by simply presenting the name at the head of the list for ministerial ratification. The same arguments which we have already used against the neutrality of the central consistory in the election of an ordinary Rabbi, apply with even greater force to the election of a Chief Rabbi, for it must be remembered that this official, chosen perhaps by the insufficient test of a trial sermon, is an important functionary of state, taking rank as a bishop, and connected with the highest authorities. It is, however, only fair to

add that the action, or rather inaction, of the central consistory may be accounted for to a certain extent by the following fact:—The Rabbis of France are one and all men who do honour to their office and to their religion; consequently the central consistory is well aware that though the chosen candidates may be of unequal intellectual powers, there is no doubt that their high principles, learning, and disinterestedness will make them worthy of the position they are to fill.

Finally, at the head of the Rabbinical hierarchy stands the Chief Rabbi of France (or to give him his full French title, "le grand rabbin du consistoire central des Israélites de France").

The often mentioned decree of 1808 had appointed three Chief Rabbis, nominated by Napoleon himself, to serve on the central consistory. But all subsequent decrees refer only to one Chief Rabbi of the central consistory, who is elected to his important post by a college composed of the twelve members of the central consistory and two delegates (chosen, as usual, by universal suffrage) from each of the twelve departmental consistories, thus making a total of thirty-six electors. It is hardly necessary to say that on the occasion of the election of the "grand rabbin de France" the central consistory departs entirely from its previous neutrality and inactivity. It is obvious that this must be the case, inasmuch as these thirty-six electors are the only persons concerned in the election of so important an individual as the Chief Rabbi, who not only becomes at once a member of the central consistory, but the real head of French Judaism, whose duty it is to guard and watch over its religion and its fortunes.

II.

These introductory remarks have only brought us to what may be described as the outer border of French Judaism.

We shall be uttering a mere truism in saying that there

is no part of Europe, except perhaps Poland, in which the religion of Israel has continued to be taught and practised with the fervent uniformity that formerly distinguished it.

A mighty wave of liberalism, and, to speak plainly, of reform, has swept over Europe, shaking religious beliefs to their foundations, setting at close quarters two different parties—those men who, abandoning themselves to the stream, have sought to change the face of the religion, and those men who, attached to the past, have anchored themselves to it as to a rock. Has French Judaism also been troubled by this revolutionary tempest in religious matters, and on what side has the victory fallen—on the side of the spirit of conservatism, or that of reform? In the latter case to what living branch has the axe of renovation been applied?

Let us say, at once, that among French Jews the advocates for religious reform have never received authoritative support. There has never arisen what might be called a popular movement in favour of reform. The few champions of a new order of things were men without a following or religious character, and without any theological or religious knowledge. On the other hand, the large masses have always remained outside the contest. On one occasion, indeed, in 1831, a demand signed by a certain number of persons reached the central consistory, asking that body for certain substantial reforms, such as the transference of the Sabbath to Sunday. The step did not meet with an encouraging reception, so that no such attempt is likely to be made again. For several years, however, a war of the pen has been carried on by certain warriors, but they are isolated soldiers, whose ineffectual blows were discharged in empty air. About the years 1830 to 1840, Judaism in Germany was troubled by religious struggles, which showed themselves not only in virulent controversies, but also in actual schisms. The echo of these severe struggles was reflected in some few French minds. The

contagion spread. The man who applied the match to the powder was a professor of mathematics, M. O. Terquem, a man of fiery temperament and moderate learning. In a series of pamphlets called "Lettres Tsarphatiques" he sarcastically attacked all religious institutions and traditions. These violent assaults provoked an energetic defence on the part of several Jews of Paris and Metz, who finally reduced to silence the author of this religious war, this leader without an army.

Thus religious observances, the chief object of the attack of O. Terquem, came forth unhurt from this trial, and no attack since that period has been made against them. We are far from pretending that religious observances are carried out as faithfully as of old in the life of French Jews; we shall soon see that it is not so; yet officially at least, in the public organs, there has been no further question since that time of expunging from the religious code the observances, commandments and prohibitions, of which a large number of Jews individually take no account whatever. These official attempts at reform miscarried, but in the case of the ritual ceremonies and the prayers there was no similar immunity. There the spirit of reform, far from laying aside its weapons of attack, gained ground every day. Since the first years which followed the systematisation of the ritual, it was understood that religious ceremonies under their disorderly and unedifying shape, and many prayers under their antiquated form, did not answer to the demands of the Jewish people, or to the requirements of Jewish hearts.

The central consistory in 1831 had already taken an important step in publicly prohibiting the preaching of the sermon in any other language than French. This measure, radical at the time, was far from satisfying the mass of Jews some years later. Rabbis and laymen were soon agreed that a renovation of religious ceremonies was necessary. The communities were everywhere more or less flourishing, everywhere synagogues were erected. Every-

where the intellectual level was raised, and under pain of being entirely abrogated, it was evidently necessary for the ritual to put on a more modern garb. Upon this point there was a universal agreement. A difference of opinion was displayed only when it became a question of passing from theory to practice, and of laying hands upon prayers and customs which had the authority of time, a sanction inviolable in the eyes of some, empty in the eyes of others, venerable but not sacrosanct in the eyes of the large majority.

According to the one party it was necessary then to remodel completely and ruthlessly the ritual, its customs and liturgy: the Hebrew of the synagogue had to be replaced throughout by the vernacular, all the Piyutim suppressed, and the organ and the choir introduced into every synagogue. The organ, it is true, was already adopted at the consistorial synagogue in Paris, but it was not used except on the Sacred Festivals, while elsewhere the synagogues were not provided with organs.

According to the other party, all the prayers in use ought to be respected, including the Piyutim. As for the organ it must be absolutely banished from a Jewish house of prayer. For, they argued, either this instrument did not exist in the Temple of Jerusalem, and so its introduction to the modern temple was an infringement of the command against imitating the religious practices of non-Jews; or it already had a place in the services of the Temple at Jerusalem, and so its admission into the modern temple is a profanation.

Lastly, according to the majority, it was wise to eliminate from the services superfluous prayers, repetitions and those of the Piyutim which, in consequence of their incorrect style or their purport, no longer corresponded with the condition of the mind and heart of modern Jews: yet withal to touch with extreme caution the established order of things. This is the system which has prevailed, and which still prevails to-day in France.

Yet Rabbis and governing bodies halted, troubled and divided between the desire of bringing more *éclat* to the religious services, of breathing more fervour into the heart, and the fear of laying a rash hand on their consciences. These hesitations and troubles, real, though hidden, were always in existence. Neither then nor subsequently did they cause any division in the heart of the communities, but they created in French Judaism a condition of things unworthy of the advance it had made, a kind of chaos of opinions and expressions which demonstrated the urgent necessity of endowing the whole of France with a uniform ritual. In 1856 the chief Rabbi of the central consistory, M. Ulmann, took a wise and courageous course. He summoned to Paris all the chief Rabbis of the consistories, and invited them to discuss the questions about which opinions were then divided, to take their decisions, and, in a word, to elaborate a project for reorganising the ritual for the whole of French Judaism.

The chief Rabbis of Strasburg and Colmar had, on a previous occasion, already found it opportune to unite all the Rabbis of their district, and to submit to their deliberation a certain number of projects of ritual reform; but these were simple consultations, without any authority that could bind all the Jews of France. The synod, summoned by M. Ulmann, and working under him as president, was on the other hand able to give decisions which applied to all the Jewish communities of France, and carried in them an incontestable moral value.

This assembly, in which, after a deep discussion, a vote was taken on the serious questions which had been agitating men for some years with reference to the ritual, ought to be noticed as an important event in the peaceful history of the ritual of French Judaism. Not that it took any decisive step forward. In fact, when we read the account given of the sittings of this assembly, we are present at the struggle of those feelings which were fighting for the mastery in the heart of every member;—

a conflict which is the eternal history of all hearts that love truth and peace—the struggle between the desire of advancing, and the fear of going too far. It was felt to be necessary at any cost to give to the ritual the means of touching the soul, and it was desired absolutely to avoid frightening timid consciences.

But this assembly was an important event, because it was the opening of a new era. It was the starting point of all the modifications, additions and suppressions, by which, in the course of time, the uniformity of religious worship has been affected. Besides, beyond the legitimate timidity displayed by the decisions of this assembly, there is seen to hover constantly, if the expression may be used, like a fixed and dominant idea, the notion of purifying the ritual and modernising its form.

In order to open and prepare a way for ritual reforms without on the other hand ordaining them, the Synod adopted a certain number of resolutions, but took care to establish on the subject of each that the Rabbis, in consultation with the governing body and with the chief Rabbi, their superior officer, are henceforth to be the judges of the opportuneness of those reforms. We shall see presently what were the few and unimportant innovations which this open breach introduced into the ritual, down to the time at which we are now writing.

But before describing these innovations which we have just mentioned, we must point out that now-a-days there is no question at all of an official religious reform, and that as regards ritual, no alteration, omission, or addition of ceremony or prayer which the Rabbi might deem expedient is ever the object of any criticism or any observation on the part of the public. In the first place, religious indifference is extreme. Reforms in matters of observances can be desired and demanded only by men who still cherish solid convictions, who, finding themselves put to inconvenience in their life by the laws relating to food, and to the cessation from work on Sabbaths and holy-days, would

like to be able to remain within the pale of a sort of orthodoxy, and at the same time to free themselves from the troublesome part of these commands. But to-day where are these substantial religious convictions ? They are at any rate very few and far between in France. Observance of the Sabbath and holydays by resting from business and closing up offices, has become a thing almost unknown and quite phenomenal. The laws relating to the mixture, choice and preparation of food, though practised by a small number, are generally neglected. There are many who do not give up the use of leavened bread during Passover, many also who abstain from it for one or two days only. Others, in order to satisfy at once their desires and their consciences, push originality so far as to serve ordinary bread and pass-over-cakes on the same table. As for living in tabernacles (booths) during the Festival of Tabernacles, this practice has become for a very large majority a mere memory. With convictions thus enfeebled, and with this easy-going faith, the necessity of a general reform is not at all impressed upon the eyes of the less religious, and everyone feels himself at liberty to ask his own conscience, and to execute its more or less indulgent orders.

Another reason why an official reform of religious practices has no *raison d'être* is that in France no trace whatever is found to-day of what is the starting point of all official reform, viz., the passionate strife that excites the minds of men, hollows out an abyss between them, and drives those in the two camps to extremes. In France toleration is without bounds ; not only the mass of indifferent people have a horror of quarrels and divisions, but fervent and observant believers do not understand those attacks, the sounds of which once for a little while re-echoed in France, and those regrettable clan hatreds, which rage still to the present time in other countries in the midst of Jewish communities, and divide them into two irreconcilable camps. In France there can be seen living together side by side, united like brothers, treating one another with

reciprocal goodwill: on the one hand those sincerely pious men who remain attached to the slightest Talmudic commands, and on the other hand those incorrigible sceptics who treat as useless the precepts of the Bible. Both elements, moreover, are mingled in our temples, at the services and solemn ceremonies, to which, thanks to the renovation which reclothed them, without at all robbing them of their ancient character, both the observant and the non-observant hasten — those who have openly attacked that which they call the prejudices of the past, and those who tenderly preserve all the traditions bequeathed by antiquity. We ought to add, to be exact, that if we no longer find a large number of families observant with the faithfulness and scrupulous conscientiousness of former times, it does not follow that the majority of Jews have broken with all the observances of Judaism. By no means; it is true that cessation of work on the Sabbath has almost become obsolete, together with other important customs; but the rite of circumcision is, as a rule, preserved. The very small number of bold spirits is easily counted who have pushed their religious independence so far as to free themselves from this Mosaic command.

Nor are the numbers of the parents who are content that their children marry with purely civil rites more numerous. A religious celebration of the marriage is almost without exception required, even by those who from one end of the year to the other do not at all recollect that they are Jews. It is also very curious to notice that in families where people are no longer Jews except in name, just as in the most orthodox families, it is round the religious ceremony of the Synagogue, and not round the civil ceremony in the Town Hall, that all the honours of the real celebration are gathered. The civil ceremony is always cold, without any pomp or feeling, while the religious ceremony is always touching and solemn.

Mixed marriages between Jews and Christians have

in modern France become less infrequent. This tendency to mixed marriages, which is more marked as time goes on, is not peculiar to any one class. In the highest and lowest families these new customs, during recent years, have often found an indulgent reception. French Jews are so intimately associated with the representatives of other religions, that with the additional help of religious indifference the increase of these unions could easily be foreseen. Certainly Judaism is not yet in danger, although most often it loses the offspring of these unions. But a reassuring feature for Judaism is that the best known Jewish families, those that exercise a powerful influence over the rest of the Jews, have shown many times that they neither indulge in nor approve of marriages between Jews and Christians. Still, when I say that I myself know the whole Jewish population in a certain district around Paris, and that, within this small circle, which does not number more than four hundred persons, there are ten "mixed" unions, it will be seen that it is worth while to record this fact.

On the other hand, apostasy from Judaism to Christianity is absolutely unknown. Conversions are so unusual and alien to the French mind that, even in the "mixed" unions of which we have just spoken, the two parties never think of giving up their respective religions.

And why should the name of Jew be given up in France where the Jewish population is distinguished by its intelligent activity and its morality? Further, in this country there is unbounded liberty as regards all beliefs and opinions. There is no difference between those who profess different creeds. In France a change of religion always implies a notion of treachery. The renegade is regarded as a deserter, who has been induced to abjure the faith of his fathers by a desire for money or a complaisant conscience. Why, then, in a society where every branch of human activity and every honour is open to every member of the State without distinction—why should any one, in spite of

his want of belief, assume a ridiculous garb, and brand himself with apostasy ?

This freedom of belief, this brotherhood among members of different persuasions of which we have spoken above, are very natural to the French temperament. The most violent attacks of the anti-Semites will not prevail against them. The various pamphlets of Drumont and his meagre following have had no influence upon ideas and customs in France. Jews continue to enjoy, it is needless to say, not only every benefit of the law, but even all the sympathy and respect they deserve. They are received, according to their rank and education, in all classes of society without any hesitation. One would almost be justified in saying that anti-Semitism does not exist in France. There are some very few writers—epicures in scandal—who have been joined by some bitter and envious minds and the everlasting band of those who fish in troubled waters, who may be regarded as anti-Semites; but the French nation absolutely rebels against their hateful appeals, and is already beginning to lose that interest and curiosity in them which caused the success of the first books of Drumont. The most clear proof that the French nation is opposed to anti-Semitism is the result of the Municipal elections which took place in Paris on April 28, 1890. It was in Paris that the leaders of this new sect had placed all their batteries. There had been no dearth of money, attempts at corruption, speeches, or writings, and yet not a single person of the anti-Semitic clique was elected, or had even a number of votes sufficient to give him the least hope. The chief of the band M. Drumont, only obtained a ridiculously small total. Anti-Semitism may be said to have ended its life. Crushed in the capital, it will never again recover from its defeat.

We believe we have given a short and exact sketch of the intellectual attitude of French Judaism. We have shown that none among the most liberal-minded trouble themselves to pronounce the word "reform" in reference

to ceremonial observances. We have also shown that on the ground of ritual ceremonies, and of the Liturgy, which is their foundation, the Assembly of Chief Rabbis (1856) had deemed it expedient to take certain measures for modifying the ritual, and to leave to allthe Rabbis in France a latitude in certain matters to alter, improve, and make innovations when they considered it opportune so to do. We shall now proceed to explain in its chief outlines what has been realised up to the present time.

At the outset it is necessary to allude to the changes which have been introduced by the force of circumstances into the life and career of the Rabbi, who is the soul of all religious worship. In the midst of the community in which he represents the religious idea, he is the only man to-day who possesses religious knowledge. Hence comes his great authority at the present time in the domain of ritual, where he may be said to have at least the power, if not the right, to bind and loose, to add, withdraw and modify.

We ought then, above all, to devote some few lines to the duties of the Chief Rabbi in the Central Consistory, and the more so as his career does not at all resemble that of the other Rabbis and Chief Rabbis, his province being quite different. All the communities in France are entrusted to his care. From time to time, on certain solemn occasions especially, he visits them and brings to them and their Rabbis the prestige of his presence. His visits always leave behind them, as it were, a renewal of religious life. But if he is the venerated chief of all the communities, if he comes on all important occasions, *e.g.*, at the inauguration of synagogues, to make the Sacred Word re-echo in all the Jewish pulpits in France, this supreme dignitary of French Judaism has not any community of his own to which he can devote himself with all his soul. Formerly his days were occupied with innumerable consultations on religious matters addressed to him from all quarters under his jurisdiction. To-day the laxness of observances and the diminution of Talmudic studies leave

him leisure. Again, formerly the Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory was a kind of president over the tribunal of the Beth Din, which decided, as a final court, disputed questions on religious subjects. We do not mean to imply that since the Revolution in 1789 the Jews have been amenable to tribunals other than those of the whole French nation. The Beth Din, in the true meaning of the term, ceased to exist after that Revolution, but for some time the Chief Rabbi used still to call himself—and this title was legal and in conformity with the terms of the Decree of 1808—"Ab Beth Din," and used often to perform the duties associated with the title. Now-a-days there exists nothing like this in the powers of the Chief Rabbi of France. His work now consists for the most part in contributing to the foundation of good works, and in displaying his interest in religious and charitable institutions by his frequent visits, and by the support of his influence with the higher classes.

This career, so defined, is assuredly noble and fruitful in good actions; but it is none the less true that this absence of a community to which the Chief Rabbi of France, like the other ministers of religion, could devote himself, is a void difficult to fill up without suppressing the Grand Rabbinate of Paris, and entrusting to a single clergyman the post of Chief Rabbi of Paris and Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory. This measure is proposed by the most prominent men every time the Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory has to be nominated.

But if the Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory cannot take part in the active daily life of any particular community, the same cannot be asserted with regard to the other Chief Rabbis and the local Rabbis, and it is among these above all that the duties of their holy office have completely changed. Taking literally the precept, והגית בו יומם ולילה, "Thou shalt meditate on the law day and night," the spiritual chief in former ages used to make the study of the law and the Talmud his constant occupation. This study was interrupted only by the numerous (שאלות)

consultations on points of religion and casuistry which the faithful used to submit to him. Now-a-days laymen are no longer themselves troubled by religious doubts, and do not feel the necessity of submitting their scruples to the knowledge of a doctor of the law.

On the other hand, under the fertile inspiration of modern ideas a considerable change has been effected in the manner of life of the Jews, and it is this new condition of things which has created new duties for the Rabbis of our times. Thanks to the softening of their manners, Jews have left off concentrating themselves all in the same district. In French towns the Jews are no longer seen to mass themselves together and pen themselves up in a kind of voluntary Ghetto, where they must all know one another intimately through meeting each day inside or outside the religious institutions. Thoroughly at home in the various paths of social life, they are scattered over all parts of the town, unknown to one another, no longer united by that powerful sentiment of solidarity which formerly induced all the Israelites of the same town to make themselves a community, and to form one large family. Hence there now devolves on the Rabbi the imperious duty of frequently visiting these scattered individuals, in the midst of whom he is the solitary point of union. The Rabbi of the present day is compelled to become a public man, a man of society—we were going to say a man of the world. This is inevitable, and the Rabbinate of the present day has recognised the fact. Not that the Rabbi, as might be supposed, is transformed into a wandering preacher with a moral lesson always upon his lips. The French Jews have no liking for religious discussions, nor for sermons outside the synagogue. The French Rabbi, whose manner of life breathes dignity of soul and elevation of heart, discards the *rôle* of preacher when he descends from the pulpit. It is his presence in the families and his visits, which are never without their effect, that bring in and retain in the bosom of the community families separated from one

another, and which without him would very quickly forget, not only that they are Jews, but that religion, in order to endure, must find its expression in external worship.

But modern times have brought yet another duty to the Rabbinate, and this, the duty of preaching often, has been particularly entrusted to it by the Synod of Chief Rabbis. Our fathers had no need of the eloquence or the sermons of the Rabbi in order to believe and observe. Faith then filled all hearts, and the love of prayer was sufficient to attract the people to the synagogue. Sermons were very rare in past times. Pulpit addresses were heard but twice a year, on the Saturday before Passover and the Saturday before the Day of Atonement. For the rest of the year the pulpit was silent, nor did any one think of complaining about it; and it must be admitted that no injury was done to our religion, belief, or observances. In modern times all this has changed. Prayer is not a necessity for hearts that are no longer filled with faith. In order to make Jews walk on the road to the house of prayer, one must modify the length of the services, and vivify the barrenness of prayers no longer intelligible. The sermon must be utilised as an attractive force. Accordingly, a sermon, or rather, an address, has become a regular institution in every important service in every community, however insignificant. Nearly every Saturday, and in some communities, on every Saturday, before the Scrolls of the Law are taken from the Ark, the Rabbi briefly expounds the more striking passages in the Portion of the day. Often he takes one of the passages or an expression in this Portion as a text, or rather, as a pretext for bringing to light some important principle of Judaism. Certainly, no festival ever passes in any Jewish community without a sermon, and this sermon has become the chief attraction in the religious service.

The frequency with which sermons are delivered at present is, then, a modern innovation, but the quality also of the sermons has been altered, or rather, the sermon has

entirely changed its character. Formerly, the sermon was a long explanation of Talmudic subtleties, sometimes a kind of religious exhortation, in which the preacher often severely abused his audience, and sometimes it was a combination of the two. During more recent times the sermon quite ceased to be a Talmudic exercise, too learned for a modern audience, and became a series of admonitions falling from the mouth of the representative of God, upon the faithful who were humbled and affected by his words. Happy time when the preacher literally "preached to the converted," when he had only to threaten the thunderbolts of heaven, and men of firm faith, and of irreproachable past, beat their breasts. Now-a-days, the religious life of his audience would be a ready object of attack to the defender of the principles and observances of Judaism. But to make this attack would be an anachronism, a display of bad taste, the inopportuneness, or rather, the danger of which the Rabbi thoroughly appreciates. At present it is the duty of the orator above everything not to alienate the kindly disposition of his hearers, to gain their sympathy, and lastly, to attract them to the service, and to make them fond of the synagogue. No more indignant tirades against the caprices of our age, no more barren discussions on questions of dogma and theology—the dominant note is soft and paternal. In other respects the form must be carefully finished, the composition in conformity with the rules of rhetoric, the style chaste, and the whole logical and suitable to modern taste. Does this amount to saying that the Rabbi of the present day sacrifices depth to form, and forgets that his office is to preach the love of God and religion, to make our hearts better, and to guide our consciences? It is needless to refute this statement; it is the means, and not the end that has changed. But we must not forget that the public of to-day—the public which no longer has its faith riveted in its soul—is a spoilt child, a reluctant patient, in whom the love of austere virtue may perhaps be inspired by taking care, as the proverb says, to

gild the pill. You praise before his face his docility and activity in order to make him docile and active. It is the same with the Jews to whom the Rabbi addresses himself. Another form of oratory which is much used in France to-day, and not without profit, consists in bringing before the audience for their admiration all the great moral beauties, all the fertile emotions, and all the exalted aspirations which arise out of every religious ordinance, and every ceremony of Judaism.

It is to M. Lazare Isidore, Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory (1867-1889), that the glory belongs of having been the first to give this new direction to the eloquence of the Jewish pulpit. His personal character was a great help to him in the task which he had undertaken. This excellent minister, whose kindness and sweetness of disposition were proverbial, felt that the encouragements and promises of a God of love and mercy came more easily to his lips than terrifying threats of a God of justice. But it is his present successor, M. Zadoc Kahn, who has shown himself possessed of the happy gift to a marvellous degree. His sermons are perfect patterns for style and depth. In the three volumes which have hitherto been published it is impossible to read a page without emotion, without a sense of intimate contact with every noble and beautiful ideal. This is the true charm by which effectually to turn the ideal into the actual. It may be of interest, before finishing this account of the changes introduced into the career of the Rabbi, and into the oratorical art which he cultivates, to notice the absolute independence which he enjoys in the pulpit. Certainly by law the Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory and the Central Consistory itself have the right of control and censure over every act and deed of the members of the Jewish clergy; the Chief Rabbi of the Departmental Consistory and the Departmental Consistory have the same rights over the acts and deeds of the Rabbis of the Circumscription. But law is one thing and custom another, and to the honour of the Chief Rabbis and the

Consistories be it said that neither the former nor the latter have ever thought of limiting the freedom of the preacher, or of controlling the use he makes of his liberty. He is absolute master of his words and his doctrines.

It is fair also to recognise that the French Rabbi never descends to the dangerous ground of religious controversy and of Biblical exegesis. The public would not be at all pleased to see him transform the pulpit into a schoolmaster's reading desk. But, on the other hand, if perchance the preacher happened to say that in the field of Biblical and Talmudic literature, he adhered, upon some point, to the statements or hypotheses of contemporary criticism, he would not on that account incur blame from his superiors. In spite of the legal hierarchy, every minister of religion is responsible for his doctrines to God and his own conscience. Whether, for instance, the Rabbi were to say that the Book of Isaiah is the work of a single author, according to the Talmud and early writers, or according to modern criticism, to assert, when quoting some particular verse, the claim of a second Isaiah; whether he speaks of the Psalms of David in accordance with orthodox tradition, or assigns, with modern expositors, different periods for the production of a great number of the Psalms; whether, in his opinion, Ecclesiastes be the work of Solomon or of some malcontent in the reign of Herod—the speaker is free to express openly those opinions and hypotheses which he thinks are closest to the truth.

This great liberty which the preacher enjoys finds undoubtedly a sufficient justification in the fact that the preacher is always a qualified and certificated Rabbi, who has to be furnished with every proper guarantee in respect of knowledge, character and integrity. In fact, the Rabbi in France is the only person who has the right of preaching. While in other countries, *e.g.*, in Germany, the officiating minister, the Chazan (Reader), or the schoolmaster, ascends the pulpit when the Rabbi is not present, that honour

is denied in France to every person who is not duly invested with the functions of a Rabbi. The fact that everyone who does not wear the robes of a Rabbi is prohibited from preaching in the synagogue, is, we admit, the best safeguard of the dignity of the pulpit, but it occasionally involves some regrettable results. Not every community possesses its own Rabbi; on the contrary, a single Rabbinate has sometimes jurisdiction over two or three, or as many as six communities. What safeguard is there against these communities being entirely deprived of the pleasure as well as the benefit of exhortation from the pulpit? The Rabbi does his best. He undertakes the exacting duty of spending in each of these communities one or even two Saturdays in each year; but during all the rest of the year, including the Holy Festivals, they do not receive from him a word of comfort or consolation to exalt their hearts or enlighten their souls. In this matter there is undoubtedly a very grievous void that requires to be filled up. There might be one means of meeting the difficulty, viz., by charging the officiating ministers in the communities that do not possess a Rabbi, to preach the word of God. Every community is provided with officiating ministers, and it would thus have its preacher, a kind of sub-Rabbi in its midst. But in order to realise this project, it would be necessary for the French readers (Chazanim), to have, like the German Cantors for instance, some considerable knowledge of sacred and profane literature. But our Readers are far from possessing this knowledge; they are nearly always excellent singers, often also excellent musicians; we admit that a certain number of them have a kind of skill in reading Hebrew texts, but with very few exceptions these Chazanim are absolutely ignorant men, who have never studied, who are incapable of explaining a line of Hebrew, or of writing grammatically a single sentence in French.

The words "School of Chazanim" are on many lips, and the religious press has already often advocated the establishment of such a school. It would be a kind of seminary

in which these officiating ministers, whose duties have assumed some importance in our modern services, would acquire, together with the science of singing sacred tunes, some knowledge of the Bible and Talmud, and also of secular literature. This would, without doubt, be a useful establishment, but though it may exist in our wishes or dreams it will never get beyond that state. The number of communities is not sufficiently large in France to demand the establishment of a school for the purpose of preparing officiating readers.

Moreover, the type of Chazan was long since fixed in France; in a Chazan there is expected a fine voice, a little musical knowledge and a more or less correct pronunciation of Hebrew. This constitutes the normal Chazan; the French public would consider it very strange to see him ascend the pulpit and lecture to the assembly of the faithful.

We think we ought to mention an idea due to M. Isidore, an idea which, though excellent in itself, has not had the success which it deserved. It was in 1871, just after the war which had caused France to lose forty rabbinates, together with Alsace and Lorraine. The Central Consistory, as well as the Government, proposed on the one hand to provide substitutes for the lost posts, and on the other to provide employment for the young Rabbis, who, through their disinclination to continue their duties in Alsace-Lorraine, were wandering in France without any appointment. It was then that M. Isidore asked for and obtained the foundation of new Rabbinates in different towns. But in these towns the communities were too unimportant to permit of the luxury of two officers, a Rabbi and a Chazan. So M. Isidore seized the idea of combining the two offices, and submitted to the communities the project of joining the duties of officiating minister to the sacerdotal functions of their Rabbi. This innovation was approved of by all these little towns, which had thenceforth a Rabbinate; and the change was in reality a good one.

The office lost some of its artistic and imposing character; but it gained in dignity and fervour. None but the Rabbi is well fitted for being the שליח צבור, the chosen representative and advocate of the assembly of the faithful. Nevertheless, this ingenious organisation did not last long, and for a very simple reason. The public, which is now-a-days wanting in faith, seeks, as we have said above, attraction in the synagogue, attraction in singing as well as in preaching, and the Rabbi has not always the same power to satisfy this double desire. Hence, in all these communities, one after the other, a recognised Chazan was added to a recognised Rabbi, in spite of the senseless expense entailed by the presence of this new functionary who is deemed so indispensable. In the whole of France we do not know of more than two communities (Nantes and Pau) which have not yet divided these twin functions, for a while fused together, and these instances are undoubtedly to be explained by exceptional financial reasons.

Though there exists no school for training Chazanim, and for giving them the elementary instruction that would be so necessary for them, the same is not the case with the Rabbinate. France has for a long time possessed an establishment where our young ministers may acquire the religious and secular knowledge necessary for the worthy performance of their office.

We must go back almost to the beginning of the emancipation of the Jews, in order to trace the first steps towards the formation of an official training college for those who were intending to adopt the clerical career. Scarcely had the Jews been enabled, under the protection of liberal laws, to introduce into their worship a little order and regularity, when they very soon perceived how little the knowledge and culture, and consequently, also, the preaching, of their ministers were in harmony with the new position of Judaism. It goes without saying that the staff of Rabbis was not changed immediately after the emancipation, and the decrees of the Government, and the

instructions of the Consistories were not sufficient to inspire them with knowledge. The Jewish clergy was almost in its entirety composed (and still remained composed for a time) of former merchants, who, to obtain their livelihood, combined the ministry with trade. They were generally excellent Talmudists, and profound casuists, but it can be easily conceived that these men, "*unius libri*," would be but moderate orators, and religious chiefs whose influence would decrease in proportion to the rise in the level of education around them.

Thus the establishment of a Rabbinical school was indispensable to the new order of things. With this view the Imperial Government was approached, but no result ensued. In 1829 the Central Consistory returned to the charge, and this time the Government ordered an inquiry as to the feeling of the Departmental Consistories. The latter responded enthusiastically in support of this project; the formation of this school was decided upon in principle, but it was less easy to agree upon the town in which to place it. The immense majority of French Jews were then to be found in Alsace-Lorraine; and Metz, the capital of Jewish Lorraine, was long a real home of Talmudic studies. Metz consequently carried the day, and a decree of the Government dated August 21st, 1829, announced the creation of this institution under the name of the Central Rabbinic School. Joined to this decree was a schedule concerning the mode of admission, the programme of studies, and the administration. Thirty years later the seminary was still at Metz; during the interval the school had provided from its scholars all the French Rabbinates, but the programme of secular studies had not undergone the slightest change. The level of education among the Jews, on the other hand, had been greatly raised since the period when the school was established. It was time, if the Rabbinic school and Rabbis were to preserve their prestige, to raise the syllabus of studies to the standard required by modern demands.

On the other hand, at Paris, the Jewish population had considerably increased. Paris was no longer the modest community of former times, but had become the head and heart of French Judaism. So it was the capital which was now fixed upon as the seat of the Rabbinic school. Moreover the community of Paris had not alone become the soul of Judaism, but it was also in the town of Paris that, thanks to the instruction of the most eminent masters in France, and to the intellectual and scientific movement that influenced everybody, young ministers could henceforth obtain the knowledge which is necessary for them in our days. The transference of the Central Rabbinic School was then energetically demanded by all those who were interested in the future of the Rabbinate and of Judaism. During the deliberations of the Synod in 1856, the chief Rabbis unanimously voted for this measure. A decree dated July 1st, 1859, ordered the transference; henceforth the school was no longer to be called "The Central Rabbinic School," but "The Jewish Seminary."

After various migrations, the Seminary is now comfortably settled in some large specially constructed buildings, situated in a healthy and quiet neighbourhood. The pupils, for the most part boarders (though day pupils have an equal right of admission), have a holiday three times a week, Saturday the whole day, Sunday afternoon, and Thursday from 2 to 4. To gain admittance to this Seminary, the applicant must be eighteen years old, possess the diploma of Bachelor, know the meaning of any verse in the Bible, and must be able to expound clearly a passage of the Talmud with the Tosaphot which refer to it.

The yearly entrance examinations take place in the presence of the committee of management, presided over by the Chief Rabbi of France, in October and November (1st of Marhesvan). The course of study lasts for six years. At the end of these six years, the pupil is examined in all the subjects studied during his stay at the Seminary, and, according to the qualities displayed in the examinations,

receives the title of Rabbi or Chief Rabbi (Grand Rabbi). This last title gives its owner, after five years' service, and after having submitted to the judgment of the committee of management a thesis on a Talmudical subject, the right of becoming a candidate, when the time comes, for any post of Chief Rabbi of a Departmental Consistory.

The committee of management is composed of certain members of the Central Consistory and of certain members of the Consistory of Paris.

The pupils who have reached the third year of their studies are bound to deliver in turn a sermon once a month in the oratory of the Seminary, in the presence of the committee of management.

As regards the studies, which are naturally the object of special care, the following is the syllabus for every week: Talmud—six lessons of two hours each. Three of these lessons are devoted to the Halachah, two to the Hagadah, and one to Methodology. For the Halachah, first the text of the Gemara is studied, and the Tosaphot which refer to it with the Commentaries מהרש"א, מהר"ם שיף and מהרש"ל then the student proceeds to the ראשונים (ר"ן, רי"ף, רא"ש) and lastly the אחרונים (טור, ערוך שלחן). For the Hagadah they read the different passages of Hagadah which are found scattered in the Talmud. For method, they pass in review the texts before their eyes, and distinguish the different modes and rules of reasoning employed by the Talmud. At these different lessons, it is the pupils who, under the direction of their teacher, carry on the discussion.

Theology.—Two lessons of two hours each. This study comprises the explanation and criticism of the principal works of Jewish theologians (Maimonides, Albo, Saadiah, etc.).

Hebrew.—Three hours of Biblical exegesis, and one hour for the correction of a Hebrew exercise. For exegesis, different parts of the Bible are successively taken, with special reference to grammar and philology.

Jewish History.—Two lessons of two hours each. This course, founded by M. Isidore Loeb ten years ago, is devoted to the post-Biblical history of the Jews down to the present day.

French.—Two lessons of one hour each; the pupils bring some written work at each lesson.

Greek and Latin.—One lecture of one hour, during which are read the classical and non-classical Latin and Greek ancient authors (Plautus, Horace, etc., Plato, Homer, Aristophanes, etc.).

Philosophy.—One lecture of one hour. The teacher treats of psychology, ethics, and logic, as well as of the great questions of metaphysics. During the first half of the year the teacher delivers lectures; during the second half the pupils, under the direction of their professor, discuss the subjects they have learned. All the pupils compose every month an essay upon a given subject.

Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee.—Two hours of Arabic, and half an hour of Syriac or Chaldee. In Arabic they now translate the Koran and Saadiah, in Chaldee, Onkelos, and in Syriac a collection of anecdotes.

German.—One hour. Formerly this lesson was of practical use, since most of the Rabbinates were then established in Alsace, where sermons were delivered in German Now-a-days, this subject is of a scientific use, since there are numerous learned works in German on Jewish subjects, and these works must be studied.

Synagogal Singing.—One hour. It became necessary to include this subject when, after the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, the French Rabbis were compelled to add to their other duties those of officiating ministers in the recently-founded Rabbinates. It still has its use in the present day.

Elocution.—Two lessons of an hour each. The pupils read aloud, and the master gives them advice in the art of clear enunciation.

Thus no pains are spared to make this school a true home of learning. It is, moreover, entrusted to the guid-

ance of M. Trénel, a Chief Rabbi, a man of intelligent devotion and profound knowledge. The State grants a yearly subvention of 22,000 francs for the expenses of this institution, an absurdly small sum compared with the cost of maintaining the institution, and supporting the students. The Paris Consistory makes up the annual deficit.

But the solicitude of the Consistory does not confine itself to the Seminary. When the level of the studies in the Seminary was gradually raised, it was necessary to increase the difficulty of the entrance examinations. But there was no school in France where those who intended to devote themselves to the career of a Rabbi could acquire the religious and secular knowledge necessary to gain admission into the Seminary. This difficulty was a great obstacle to young aspirants to the Rabbinate. There was however already in Paris a school called "Talmud Torah," which was established as early as 1852. Founded by a special society, it became attached to the Consistory in 1853. The Consistory made use of this school, and transformed it into a kind of minor Seminary, a sort of preparatory school where children admitted while they were young might acquire, under the guidance of good masters, the elements of religious knowledge side by side with the usual secular instruction, which latter was indispensable for admission into the Seminary.

In proportion as the programme of studies in the Seminary was increased, the Talmud Torah, which has always kept its original name, enlarged its aims so that the young pupils were prepared for the degree of Bachelor without prejudice to the sacred studies which occupied their appropriate place in an establishment of this nature.

This establishment provides gratuitous instruction to day pupils, and receives boarders at low fees. Children of poor parents can obtain every year scholarships and exhibitions.

As this school is not recognised by the State, it is a very great burden to the Consistory, especially since it spares

no expense to perfect the institution. After having, like the Seminary, occupied successively different sites, the Talmud Torah was transferred in 1872 to the same establishment as the Seminary, and entrusted to the same principal.

Instruction is given by a staff of eleven professors. There are three divisions. The first division has twenty lessons divided among the study of the Bible, Rashi, Hebrew grammar, Mishnah, French, Latin, Greek, geography, history, science, German, Synagogal music, and gymnastic exercise.

The second division has nineteen hours, divided between the study of the Bible, Rashi, Hebrew grammar, Talmud (without the Tosaphot), history, geography, science, German and gymnastic exercise.

The third division has nineteen hours, utilized for the study of the same branches, but more advanced than the second division, and in learning the Talmud Tosaphot are included.

We now come to treat of the present condition of the ritual. First, as to the additions. We have already pointed out the necessity felt by Rabbis of preaching frequently, in order to attract the public to the synagogue. Not content with having sermons at ordinary services, new services have been instituted, and it is in these that the sermon is the great attraction. What we wish to point out specially is, the solemnity of the afternoon service which takes place in the Consistorial Synagogue in Paris and in the synagogues of many other important communities. To be strictly accurate, we must say that this innovation was mainly effected out of regard for the female portion of the community. Though they attend on the festivals, they rarely come to the synagogue on ordinary Sabbaths. Few tradesmen or manufacturers, indeed, cease from work on the day "devoted to rest." This custom is so general that the Rabbinate would in vain try to oppose it. It is the ladies, then, who must be relied on to form the congregation at the ordinary services. Moreover,

it is not an ungrateful work to point out to them the way to the synagogue. In France, as no doubt in all Europe, it is woman who is the guardian of the ideal—the apostle of religious sentiment. It is through her, whether as wife or mother, that families keep their respect for the religious traditions of the home. Now, the morning service on Sabbaths takes place too early for ladies to attend, in the large towns especially, where Jewish families sometimes live far from the synagogue. It was M. Zadoc Kahn, who when placed at the head of the large community of Paris, was the first among the Rabbis to understand that an innovation was necessary. This illustrious minister, whose talent is equalled by his intelligence, has always known, in a wonderful way, how, in the interest of Judaism, to turn to account "the deep sense of religion" which still fills the heart of Jews, in spite of their great indifference to religious observances. He instituted a solemn Minchah service on Saturday afternoons at a very convenient hour, and at this service a regular sermon was an important feature. The institution of this service has had an enormous success. The synagogue is literally crammed with people. In every large community the ministers of religion seized the opportunity and did not neglect to institute similar services, and to utilise them by preaching before a more or less numerous assembly.

The children, in their turn, have not been neglected. It has long been understood that in the case of religion especially the words are true: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained strength," a passage which may be illustrated by the no less expressive quotation from a profound modern thinker, "Give me the control over the education of the children, and I will transform the world." As early as 1841 the consistory of Paris had decided that henceforth there should be twice a year (on Passover and on the Feast of Tabernacles) a religious confirmation for both sexes. In 1852 the ceremony of Initiation was limited to one occasion annually (the Thursday after

Pentecost). Some difficulty was experienced in establishing this custom, but it has now fully entered into the religious life wherever there was a nucleus of a community.

This religious Initiation, which is now-a-days celebrated with much solemnity, is, as it were, the consummation of the religious instruction of children. Boys of thirteen years and girls of twelve are invited to pass, on a day fixed by the Rabbis, an examination for admission to the ceremony of Initiation. The examination comprises Hebrew reading, translation of the principal prayers, sacred history, and the catechism. The children who successfully pass through this ordeal are summoned to the synagogue on the first Thursday after Pentecost. The boys generally wear black, and the girls always wear white. In Paris every parent who applies to the Benevolent Society is granted sufficient to defray the cost of these costumes, and seats are reserved for the parents at the ceremony in the synagogue. The details of the ceremony vary according to the different communities, but everywhere it comprises the chanting of various passages of the Liturgy, the recital by the children of the prayer, "Hear, O Israel," the Ten Commandments, the thirteen creeds in an abbreviated form, and, most important of all, there is an address by the spiritual chief. This "Initiation" reminds one very closely of the Catholic ceremony of "First Communion." The similarity holds good even to the dress of the little girls. Whatever may be its origin, it has ended by receiving everywhere a hearty welcome. Its usefulness was so readily perceived that the Rabbis, who were most strongly opposed to any innovation, have accepted it, in spite of its odour of Christianity, and have put it into practice without hesitation.

We have seen that this modern ceremony applies both to boys and girls. But, in the case of boys, it is celebrated without prejudice to the ancient ceremony of Barmitzvah, which it ought to precede. Besides, every lad, if he has

not taken part in the ceremony of Initiation, is bound, before being admitted to the ceremony of Barmitzvah, to undergo an examination on the same subjects as for the examination which precedes the confirmation. It should be added that parents seldom allow their sons to dispense with the Barmitzvah function. Although everybody knows that this is not one of the fundamental doctrines of Judaism, it is generally kept even by the most unobservant families, in order to leave to their children the memory of the celebration of the Barmitzvah, which has a more essentially Jewish stamp than the new Initiation, and reminds them more eloquently of their origin.

In the Consistorial Assembly (October, 1841), in which the Initiation was established at Paris, it was intended to establish immediately "free public religious and moral instruction," to prepare the children for Initiation; but at this period there was not in Paris, besides the Chief Rabbi of France, more than a single Rabbi, and he could not be expected to undertake, in addition to his ordinary occupation, the duty of giving religious instruction to children. It was M. Munk and M. Albert Cohn—the one a wealthy scholar and the other a very learned man—who placed their time and goodwill at the disposal of the Consistory and offered to accept this task twice a week for the boys, and twice a week for the girls.

At present these courses are carried on in Paris, as in the communities of the Provinces, by Rabbis who twice a week assemble the children in the synagogue, and give them the necessary instruction respecting the observances of Judaism with its dogmas and ethics.

Lastly, to all secondary schools at which pupils are boarded, and which are subsidised by the State, there is appointed a State-Chaplain for every religion. The Jewish chaplain, who is a Rabbi, accordingly gives, in regular courses, religious instruction to every child who desires to be present at his classes; and it may be said that

the pupils of high schools and colleges rarely withdraw themselves from these optional studies.

As regards schools of higher instruction and schools of primary instruction, they do not provide religious training. This would, indeed, be quite superfluous, since the former only contain pupils past the age of childhood, and the latter never possess a boarding-house.

As in the case of preaching, so in the case of religious instruction, the Rabbi enjoys absolute freedom, and need never be afraid of the interference of his spiritual superiors in his system of teaching religion and morality. There are, nevertheless, some religious works—catechisms, sacred histories, translated prayer-books, translations from the Bible, moral books—approved by the Chief Rabbi of the Central Consistory, which are ordinarily what may be called the official guides for Rabbis to follow.

Of catechisms we possess some few more or less complete. The principal ones, which are most frequently used, are those of Chief Rabbi Ulmann and M. Mayer. They all contain substantially the same elements under the form of questions and answers. We quote the titles of the chapters of one of them, and *ab uno disce omnes*:—"Religion," "The Holy Books," "Thirteen Creeds," "Israel's Mission," "Revelation of Sinai," "Duties toward God," "External Duties," "Feasts," "Fasts," "Principal Prohibitions," "Sin and Repentance," "Duties towards our Neighbours," "Jealousy," "Lying," "Slander," "Charity," "Patriotism," "Duties towards Parents," "Man's Duty to Himself," "Laws regarding Animals and Inanimate Objects," "Jewish Calendar."

The sacred histories are sufficiently numerous. Some are abridgments like those of M. Lévy Isaac and M. Mayer; others are more modern and superior to the former, such as that of M. Ledrain. We do not mention the work of M. Renan, which is rather a history of Israel, in which a scientific method is qualified by the play of the imagination, and thus renders it unsuited for the use of

children. We are not equally deficient in good translations of the prayers. The translations of the Prayer Book by M. Anspach, by M. Durlacher, and by M. Bloch, with the Piyutim still used, leave nothing to be desired. To this series there must still be added the "Prayers of a Jewish Heart," containing in French, without the Hebrew text, the translation of the prayers for the whole year. This excellent book is the work of M. Aron, Chief Rabbi of Strasburg.

We possess several translations of the Bible. We may make special mention of the complete translation of the Bible by M. Cahen, and the translation of the Pentateuch by M. Wogue, Professor of Biblical Exegesis at the Seminary. The former shows that its author was thoroughly acquainted with the progress of modern science, and the other is a *chef d'œuvre* of knowledge and erudition.

As regards religious reading-books, we possess a small number, like "The First-Fruits," by M. E. Lambert, the "Holy Seeds," by the same author; "The Mornings of the Sabbath," by M. G. Neil: the "Ethics of Judaism," by M A. Weill; "Jewish Recreations," by M. Lévy Isaac, etc. In fact, our religious literature comprises only a very limited number of works, and most of these are formal treatises. The dearth of these works in France is easily explained: first, as has been seen above, the Jews in France are very few, and then it must be confessed, for this is the true reason, religious works are not read in France, and among the Jews it is only in the libraries of the Rabbis that works of this nature find a hospitable corner.

There are published in France—a large number for so limited a public—three Jewish journals, viz.:—*L'Univers* (Paris), *Les Archives Israélites* (Paris), and *La Famille de Jacob* (Avignon). We do not think we are exaggerating when we say that a large number of their subscribers must come from abroad. *La Revue des Etudes Juives*, a scientific review, which does the greatest honour to Judaism, has, on

the contrary, met with an excellent reception. I do not say that all the subscribers read it, but it is something, at any rate, that a publication of this kind, which is addressed more to the learned than to amateurs, has met with such great sympathy, and with all the support that is necessary for it.

In speaking of the institution of the religious Initiation, we have been led by the connection of these two subjects to speak also of the religious publications in France. This was, perhaps, to a certain extent a digression, but it was a necessary digression. To return to our subject, let us point out another ceremony, the origin of which does not go back beyond the present period. This ceremony consists in bringing to the synagogue new-born children, and in presenting them to the minister, who gives them his blessing. This innovation had already been proposed in the course of the sitting of the Synod, and its appropriateness had been vigorously contested by certain members of that assembly. These members felt it repugnant to introduce into the Jewish religion a custom which recalled, as must be admitted, the Christian rite of baptism. It was nevertheless carried by a large majority in this assembly of Chief Rabbis, and the ceremony is performed at either of the Sabbath services, morning or afternoon.

In spite of the affirmative vote of the Synod, this custom has only recently become general. Now-a-days, in spite of, or rather by reason of, its odour of Christianity, it tends to become acclimatised in every community in France. We say by reason of its odour of Christianity, because the resemblance of this ceremony to the ceremony of baptism has, perhaps, contributed to its becoming, as it were, completely naturalised in higher Jewish social spheres. It is impossible for a weak minority, as the Jews are in France, not to feel the influence of Christianity—at least, in certain exterior details of worship. Not only do the large majority of Jews see no harm in borrowing from a religion—the daughter of Judaism, and no less moral than her parent

—a beautiful and imposing ceremony, fertile in generous emotions and in salutary memorials; but it may be said that the very resemblance to the ceremonies of Christian ritual is generally an excellent recommendation in France for every innovation. Jews are so closely blended with Christians, they are so wedded to their manners and ideas, that where it is possible, and most often in a quite unconscious fashion, the Jews of their own accord bring into their religious life customs which they are used to see observed at every moment around them. The religious Initiation for young girls, especially as they are clad in white, surely reminds us of the First Communion; and can it be denied that it owes a part of its success to this analogy? The collection that takes place at marriage ceremonies, performed by a young girl on the arm of a young man, is again a copy of the collection in churches. The custom which for some years has been establishing itself in the heart of every community, especially in the provinces, to summon the Rabbi to the bedside of the dying, is but an importation from Christianity, where the presence of the priest is necessary to the welfare of the soul of the dying. The covering of coffins with flowers and garlands, the hangings at the entry of the mortuary, and all the luxury of the hearse, are equally proofs of the incursion into the domain of Judaism of the customs of other creeds. And, lastly, we have a striking example of the same process when, in that very assembly to which we have often referred, and which was entirely composed of Rabbis, these Rabbis adopted for their official dress the dress of the Catholic priest, the only difference being in the white colour of the band.

Besides the new customs introduced into the Jewish ritual, there is one—viz., the employment of the organ in the temple—which was the object of lively debate during the Synod, and for several years afterwards. This assembly of Rabbis, deeply embarrassed, was driven, as it were, in one direction by the demands of those who deemed the accompaniment of the organ permissible and desirable,

and in the other direction by the protests of those who declared it to be contrary to religious ordinances. It found a way of satisfying the two parties, by proclaiming that the organ accompaniment was lawful from a religious point of view, but gave to the respective Rabbis, in conjunction with their managing board, the option of allowing or refusing the introduction of the organ into the synagogue. The community of Paris soon had its organ in the synagogue on all solemn occasions, and all the large communities immediately followed her example. Now-a-days there is not a community in France where the penetrating tones of this instrument are not heard every Sabbath. In France, as we have already seen, hesitation, and even discussion, die out before the sight of an imposing service. Rabbis and committees are always sure beforehand of absolution, and still more of approval from the public, provided the worship be attractive, the ceremonies moving and full of pious dignity.

There is another ceremony which is now so generally practised as to almost constitute a new institution—the ancient הזכרת נשמות, or prayer in memory of the dead, which occupies now-a-days a place of honour in the Atonement service at the beginning of Minchah. The two doors of the ark are opened, and the Rabbi begins by a meditation in French, followed generally by a prayer also in French. Then he recites the passage טוב שם משמן טוב and ends by calling over the names of those members of the community who have died in the course of the year. The institution of the ceremony under this form is due to Chief Rabbi Isidore, whose "meditation" has been generally adopted by the other Rabbis. We quote this meditation, and reproduce it because of its universal use in France :—

"Seigneur! Toi qui dispenses la vie et la mort, tu as tiré le monde du néant, tu as créé l'homme, tu l'as formé à ton image et lui as dit : tu seras le maître de l'ouvrage de mes mains. Tu lui as donné l'intelligence, cette étincelle divine, pour qu'il reconnaisse ta puissance et ta grandeur, et il a plu à ta sagesse d'assigner une borne à chaque créature

pour entrer dans la vie et pour aller à la mort, comme la plante, comme le ver de terre, l'homme disparaît et descend dans la tombe.

"Mais ce qui a été créé et formé par toi ne peut pas devenir la proie de la destruction. Ce qui est sorti de sa puissante main ne peut pas se perdre, ne peut être anéanti sans retour. Tout meurt pour revivre ; tu ne peux pas, toi qui crées et ne détruis pas, tu ne peux pas détruire cette âme qui est en nous et qui nous vient de toi. Non, notre âme ne meurt pas, elle remonte vers toi, la source d'où elle est venue et notre enveloppe terrestre qui sort de la poussière redevient de la poussière.

" Dans cette poussière reposent toutes les générations qui nous ont précédés, là aussi reposent nos parents, nos amis, tous ceux que nous avons aimés. Leur corps est là, renfermé dans la tombe, mais leur esprit est devant toi, ô Seigneur Tout-Puissant, et nous aussi, quand notre heure sonnera, notre corps s'unira à leur corps et notre esprit ira t'adorer, au pied de ton trône éternel.

" O Dieu, donne-nous à tous la force d'attendre tranquillement le moment qui nous rappelle vers toi et quand l'heure fixée par ta sagesse sera arrivée sois encore avec nous et laisse-nous participer aux félicités que tu réserves aux justes !

"Nous rappelons devant toi le souvenir de nos parents qui ne sont plus, nous pensons en ce moment surtout aux sacrifices qu'ils se sont imposés pour nous et à la perte cruelle que leur mort nous a fait éprouver.

"Nous rappelons devant toi le souvenir de ceux dont la vie a été consacrée au bien, le souvenir des hommes pieux, justes, éclairés, qui ont défendu la cause israélite, la cause de la vertu, de l'humanité.

"Exauce, ô mon Dieu, les vœux que nous formons pour leur béatitude éternelle et réalise les espérances qu'ils ont nourries pour leurs familles et pour nous, au moment de quitter la terre ! Accorde-leur la récompense que tu réserves aux justes.

"Puissent leurs regards descendre sur nous. Puissent-ils nous bénir comme tu l'as promis à ceux qui espèrent en ta grâce et en ta miséricorde. *Amen!*"

This ceremony has now acquired exceptional importance. It is received every year by the faithful with deep emotion, due to the touching character of the ceremony in itself, to the solemnity of the Day of Atonement, and also to the need for some outlet to sentimentality which, thanks to the void and unrest which modern scepticism leaves in the heart, evidences itself more clearly every day.

We have not given in the above the whole list of inno-

vations of which we have to speak. It is necessary to mention that everywhere in France, at the initiative of M. Zadoc Kahn, the Rabbis recite in the temple a prayer in French on the Friday evening before the Kiddush, and another prayer on the next morning, also in French, when the Law is taken out of the Ark.

To the number of novelties introduced into the religious service, we must further add a kind of Ketubah in French, composed by M. Zadoc Kahn, and adopted or imitated by the generality of French Rabbis. The text is as follows :—

"Aujourd'hui jour du mois de de l'année de la création du monde, les époux et se sont présentés devant nous à l'effet d'obtenir la consécration religieuse, la bénédiction de Dieu.

"En présence de Dieu et dans le Temple consacré à son culte, après la récitation des prières d'usage et l'accomplissement des formalités traditionnelles ; après avoir indiqué aux deux époux les devoirs qu'ils auront à remplir dans leur vie nouvelle ; après les avoir bénis au nom de la Religion et appelé sur eux les faveurs du ciel, nous les déclarons unis par les liens du mariage suivant la loi de Moïse et d'Israël."

In this place should also be mentioned a French prayer, composed by Chief Rabbi Isidore for use at the Burial Service. This prayer, printed among the other prayers read on these occasions, is an integral portion of the Burial Service, and runs as follows :—

"Dieu de bonté et de miséricorde, toi qui tiens entre tes mains l'âme des vivants et le souffle de tout mortel, nous venons rappeler devant toi le souvenir de notre frère (notre sœur).....et recommander à ta clémence et à ta miséricorde infinie son âme qui a quitté le monde pour aller dans le monde meilleur.

"Exauce les prières que nous t'adressons pour le salut de cette âme, ouvre-lui les portes du ciel, accueille-la avec amour et donne-lui une place au pied de ton trône éternel.

"En faveur de ton saint nom, pardonne à notre frère (sœur) les fautes qu'il (elle) peut avoir commises. "Quel est le mortel, a dit le prophète, qui fait toujours le bien et ne pêche jamais?" Accepte comme un sacrifice d'expiation tout ce qu'il (elle) a souffert ici-bas et tiens-lui compte de ses bonnes actions et de ses bonnes intentions. Accorde-lui les récompenses que tu réserves aux justes et aux pieux, à tous ceux qui confessent et qui adorent ton nom.

"Console, ô mon Dieu, ceux que cette mort plonge dans l'affliction es doucis leur amertume ; rends-leur le calme et la paix, et que le souvenir du défunt (de la défunte) soit toujours pour eux et pour nous un objet de bénédictions.

"Que sa sortie de ce monde et son entrée dans le royaume céleste soient bénies devant toi, ô notre Dieu et notre Père. *Amen!*"

We possess quite a series of special prayers and meditations composed, some by M. Isidore, and some by M. Zadoc Kahn, and others again by M. Wogue, to be recited at the graves of the departed. In reforming the ritual, some prayers have been suppressed without others being inserted in their place, and, on the other hand, several additions have been made.

Under the head of suppressions, the Piyutim must be mentioned. The introduction into the synagogue of the organ and choirs necessarily lengthened the services, and a compensating abridgement had to be effected. Little by little the longest Piyutim were, in fact, withdrawn from the ritual; and soon, Paris first, and afterwards other communities, passed the limits fixed by the Synod, which had given permissive right to omit the less satisfactory of these poems. The process of clearance was ruthlessly carried on in this forest of Piyutim, which had been for centuries the joy of our ancestors, and a true delight for pious hearts. Now-a-days the Piyutim are almost or quite eliminated from all services other than those of New Year, and the Day of Atonement. Moreover, on these two solemn days the number of Piyutim has been conspicuously reduced. There has appeared recently in Paris a Prayer-book with translations for the various festivals in the year. This book, as regards the Piyutim, is composed on the principle we have just pointed out, and it is likely to become the official Prayer-book of all the French communities.

The prayers for week-days and Sabbaths have also been occasionally modified. Thus the long supplication beginning with והוא רחום, and read formerly on Mondays and Thursdays in the morning service; and,

also במה מדליקין, have shared the fate of the Piyutim. The שיר היחוד and the אנעים זמירות have not been more fortunate. The במה מדליקין, and יקום פורקן, and אין כאלהינו, have not found more favour. The מוסף is read only aloud, and lastly, the שיר המעלות in winter and the פרקי אבות in summer have not escaped. Other prayers have not been removed, but paraphrased or translated into French. A few words ought to be said about the prayer for the Government and our native country, inasmuch as it has passed through various vicissitudes before reaching its modern shape.

Formerly in France, as elsewhere, the old הנותן תשועה למלכים was read in every synagogue during the morning service. The passage which prayed that the head of the State should have the glory of crushing his enemies under his feet, of coming out victorious from all his enterprises, harmonised admirably with the ambitious dreams and bold enterprises of the first Bonaparte. Nevertheless, it was during his reign that הנותן תשועה was replaced by a new prayer, commonly called אלהים חיים, from the first two words of the prayer. The reason why it had become necessary to compose a new prayer was that, in 1808, the Jewish ritual had just been officially organised. Now the emperor understood that his numerous victories and colossal ambition were celebrated in every house of prayer with the most vehement enthusiasm. The הנותן תשועה in plain prose did not lend itself to choral accompaniment. It was not a Te Deum sufficiently pompous for the greatness of the emperor, or for the gratitude and ardent loyalty of the Jews. It was due to the talent of the celebrated Abraham Cologna, the first of the three Chief Rabbis, who was then a member of the Central Consistory, that a prayer was composed more in conformity with the new requirements.

The new prayer was, in fact, a poetic hymn in rhymed verse. It was written in a stately style, adapted to the accompaniment of a choir, which ought, doubtless, to respond

Amen, after each distich. Substantially this prayer, substituted for the old one, was nothing else than a reproduction in a poetic shape of the wishes for glory, dominion and victory contained in the first prayer. One thing, however, is omitted in the work of Cologna, no doubt intentionally, viz., the entreaty to God to incline the heart of the king and his counsellors to have pity on the unhappy fate of the Jews, and to cause the time of deliverance of Zion to draw near. This passage was no longer appropriate in a prayer composed after the emancipation of the Jews. They had already been admitted into the heart of the great French family, and henceforth had a native country of their own. Accordingly, to ask for pity from men had become superfluous in the eyes of the Jews, and to pray for the restoration of Zion might have appeared suspicious to the emperor.

This prayer was still the national official prayer when the Synod held its meeting. This assembly voted that it should be replaced by a French prayer, but for the day of the national fête alone. In the ordinary Saturday services the אלהים חיים was always read. It was only some years afterwards that Chief Rabbi Isidore replaced it definitely and officially by a French prayer, which he made obligatory for every community in France. This prayer is still said in every French temple, and corresponds too well with modern feelings and ideas for any further change to be necessary. We quote this prayer, and print it together with its Hebrew original. As will be seen, M. Isidore has often departed from the Hebrew text. He has taken care to adapt to the Republic all the prayers which were suitable under the imperial regime, and to cut out those which could not be so adapted.

אלהים חיים ומלך עולם המגביהי לשבת · המשפילי לראות
בשמים ובארץ · בידך כח וגבורה לגדל ולחזק לכל · אשר מפיך
מלכים ימלוכו ומידך למו מטה עז שבט מישור לנחל לאמים ·
השקיפה ממעון קדשך וברך ונצור ושמור אדוננו · · · · אמן ·

ברכות שמים מעל תצו אתו יאריך ימים ושנות חיים על ממלכתו אמן · כאשון בת עין תנצרהו · עטרת תפארת נצח תמגנהו אמן · שלח אורך ואמתך המה ינחוהו · חסד ואמת תמיד יצרוהו אמן · מאד מאד ירום אדוננו ונשא וגבה · עם כל בני משפחתו הנשגבה אמן · בארצנו רב שלום יפרח · ויושביה לעד ישכנו לבטח אמן · יהיו לרצון אמרי פינו והגיון לבנו · לפניך ה׳ צורנו וגואלנו אמן :

"Dieu, Eternel, maître de l'Univers ! Du haut de ton trône tu inclines les regards de ta Providence vers les cieux et la terre ; la force et la puissance t'appartiennent ; par toi tout s'agrandit, tout s'affermit ; de ta demeure sainte, ô Seigneur, bénis et protège la République française et le peuple français. *Amen.*

"Accorde à notre pays bien-aimé la sécurité, et le bonheur et qu'il jouisse toujours d'une paix profonde. *Amen.*

"Que par le travail, l'instruction et la concorde, la France prospère et conserve toujours son rang glorieux parmi les nations. *Amen.*

"Que les rayons de ta lumière éclairent et guident ceux qui sont à la tête de l'Etat, que ta miséricorde et ta grâce soient leur bouclier. *Amen.*

"Accueille favorablement nos vœux, que les paroles de notre bouche et les sentiments de notre cœur trouvent grâce devant toi, ô Eternel, notre créateur et notre libérateur."

Other prayers also have been replaced by a French translation more or less free. Thus, at the taking of the Law out of the Ark, the prayer commencing with רבונו של עולם has, in most communities which have a Rabbi, been replaced by a French paraphrase.

In the same way, the benediction called מי שברך, which the Rabbi used to read aloud before the return of the Law to the Ark, is replaced in those communities where there is a Rabbi by an equivalent French benediction. As regards several French prayers which are added to the service, or which are mere translations of the ordinary Hebrew prayers, we must be careful to state that they are only added or translated where there is a Rabbi to read them. We have in fact seen above that the Chazan has neither the right nor the capacity to compose a French prayer, or to read it with appropriate expression.

The above are the principal reforms which the ritual has undergone. These changes have been introduced little by little in the most peaceable manner possible without a single objection being raised. They are, moreover, very mild, and scarcely deserve the ambitious name of Reforms. People may be inclined to smile when they think that these light touches were able, some years ago, to raise, and can still raise, so many angry feelings. This appears the more astonishing when the Rabbi is actually the absolute master of the whole collection of prayers and ceremonies of the ritual, and when no one would think of offering the slightest objection against anything which he should deem it expedient to do, or not to do.

III.

We have finished with the religious and liturgical sections of our paper, though we by no means pretend that our account is complete. Our object was simply to give to those who do not know French Judaism an approximate idea of the condition of its religious spirit, its ritual, its nature, and its tendencies. We must now attempt a similar work with regard to its philanthropy. This is merely another aspect of Judaism, which places charity among religious duties.

Philanthropy, which is, and has always been, a characteristic virtue of Jews, is exercised to an extraordinary degree among the Jews of France. We do not refer to the poor-boxes which have been established in every Jewish community from time immemorial for the relief of poor travellers and the necessitous families of the locality. It is an ancient Jewish institution—a sacred tradition. A society for administering charity, under some name or other, has always been established at the same time as the community itself. But as soon as this community has increased to a hundred families, we are sure to find by the side of these inevitable committees the names of other institutions, such as the Society for Helping the Sick, Lying-in Charities,

Society of Arts and Handicrafts, Society of Levayat Metim (Burial), an Orphan Asylum, Almshouses, and Hospitals for the Afflicted, etc., etc. We are certainly giving only an insignificant portion of the names of these associations which exist and prosper in the communities, to the great relief of human misery under all its forms. We need scarcely say that it is in Paris that charity and generous philanthropy have found their chief expression, and we shall accordingly pass in review its principal philanthropic institutions. In Paris the amount of misery is very great; the philanthropic institutions have increased in number to keep pace with growing needs. We must confine our remarks to the chief institutions, because a volume would be necessary to give a complete account.

The "Comité de Bienfaisance" of Paris must have the honour of priority. It is the first in importance, as well as the first in date, among all the benevolent institutions. Further, it is in some way the source from which the other institutions, like so many different ramifications, have taken their origin, and it still contributes, sometimes in a large degree, to their daily support. The association dates from 1819, and then bore the name of "Comité Consistorial de Secours et d'Encouragement." The members of this society took upon themselves the task of caring for poor invalids, of securing the necessary attendance (*minyan*) at funerals and at prayers morning and evening, of watching by the dead, of preparing them for interment, and digging their graves. This organisation was only temporary, but many years had to elapse before any change was made in it. Towards 1852, under the fertile impulse of the ever-memorable Albert Cohn, this society was considerably developed, and changed its name, as well as its programme, and embraced in its charitable work every form of suffering and infirmity. Henceforth it was called by the short title of "Comité de Bienfaisance," and became a species of public help, from the midst of which radiated almost without limit an extraordinary

number of other philanthropic institutions. It was a store-house, by means of which the needy of all sorts and conditions were relieved. It disburses annually more than 500,000 francs. We cannot mention all the forms that the charity of this association assumes, but will confine ourselves to quoting its chief services and creations, viz, regular monthly assistance to the poor on the books of the institution; temporary assistance to the poor not on the books; assisting foreigners to return to their native country; special distributions on religious feasts; distribution of coal, etc., in winter; soup kitchens, serving on an average about 300,000 portions per annum; helping women during their confinement; the annual distribution of hot food and clothes to more than 200 children in the elementary schools; distribution of clothes to more than 200 poor children at their religious Initiation; the loan office for advancing up to 100 francs to small tradesmen in distress; looking after children in receipt of relief, but not admitted into orphanages, and placing them in families where they are received for a sum agreed upon; the work of housing a certain number of poor widows and families; the provision for a small annual payment of the right to a grave in the Jewish cemetery; and, lastly, the hospitals, refuges, orphanages, and similar institutions, of which we shall treat with some particularity, because they are institutions which have become very important, so that each necessitates the possession of special establishments.

One of the most ancient foundations of the community of Paris, or rather of the Benevolent Society, is that of the Almshouses. The Society began in 1809 by giving to these invalids such assistance as enabled them to be attended to in their own homes, or in the houses of other Jews. After many futile efforts, the present hospital was established in 1852, and is due to the munificence of Baron James de Rothschild. The building, situate at 76, Rue Piepus, and belonging by deed of gift to the Consistory of

Paris, is supported by the donations of numerous contributors, and a large annual subvention from the Benevolent Society. It has in later times been greatly enlarged, and is no longer a single hospital, but a combination, in one body, of several connected hospitals, intended to receive the adult sick, children, incurables, and old people, whose infirmities arise from age. Further special halls have recently been organised for lying-in women and for nurses, and isolated rooms for contagious diseases.

The hospital is situated in a healthy, airy, quiet quarter. It is surrounded by handsome gardens which belong to the hospital, and contain large promenades for the use of convalescents. In these hospitals there are no male attendants, but all the nurses are women—an excellent thing, since, as is well known, a woman is better for this duty than a man; she is more tender towards, and at the same time has more control over, an invalid. The institution receives with the same benevolence the poor unfortunate people, who, under the pretext of illness come and ask for peace and quiet, and the recovery of their strength; and welcomes also those unhappy victims, who, attacked with pitiless disease, are doomed to long suffering, and are weary unto death. This hospital supports them for months and years; for while in other hospitals of the town old cases are often obliged to make room for new ones, the Jewish hospital (it is worth while to say this pointedly) only discharges its patients when they are either cured or dead—cured, we say, and not merely convalescent.

The management of the institution is in itself gentle and paternal, as the director, and his army of attendants following his example, necessarily are. We give some particulars which show to what a degree anxious care is displayed on behalf of those who seek their benevolent hospitality. As the patients for the most part belong to poor families, the funds of the establishment pay, in case of death, all the expenses of the funeral. Moreover, there is

never any autopsy over the bodies of those who die int he hospital. If the patient is cured, he is not roughly cast from an easy life, free from anxiety, into the rough struggles of daily life. There are in the hospital two special foundations, two relieving offices, one for persons who have stayed less than a fortnight at the hospital, and the other for persons whose stay has exceeded two weeks. These last receive assistance to the amount of as much as a hundred francs.

The services which this hospital renders daily may be appreciated by the fact that from its foundation down to the present day it has admitted nearly forty thousand patients. In this total is not included the considerable number of patients who come every morning at the hour of consultation fixed by the hospital doctors. The medicines prescribed are furnished gratuitously by the dispensary of the hospital.

The portion devoted to afflicted children is in the same building as that devoted to the adult invalids. The children are received at any age. There is a special department for the accouchement of women. Strong and healthy wet-nurses are put at the disposal of those children whose premature sufferings have brought them to the hospital. Everything in this institution is organised in such a manner that these little creatures obtain there, in addition to medical treatment, the caresses and joys of which children of their tender years have so much need. Many children, too, are attacked with maladies and infirmities against which medical science struggles in vain if they cannot borrow certain of the powers of nature. These natural aids are strengthening sea-breezes, and the life-giving atmosphere of the sea-shore. Accordingly, at Berck-sur-Mer a branch of this children's hospital has been erected, an enormous model establishment which receives all that sad, suffering legion, stricken at the dawn of life by maladies and diseases.

Let us return now to the hospital of the Rue Piepus,

which we left for a while. The home for incurables (built in 1877) is separated by a vast garden from the hospital of the adults and children. The unfortunate beings to whom it opens its doors are the deformed, and those afflicted with anchylosis and paralysis, some of whom are driven about in carriages, while others drag themselves along on crutches. This class, to whom human science can bring no cure or relief, is at all events sheltered from the additional terrors of the struggle for existence.

A little further lies the Asylum for the Aged, which is a model of its kind. Every old man has his own room, and he is master of it; he can take refuge in it, or leave it whenever he pleases. The rooms are comfortable, and the furniture in them is simple, but complete. Every room is supplied with an electric bell, to summon, in case of need, the assistance of the staff. In addition to this there are large gardens furnished with seats, gravelled drives where these peaceable pensioners can imbibe the air and sunshine, large covered promenades, spacious courtyards warmed in winter, where they take their exercise in bad weather; rooms for smoking and conversation, where, though cards are forbidden, the old men are allowed to throw dice and play dominoes, and there is provided a covered refreshment room almost luxurious; in short, everything is arranged in such a way that many a veteran who ends his days in this peaceful retreat finds there pleasures which he had never tasted before.

This retreat for the old receives a large number of boarders, but there was still room for another institution for inmates of a different class, viz., old people without family or relations, not sufficiently rich to live on their own incomes, nor sufficiently poor to ask for gratuitous relief. This house, the necessity for which made itself felt, has been erected recently, but only for women. M. Moyse Léon, a generous and active man, founded at the gates of Paris and near the Bois, an establishment capable of receiving a large number of aged women. The expense of

the acquisition of the land was covered partly by the personal sacrifices of M. Léon, and partly by the subscriptions he collected. To be a pensioner in this house, every woman pays the sum of six hundred francs a year. They remain there until the end of their lives, attended with all the care and solicitude required at their age.

It is certainly in accordance with the traditional charity of Jews to relieve the suffering and soften the wretchedness of old age; but its actions ought not to be confined to this, nor are they so confined in France. From 1809, the Benevolent Society had thought of such unhappy young people as are cruelly tried before they are able fully to appreciate what they suffer. But the work had to be begun with very modest means. A commencement was made by entrusting a five-year old orphan to a family, which, with the help of a payment, undertook to keep him for seven years, and to have him taught a useful profession. This system of placing orphans in families was continued until the time when the number of orphans for whom the committee had to find a place having become too large, and the Society having become richer, they decided to provide a special establishment for orphans. A gift of four hundred thousand francs offered by the Rothschild family enabled them, without delay, to acquire a large site in the Rue des Rosiers. This was in 1857. Ten years later this house became too small in its turn, and many applications had to be rejected through sad necessity. Again, the generosity of a member of the Rothschild family, Baroness Salomon, came to the rescue, and a large piece of land in Rue Lamblardie was acquired.

The Orphanage erected on this ground is sumptuous, and answers current needs. It contains at present about fifty children of both sexes. They are admitted from four years old, and it is needless to say that their intellectual and moral education is well and lovingly looked after. The boys are sent to higher schools or are apprenticed, according to the capacity they display; the girls are retained in

the homes until suitable employment is found for them as servants or governesses.

A school for apprentices exists in Paris, and is called "Ecole de Travail." Its object is to teach boys some handicraft that will enable them to gain an honest living. The commencement of this school was something like that of the Orphanage. The Benevolent Society began by placing some children with certain patrons who took upon themselves the task of providing them with material support, and also of teaching them a trade. Later on the necessity was felt of having a boarding-house whence the young apprentices, after being fed, lodged and clothed, might proceed to their daily work at the shops, etc., of their employers, and then attend in the evening, after supper, a class opened specially for them. In 1869, the wish of the committee to meet this necessity was realised under modest conditions. A house was bought, and was immediately occupied by a dozen pupils. The place soon became too small, and the school was established in the house which the orphanage had just left. It contains now a hundred, placed out among different employers, mostly Jews. In the morning they go forth to their work, and in the evening they return and find food, light and warmth, and, in the society of their companions, something like the joys of home. When they leave this establishment, they are powerfully armed for the struggle of life by a perfect knowledge of the trade they have chosen, and by the intellectual and moral education they have acquired.

The "Ecole de Travail" for girls has been in operation since 1872, and its object is similar to that of the boys' school. It is to a certain extent the special property of the Bischoffsheim family. The institution is established in a large building erected for the special purpose. Girls here receive a technical education. The house contains at present fifty pupils, who will become either governesses or shop-girls or will work at handicrafts; but whatever may

be the career they choose, they all receive lessons in sewing, dancing singing, music, English, and also in gymnastics. Intending governesses study all the branches on which they will be examined when they enter for their diploma: those who intend to learn trades are under the superintendence of instructors, who come from outside workshops; intending business-women learn book-keeping and accounts, and practise commercial correspondence.

We have just seen charity taking possession of orphans, and giving them a home; we have seen charity also occupied with adults, and giving them a means of livelihood, but we have not yet seen it struggling against vice, attempting to prevent its development or birth by snatching away its victims, or those who are likely to become so. I desire to speak of those boys and girls who, at an age when the human mind is accessible to every influence, have before their eyes only pernicious examples, and have no moral guidance from parents, or any one else. How many of these beings, corrupted before they could be even aware of it, have descended later on down every step in the ladder of degradation, when, perhaps, all that would have been required to save these poor creatures, and to have slackened or even have stopped their progress on the path of evil, was only a little generous pity? These children, who are said to be morally lost, are at least as worthy of the care and kindness of philanthropists as children who have merely lost their father or mother. To look after this class of children, to make them moral, and to teach them the way of obtaining an honest livelihood by the fruit of their labour, amounts to rescuing them beforehand from evil; or if they are already enrolled in its ranks, it is like saving them from destruction. We possess, indeed, two houses, called "Houses of Refuge for Young Jews," one at Neuilly, at the gates of Paris, for young girls, and the other at Sceaux, about ten miles from Paris, for boys.

The refuge for girls was established earlier than that for

boys, for in every work of benevolence people are rightly induced to think of woman first. Her moral life is more exposed to danger, and for her a false step, if once made, is irreparable. The house was opened in 1856, at Romainville, under the auspices of Madame Coralie Cahen, a lady of cultured mind and incomparable heart. The beginning, as usual, was very humble. Only a small number of children could be admitted—those who had been caught in the meshes of the law, and who were destined for the House of Correction. The refuge was moved later on to Neuilly, but the accommodation was still insufficient to meet the demands. There were also many more children, who, though deprived of every controlling influence, had still an irreproachable past; it was, however, necessary, by opening to them the gates of the refuge, at any cost to prevent them from rolling in the mire. Application was made to some noble-minded people, who recognised the importance of the mission undertaken by the Refuge, and answered the application with generous gifts. The Benevolent Society, in its turn, made great sacrifices, and voted a considerable subvention. Lastly, M. Zadoc Kahn, by his sermons and by other steps, caused large sums of money to pour in. Thanks to all this generosity and all these combined efforts, an institution of vast dimensions, comfortably arranged, healthily and wisely organised, is now erected at Neuilly, in the heart of a delightful neighbourhood. This refuge shelters at present more than a hundred inmates, who there obtain a mother's careful guidance.

The age of the inmates varies from five to eighteen. The hours are wisely divided between work, study, and recreation, which are necessary to keep body and mind in sound health. When they leave the Refuge, these girls are sure to know how to earn their bread honestly, and take away with them a love and knowledge of work, and principles of order and economy.

Although the Refuge for girls has been in operation for several years, the Refuge for boys is only one year old.

On the other hand, when once the creation of the boys' Refuge had been decided on, its execution was prompt, and on a large scale. The successes obtained by the house at Neuilly had been so brilliant that the benevolent-minded were sure to attempt for the boys that which had succeeded so well for the girls. In proportion, as the house at Neuilly received a larger number of abandoned children, the prisons and docks of the courts were occupied by a smaller number of young women who were going astray. Now-a-days, there are no longer any; those who seemed destined to come sooner or later before the bar of justice, have been received by the house at Neuilly before they had time to make a slip. This result was so brilliant that it was inevitable that an establishment of the same kind should be created for boys. The matter was taken in hand by M. Zadoc Kahn; in other words, it became an immense success. In a very short space of time this minister collected a sum of 500,000 francs. After that a committee could be formed with confidence, and entrusted with the execution of the work to which they could with hopeful prospects apply themselves. Already the establishment contains a considerable number of inmates, and will probably develop after the style of the older institution at Neuilly.

The pupils of the Refuge are taught agriculture. The house, being situated in the open country, lends itself admirably to this work. The children, like those of the Refuge at Neuilly, receive a substantial primary education, which is useful for them, even when they are tillers of the ground.

Before finishing our list, necessarily incomplete, even for the community of Paris, we must give a passing notice to the numerous mutual benefit societies which live and prosper by the side of the large philanthropic institutions. In the single community of Paris forty of them can be enumerated, societies for men and societies for women, but we cannot find space even to enumerate them.

S. Debré,
Rabbin de Neuilly, Paris.

JEWISH ETHICAL WILLS.

WHAT for want of a better term may be called Ethical Wills (צוואות), or, in other words, the express directions of fathers to their children and of aged teachers to their disciples, constitute an important branch of Jewish ethical literature. The value of these wills was recognised by Zunz, who, in order to illustrate the elevated ethical tone of mediæval Judaism, quotes passages from three of these documents. Yet the extent of this literature has, I believe, hitherto been far from duly estimated. The most complete bibliography is, and must continue to be, very defective. Wills of this class are not always come-at-able, being often hidden away in unexpected places. Besides, rapid additions to the series are being constantly made in modern times. For there are fashions even in death, and the ethical will is a Jewish fashion now much honoured in the observance. True, the main lines of thought remain identical, and there is a strong tendency towards monotonous uniformity in the later representatives of the class. Yet, even if the thoughts are not new, the modes of expressing them are often fresh and original, even now, when all that is said has already been said before. Here is a fine passage in which a nineteenth century father transforms a Midrashic idea into a philosophy :—

> Every father is bound to leave an exhortation for his children, to instruct them in the fear of God, and in the manner of his worship. Even if a man were himself quite perfect, he has not done all his duty by perfecting himself ; for, unless he strongly feels the impulse to perfect others, he cannot be himself perfect, inasmuch as he has overlooked the command, " Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Nor can he have walked in the ways of God, whose attribute of goodness makes others good. If this be so with regard to those who

are not related to a man, much more does it apply to the case of his own sons and daughters who are a part of himself, for in setting them right he is setting himself right.

One can almost read between the lines of this "counsel of perfection" a pronounced antipathy to the Hegelianism which at the moment bade fair to swamp the Universities of Europe. Aaron ben Abraham, the author of this will (1819), hardly maintains this same high level throughout, yet one other remark of his may be cited, because it is true in itself, and moreover shows how modern circumstances do to some extent tinge the directions of Jewish fathers to their children :—

Enthusiasm is a virtue, but it must be kept under control ; it must not be suffered to become habitual and mechanical. For if a man be enthusiastic from habit, he runs as much risk of being carried wildly to do wrong as of being led to do right, his enthusiasm, and not he, being the master of his will.

Similar brilliant flashes of originality relieve the impression of sameness which a casual inspection of the later ethical wills is apt to leave. Nor do I wish to imply that the earlier specimens are quite free from the same imputation. From the middle of the eleventh century onwards, the Jewish ethical wills begin to be largely composed of moral maxims derived from the Talmud and other Rabbinical literature. But though the jewels be more or less identical, the setting varies very considerably; and I fancy that in ethical literature generally it will be found that original thought displays itself in form rather than in substance. Besides, it is a point of considerable interest to observe what passages of the Talmud were the favourites of individual Jews. The Talmud is so rich in ethical maxims that there was little opportunity left for independent creation. Similarly the Midrash, with its wealth of fantastic imagery and poetical beauty, is partially responsible for the stunting of poetical originality among Jews. Their whole efforts were directed towards imitation ; and invention, at first unnecessary, ended by being

impossible. With ethics, however, the process commenced later than with poetry, and from the Jewish ethical wills might very easily be gathered many fine thoughts finely expressed, which bear all the marks of pronounced originality.

It is a serious problem to decide what value to attach to death-bed utterances. Nicolas, the author of *Testamenta Vetusta*, writing, it is true, of wills of another class, maintains that "the corporal suffering under which a man often labours when he makes his last testament; the solemn invocation with which it commences; the associations which it cannot fail to excite; and, above all, the recollection that the important document will not see the light until he is removed from that sphere where alone falsehood can be successful or vice be triumphant—tend to render the statements in wills of unquestionable veracity." Yet men have been known to leave by will property that they never possessed, and the question of credibility becomes intensified when the bequests deal with moral rather than material treasures. Men may feel disposed to act up to their character at the last; they would fain have the curtain fall on an effective tableau. The recorded sayings of great men at the brink of the grave are quoted and re-quoted as forming the key to character. This is hardly true without qualification. They are the key, not to character, but to the person's conception of his own character—a vastly different affair. Self-portraiture, to be faithful, must not be self-conscious. A man who has been a hypocrite all his life is not more likely to be displaying his real self when death is nigh, for he has the less chance of being found out. When Antonio de Montezinos, otherwise Aaron Levi, repeatedly asserted on his death-bed, in 1644, that he had met native Jews in South America who were the descendants of the Ten Tribes, and more aboriginal than the Indians, he was no more correct in his assertion than when he repeated the same fable at earlier periods. It was natural that so emotional an enthusiast as

Manasseh ben Israel should seize upon Antonio's statement as the basis of his Messianic fantasies, and build "Israel's Hope" upon this unstable foundation.[1]

But these objections lose their weight when applied to the wills with which we are now dealing. In the Biblical and Talmudical periods, it is true, the dying father summoned his children and addressed to them words of counsel. But the Jewish testaments of a more formal character were for the greater part of an altogether different origin. They were very rarely dictated immediately before the death of their authors, and only exceptionally emanated literally from the sick-room. Mostly they were written calmly in old age, when death was in the course of nature not far distant, or they were composed at times when their authors were about to start on long and dangerous journeys, and felt but scanty hope of ever again beholding their families. The Gaon Elijah of Wilna sent his will as a letter to his household when on the point of setting out for Palestine, and at a much earlier date Joseph Ibn Caspi acted in parallel fashion. A native of Provence, where the streams of Jewish law and Arabian philosophy came to a feeble confluence, Ibn Caspi proceeded from Argentières to Egypt in 1312, with the object of studying in the school of his intellectual master, Maimonides. He thought that where the tree had grown he would find its fruit. But he was disappointed in this hope, and turned his face homewards. In 1332 we find him in Valencia, where he formed the intention of journeying southward, having heard that there were great scholars in Fez. Perchance he might at last discover a teacher or a companion in his studies, or when his thoughts were more sanguine he even dreamt of finding a disciple. Before leaving Valencia he despatched to his son a noble letter containing his ethical will, for he feared that death might overtake him before he had ended his long and

[1] Graetz, *Geschichte*, x. 97.

wearisome search after congenial minds. Perhaps he felt less isolated when he had taken steps to ensure that his son at least would, on growing to maturity, possess the means of gaining an insight into his father's heart. These instances are the rule; it is entirely exceptional for the will to have been produced immediately before death. A pathetic interest attaches to the testament of Masus ben Judah Loeb, who in the opening lines complains of his weakness with a foreboding all too soon realised. Before he had formally closed the document death surprised him, and he left his work complete in its very incompleteness.[1] So far, however, is this from being more than an unusual phenomenon, that several testaments bear clear traces of having been composed many years before the authors' deaths. Some of them, indeed, must have been written piecemeal, for it is otherwise hard to account for the repetition of the same sentiments that will often recur in the body of one single document. Occasionally it is stated in so many words that the author added and super-added ethical codicils.[2] The length of others, again, precludes the supposition that they could have been hastily compiled; some being formal treatises of considerable proportions. Where, for instance, the writer employs the alphabetical arrangement, we often find two or even three such ethical alphabets, the implication being that all but the first series were afterthoughts. Judah Ibn Tibbon even concludes with a distinct promise of adding to his counsels for his son if opportunity served.

Of these testaments, some were obviously written for publication,[3] and with a passionate eagerness for post-

[1] Israel Luepschuetz also appears to have been interrupted by death, for he intended to address each of his children individually, and does not do so.

[2] The testament of Solomon Kluger really consists of four separate documents. Sometimes (see *e.g.* the Prague edition, 1783, of S. Hurwitz's testament) a will is printed to fill up a vacant space in another book.

[3] Naphtali Cohen, Abraham Danzig, and some others, expressly direct that their testaments were to be printed.

humous reputation, betray a striving after effect and halachic ingenuity. But most of them are charmingly simple and naïve. They were intended for the absolutely private use of children and relatives, or of some beloved disciple who held the dearest place in his master's regard The publication of many of these documents must naturally be quite accidental, and a large number of them—apart from those irreparably lost—still lie unprinted in the possession of the authors' families, or among the MS. treasures of public and private libraries. From time to time the latter are printed, as *e.g.*, two very important testaments by Judah and Jacob Asheri, which Mr. Schechter[1] edited from a British Museum MS. in 1885. Historically considered, these are among the most valuable in the whole collection.

Accident, however, is not the only decisive circumstance in the printing or non-printing of ethical testaments. To some children, the last directions of a father are sacred; to give them to the world would be to profane them. To others, the very sincerity and excellence of their fathers' counsels is a motive for allowing others to share in a treasure which they feel it selfish to hoard up for their own exclusive use. Intended for them alone, they publish them "in order to give merit to many." In the case of distinguished men, of famous scholars and Rabbis of repute, pressure has often been brought to bear to induce publication on the part of the surviving members of the family. Both of these courses have their justification. In a sense, ethical testaments are private communications which ought not to be published without sufficient reason. Indeed, in printing hitherto inedited צוואות, I feel almost as though engaged in the desecration of the dead. But it is no mummified and shapeless skeleton that is unrolled, it is a fresh and animate form, speaking with a living voice,

[1] It is impossible for me adequately to thank Mr. Schechter for the help he has rendered me. Without his assistance this Essay would not have been written; but I am solely responsible for the mistakes.

I can, I repeat, sympathise with those who have refused to give to the world private and confidential communications. But their privacy and naïvete add to their value and their interest. They are the clearest revelation of the man's innermost feelings, for he mostly had no reason to think that his words would be revealed at all. I have sometimes gained a deeper insight into an author's opinions by reading his testament than from all his other published writings. Joseph Ibn Caspi never so ably enunciated his conception of the rights of philosophy nor so unanswerably enforced them as in his last will and testament. Alexander Suesskind nowhere else so clearly manifested the stern sensitiveness of his otherwise gentle disposition, which restrained him from fondling his own children. "I never kissed my children nor took them in my arms," he says, "so as not to accustom them to silly talk, such as people are in the habit of addressing to the young." Was there ever a more naïve self-revelation than this? On the other hand, Naphtali Cohen's simple and perfect affection for his wife comes out very clearly in his ethical will. This Rabbi of Posen, who died in 1719, addresses her as follows:—

> My beloved Esther, once from our great love we clasped hands and mutually promised that when either of us two died, the other would pray to die soon afterwards, that we might quit the world together. But this wish was not right, and you have my pardon if you live a hundred years. I altogether undo our compact. If you die first, which God forbid, you must do the same. I ask you not to marry again, though I know I need not say it; but I add the words out of my overwhelming love for you.

It would be hard, again, to find a more bitter, and, at the same time, pathetic expression of an isolation verging on misanthropy than is contained in Saul Hirschel's short and striking testament. In their respective wills, too, we realise Judah Asheri's honourable reluctance to accept a salary for his services as Rabbi; Eleazar the Levite's pet aversion to slander and gossip, together with his pro-

nounced taste for cleanliness; Jacob Asheri's and Abraham Danzig's fondness for *dinim*—though in this they but reflect the tendency of their published works; Ibn Tibbon's keen affection for his books, and relish for literary style; the pseudonymous Judah Chasid's piety, that o'erleaps itself and falls into superstition; S. Kluger's unparalleled honesty, that induced him to order the restoration to their owners of all the books he had borrowed; and more generally, the devotion of the Spanish school to intellectual culture, with a certain display of cold indifference to the ordinary affairs of life, and on the other hand, the predilection of the warmer and more human German school for practical morals and the common concerns of everyday existence. These, and a host of other deep-seated convictions and quaint turns of thought, of curious habits, and equally curious aversions, are revealed in these ethical wills, which may seem, from their designation, to offer so profitless and arid a field for inquiry. There is thus no need for further explanation why so many of these little documents—"small in quantity, but great in quality," to use the favourite motto inscribed on their Hebrew title-pages—have enjoyed a wide popularity. Some of them, especially those that give a conventional presentation of Judaism, have been again and again printed, and new editions are not only constantly appearing, but in some cases these exhortations have been added to the Prayer-book as supplementary devotional exercises.[1]

But whatever the passing indications of contemporary manners, whatever the unexpected touches regarding men

[1] So popular must these testaments have become that we even find them made the subject of jargon novels. דעם פאטערס צוואה (Wilna, 1887) turns on the story of a son who was bidden by his father to adopt a holy and religious life, and to spend his years in performing religious offices and good deeds; and the moral is to enforce the importance of obeying such testamentary mandates. In the Midrash עשרת הדברות a father orders his son, Quaker-like, not to take an oath under any circumstances, and the adventures of the son consequent on this prohibition are narrated (Jellinek, *Beth Hamidrash*, I., 72).

and things—and these testaments are a rich mine for the whole range of Jewish *minhagim* or customs—important though these features clearly are, the chief interest in ethical wills is, as their name implies, an *ethical* interest. Zunz quotes a remark of Prof. Hirt, who patronisingly cast a glance at the fourteenth century testament of Asheri, and declared that the ethical principles enunciated by this Jew were superior to what one might have expected even from the Christians of his age. I cannot help thinking that this surprised utterance merely puts into words a delusion shared by many besides Hirt; yet as a matter of fact, it is hard to speak calmly of the magnitude and purity of Jewish ethical literature. To attempt adequately to characterise it lays one open to the charge of prejudiced exaggeration. Our ethical literature belongs to no one period. In some branches of Jewish literature there are unhappily, in the ages following the close of the Talmud, wide chasms hewn out by the constraining hand of circumstance. Often the wedge was forged from within, often in an external workshop. There have been comparatively long periods during which the Jews produced neither poets nor philosophers, neither imaginative writers nor historians; long and dark periods, during which the light of science was obscured, and the refinements of literary style and culture obliterated or ignored. These gaps are inexpressibly sad, but they would have been sadder still in their practical effects, but that they were all bridged over by a broad and solid structure against which the friction of internal faction and the stress of external storm were equally powerless. There is hardly any "local colouring" in the arches of this ethical bridge, there is absolutely no variation in its high moral level. Whether the particular moralist be philosopher or "Stock-Talmudist," whether he hail from a country in which the Jew was persecuted, or from one in which he was free; whether he wrote at a time of general enlightenment or at a period of wide ignorance; whether

the inspiring fount of his thought were Aristotle or Hegel, though the details will reflect differences in environment, though the style of expression varies with prevailing taste, though the abstract conception of Judaism often changes, yet the Jewish code of morality is without variation, and the noblest ideals form that code. In all the ethical testaments that I have read I do not recollect to have come across a sordid thought or hateful sentiment; intellectually, even religiously, some are low, morally all are high. In these confidential pronouncements may, I think, be sought and found a most effective theoretical vindication of the Jewish character. The conventional idea of the Jew receives a severe blow from the perusal of these pure utterances. This point is well illustrated by what may be termed the burlesque testaments, two or three of which may here be alluded to. In 1703 was printed a will supposed to emanate from Haman. He bids his children to abstain from giving charity as it is not profitable, and to avoid robbing the poor because they possess nothing worth stealing. Canaan, the son of Ham, who is himself the type of unfilial irreverence, is again brought on the stage in the Talmud as the spokesman of equally detestable thoughts. "Five things Canaan ordered his sons: Love one another; love robbery; love deceit; hate your masters; never speak the truth."[1] Revenge, as in the Hamiliar legend, is the motive of the testament of Amalek's ancestress. "The cause of the hatred of Amalek was the outcome of the commands of Timna, sister of Lotan, to her offspring. She was anxious to marry one of the seed of Abraham, but none would accept her. She accordingly became the concubine of Eliphaz, son of Esau (who was of Abraham's race), and bare Amalek. She told him all that had occurred, and directed him with a binding oath to retain this hatred for Israel eternally."[2] Thus, both positively and negatively,

---

[1] *Pesachim*, 113 *a*.

[2] An otherwise unknown Midrash in the צרור המור 75 *b*.

the Jewish ethical testaments can be subjected to the most minute moral tests. As I have mentioned burlesque testaments, it may be interesting if I allude to the Hebrew will in which Aristotle announces to his pupil, Alexander the Great, a complete revolution in his opinions. He is dying, he writes, and before the letter reaches its destination the author will be no more. Let Alexander destroy all his (Aristotle's) works, and be no longer led astray by false ideas. "If it lay in my power I would collect all my writings and destroy them, for God has opened my eyes, and I now see that the Law of Moses is the only truth" (*Chain of Tradition*, 83). Perhaps this may be paralleled by the closing words of Chaucer's Parson's Tale, in which the poet professes to recant his "worldly vanities," by which he probably meant the *Troilus*. Maimonides too was credited with a similar recantation of his philosophy. The tendency in every age is to make the views of great authorities square with current popular views, and if that be an impossible reconciliation, so much the worse for the great authorities.

The earliest extant ethical will, written as an *independent* document, is that composed about 1050 by Eleazar ben Isaac of Worms, commonly known as Eleazar the Great.[1] The eleventh and twelfth centuries supply few examples, but from the thirteenth century onwards there is no dearth of צוואות. It is possible that the renewed popularity of these testaments among Jews may have been due to Mohammedan influence. The Arabs held ethical wills (included under the general designation *Wasaya*) in such high esteem, that some were falsely ascribed by them to revered sages, like Lokman, and even to the foremost Greek philosophers.[2] A similar process, that of wrongly

[1] An interesting article on the subject of Ethical Wills was published by Dr. Neubauer, in the *Jewish Chronicle*, December 4th, 1885. Some striking contrasts between this testament of Eleazar and a Christian poem of the 13th century are to be found in Güdemann's *Cultur*, etc., 1880, page 121.

[2] See Steinschneider (Preface to *Testament of Ibn Tibbon*), and D'Herbelot (*Bibl. Orient.*, sub voce Vassaia.)

placing the names of the patriarchs at the head of wills grew up among the Jews, and thus we find a pseud-epigraphic testament of Naphtali,[1] as well as the Christian Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The view that Mohammedan impulse aided in popularising the ethical will among mediæval Jewish writers is supported by the fact that among the first to resume the fashion were Jewish philosophers of the Spanish school, who had intimate relations with Mohammedan civilisation. Among Christians on the other hand I find no clear indication that the fashion ever became popular.[2] Still the clergy often from their death-beds gave parting precepts to their brethren. From the earliest instances I may cite the case of Bishop Egwin, who, "before his exit, called together his monks and other disciples, and having exhorted them to perseverance in the way of truth and perfection, and to despise the transitory felicity of this world," died in 717. Abbot Gildas, immediately before his demise, for seven days gave moral and religious exhortations to his disciples and the death of Joachim de Flore was preceded by a similar function in the little convent of San Martino. In the preambles of many Christian wills—in England the custom, I believe, became less general in the eighteenth century—may be found declarations of faith, charitable bequests, legacies to provide poor maidens with marriage dowries, and directions as to burial, such as frequently occur in Jewish ethical testaments.

But I have advisedly spoken of the *resumption* by Jews of the fashion in the eleventh century, for the earlier Jewish literature proves that from an ancient date the ethical will was a well-established institution among the Hebrews. The Bible contains many such counsels.

[1] This, as Dr. Berliner informs me, is now published in the Jerusalem edition of the היכלות.

[2] Poems, however, containing rules of morals and of etiquette were current. See *e.g.* Dr. Furnivall's interesting *Babees Book* and Dr. Bülbring's introduction to Defoe's *English Gentleman*.

Prominently among these may be mentioned the blessings of Jacob, the dying requests of Joseph to his brethren, the addresses of Moses to the people of Israel, the advice of David to his son Solomon, the restriction laid by Jonadab, the son of Rechab, upon his children against the use of wine, and his exhortation to dwell in tents, and the injunction of the prophet of Bethel on his sons: "When I am dead, then bury me in the sepulchre wherein the man of God is buried; lay my bones beside his bones" (1 Kings xiii. 31). In several of these passages the verb used is some form of צוה (lit. "to command"), and in later times there has been a tendency to interpret the verb in a restricted sense, so that צוה, comes to mean "to give a צוואה," *i.e.*, to leave an ethical will. When Isaiah prophesies the death of Hezekiah, he bids him צו לביתך, and the meaning may be, "Give your household directions for their conduct after your death." There can be little doubt that this is the signification of Deut. xxxii. 46, when Moses says, "Set your heart upon all the words which I testify unto you this day, *which ye shall command your children.*" Even more striking in this connection is a passage in Genesis (xviii. 19), where God says of Abraham, "For I have known him in order that he may command his children and his household after him that they may keep the way of the Lord." The latter text, in particular, has been made the basis of an actual rubric, to be found in modern Jewish codes, enjoining on every father, as a bounden duty, to leave moral exhortations for his children's guidance. This feeling is well brought out in the following Midrash: "Jacob felt that his end was near, and besought the divine mercy; 'Ruler of the world!' he prayed, 'take not my soul until I have exhorted my children.' And his wish was granted."[1]

[1] "I came very near dying suddenly in the bath, and I was with difficulty revived and rescued fromt he sad fate of passing away without צוואה or confession." (Joel Shamariah.) "Love to one's children is shown by leaving them a testament," says the *Orchath Zadikim*. Cf. *Ma'bar Yabok*, Ch. viii.

The Apocrypha still further develops the ethical testament. The dying address of Mattathias to his five sons, recorded in the First Book of the Maccabees, introduces no new features; but another book of the Apocrypha deserves more attention, viz., that containing the story of Tobit. The fourth chapter of that book is in itself a complete and beautiful ethical will. Here the צוואה has reached its highest development, and, unless I am gravely mistaken, Tobit's directions to his son, who is about to leave him in search of fortune and of a wife, have inspired the writers of many a later testament. Thus, besides being intrinsically one of the noblest in Jewish literature, the fourth chapter of Tobit is in truth the earliest specimen of the Jewish ethical testament, if by that term be understood the elaborate form which post-Talmudic authors have so successfully cultivated.

The death-scenes in the Talmud, in the course of which many fine ethical precepts occur, are too numerous for me to quote them all at length. Rabbi Akiba laid upon his son seven injunctions, which are a fair summary of practical wisdom :[1]—"Dwell not in the highest part of the town to study Torah. Dwell not in a place whose governors are scholars. Do not return home unexpectedly, and much less should you pay sudden visits to your friends. Go not about with bare feet. Rise early and eat—in the summer because of the heat, in winter because of the cold. Make your Sabbath as a week-day (in respect of food), rather than accept help from others. Exert yourself together with him on whom the hour smiles." The same Rabbi also laid five injunctions on R. Simon ben Yochai, when confined in prison :—"Teach me Torah, my master," said he to Akiba. "Nay," he replied. "If you do not," said Simon, "I will tell my father, and he will denounce you to the Government." "My son," said Akiba, "more ardently than the calf desires to suck, the heifer desires to suckle it."

[1] *Pesachim*, 112.

"Then," cried Simon, "who is it that is in danger? Is it not the calf?" And Akiba acceded to his request. Rabbi when about to die, called for his sons and for the wise men of Israel, and bade the latter not to mourn for him too long. Akabya ben Mahalalel differed from contemporary authorities in four points of law, and, despite offers of honour and position, refused to abandon his views. After his death a stone was placed on his coffin to mark the ban under which he had lived. On his death-bed he summoned his son, and said:—"My son, follow the majority in those four points." "But, my father, why did you yourself not do so?" "Because I derived my opinions from many authorities, and, therefore, maintained my tradition just as my opponents did. You, however, have only the solitary view of your father to guide you; hence you must discard it, and adopt the decision of the majority." "My father, speak on my behalf to thy comrades." "No, my son! I will not plead for you. Your own acts must bring you whether honour or disgrace."[1] Eleazar ben Azariah was visited by Akiba and other Rabbis near his death. He discoursed on matters of the Law, prophesied Akiba's fate, and, pronouncing on a legal point the verdict, "*Pure*," "his soul departed in purity."[2] In old age many a Rabbi was asked to give some reasonable explanation of his longevity. All offer moral or religious explanations. "I never slept in the house of learning." "I never laughed at a companion's mishap." "I never used nicknames." "Never did I seek honour at the cost of another's disgrace." "I never lay down to rest while an angry word had been left unpar-

---

[1] *Eduyoth*, v. 7. A later parallel is related of Isaac Albalia, who, when near his end, ordered his young son, Baruch, to betake himself to Isaac Alfasi, with whom he had differed. "Ask him to bury our quarrel, and to teach thee. I know that he will accept the charge." The father's confidence was well placed, for Alfasi received his opponent's son with cordiality. (*Juchasin*, ed. Philipowski, 214, and ספר הקבלה of Abraham ben David, ed. Neubauer, p. 77.)

[2] *Sanhedrin*, 68*a*.

doned."[1] Said R. Joshua ben Levi to his sons, "Be very careful to show respect to an old man who from stress (of age or trouble) has forgotten his learning."[2]

As I have previously remarked, the earliest ethical testament after the close of the Talmud is the eleventh-century work of Eleazar ben Isaac, of Worms, and, appropriately enough, it borrows largely from the sayings of the Rabbis. Some of the less familiar of his precepts are here cited:—

"Think not of evil; for evil-thinking leads to evil-doing. . . . Take particular heed of cleanliness. Purify thy body, the dwelling-place of thy soul. . . . Do not talk in the college during the lecture, but listen to the words of the wise. Despise no man; for many pearls may be found in a poor man's cloak. . . . Be zealous in visiting the sick, for sympathy will lighten his sickness; but stay not too long, for his malady is heavy enough without thee. Enter cheerfully, and speak cheerfully. . . . Be ever ready to follow the dead to the grave. For him who does a kindness for nothing God shows unrequited favours. . . . Relieve the poor secretly, not openly; feed them at thy table, but do not watch them while they eat. . . . My son, prepare for thine own journey, and light the lamp to show thee the way. Leave it not to those who come after thee; perhaps they will be unable. . . . Be not too much dreaded in thine own house, for this is the cause of many evils. . . . Talk not during the meal, not even words of Torah. . . . Do not reveal thy secrets to thy wife. . . . Be faithful to every one. . . . Eat herbs rather than beg; beg only of God. . . . Put thy sins in one scale and thy penitence in another: they will balance. Add confession and prayer, and they will turn the balance in thy favour. . . . Sleep not with the light of the moon on thy face, especially when the moon is new. . . . Give of all thy food a portion to God. Let God's portion be the best, and give it to the poor."

If it be genuine, the testament of Maimonides to his son Abraham comes next in chronological sequence. The latter

---

[1] *Megilla* 26-7. Dr. Lerner kindly suggested this application of the passage. Cf. also *Kethuboth* 103*a*, B. Bathra 147, ספר היובלים Chs. 20 and 22. T. Jer. Kilaim, 14. Many interesting statements bearing on the last moments of different Rabbis occur in the *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan*. See Chs. xiv., xviii. xix. (end), xxv., Additions to ed. Schechter, pp. 158 and כ.

[2] *Berachoth* 8*b*. Very interesting is *Berachoth* 28*b*.

portion of this composition looks very much like a spurious attempt to account for the fact that Maimonides makes little or no reference to Rashi and the French school in his works. It consists of a strong denunciation of this school, and recommends that exclusive attention be devoted to the commentaries of Ibn Ezra and Maimonides; but the earlier section of the testament is less unworthy of the great philosopher, and accordingly I offer a few extracts from it:—

Fear the Lord but love him also; for fear only restrains a man from sin, while love stimulates him to good. . . . Accustom yourselves to habitual goodness, for a man's character is what habit makes it. . . . The perfection of the body is a necessary antecedent to the perfection of the soul, for health is the key that unlocks the inner chamber. When I bid you attend to your bodily and moral welfare, my object is to open for you the gates of heaven. . . . Measure your words, for the more your words the more your errors. Ask for explanations of what you do not understand, but let it be done at a fitting moment and in fitting language. . . . Speak in refined language, with clear utterance and gentle voice. Speak aptly to the subject as one who wishes to learn and to find the truth, not as one whose aim is to quarrel and to conquer. . . . Learn in your youth, when your food is prepared by others, while heart is still free and unencumbered with cares, ere the memory is weakened. For the time will come when you will be willing to learn but will be unable. Even if you be able, you will labour much for little result; for your heart will lag behind your lips and when it does keep pace, it will soon forget. . . . If you find in the Law or the Prophets or the Sages a hard saying which you cannot understand, which appears subversive of some principle of the religion, or altogether absurd, stand fast by your faith and attribute the fault to your own want of intelligence. Despise not your religion because you are unable to understand one difficult matter. . . . Love truth and uprightness—the ornaments of the soul—and cleave to them; prosperity so obtained is built on a sure rock. Keep firmly to your word; let not a legal contract or witnesses be more binding than your verbal promise even privately made. Disdain reservations and subterfuges, sharp practices and evasions. Woe to him who builds his house thereon! . . . Bring near those that are far off, humble yourselves to the lowly and show them the light of your countenance. In your joys make the desolate share, but put no one to the blush by your gifts. . . . I have seen the white become

black, the low brought still lower, families driven into exile, princes deposed from their high estate, cities ruined, assemblies dispersed, the pious humiliated, the honourable held lightly and despised—all on account of quarrelsomeness. Glory in forbearance, for in that is true strength and victory. . . Speech, which distinguishes man from beasts, was a loving gift which man uses best in thinking, and thanking and praising God. Ungrateful would we be to return evil for good and to utter slanders or falsehoods. . . Eat not excessively nor ravenously. Work before you eat and rest afterwards. From a man's behaviour at a public meal you can discern his character. Often have I returned hungry and thirsty to my house, because I was afraid when I saw the disgraceful conduct of those around me. . . The total abstinence from wine is good, but I will not lay this on you as an injunction. Yet break wine's power with water, and drink it for nourishment, not for mere enjoyment. . . . At gambling the player always loses. If he indeed wins money, he is weaving a spider's web round himself. . . . Dress as well as your means will allow, but spend on your food less than you can afford. . . Honour your wives, for they are your honour. Withhold not discipline from them, and let them not rule over you.

Judah Ibn Tibbon, the father of Jewish translators, adopts in his last injunctions to his son a tone of affectionate querulousness. A father is not always the best teacher of his children; his very love may make him unjust and even cruel. He expects so much, he is so nervously anxious; and his impatience contrasts unfavourably with that of a more indulgent because less interested instructor. Judah does not go so far as this, but his intense love for his son probably accounts for his peevishness without necessarily justifying it. Sobieski was asked in extremity to make a will but he laughed the suggestion to scorn. "The misfortune of royalty," said the King, "is, that we are not obeyed while we are alive; can it be expected then that we should be obeyed after we are dead?" Ibn Tibbon justified his testamentary injunctions from the very reverse argument. "Though thou didst not follow me when I was near, obey me when I am far from thee." He then proceeds to give a series of counsels well deserving of reproduction in full; but a few specimen passages

must suffice. The first of my quotations is worthy of Ruskin.

Avoid bad society, make thy books thy companions, let thy book-cases and shelves be thy gardens and pleasure-grounds. Pluck the fruit that grows therein, gather the roses, the spices and the myrrh. If thy soul be satiate and weary, change from garden to garden, from furrow to furrow, from sight to sight. Then will thy desire renew itself and thy soul be satisfied with delight. . . In all that thou dost, take counsel with a friend on whose affection and prudence thou canst rely. . . Contend not with men, and meddle not in a quarrel that is not thine . . Let not the greatest prospect of gain blind thee to danger; be not as the bird that sees the grains but not the net. . . Read every week the Sabbath portion in Arabic to become familiar with Arabic terms. . . Honour thyself, thy household and thy children, by providing proper clothing as far as thy means allow, for it is unbecoming in a man, when he is not at work, to go shabbily dressed. Withhold from thy belly, and put it on thy back. . . . At thy wedding, thou wast honoured for my sake; endeavour henceforth to merit honour for thine own. . . . Thou mayst accept fees from the rich, but heal the poor gratuitously. Examine thy drugs and medicinal herbs regularly once a week, and do not apply a remedy which thou hast not thoroughly tested. . . If thou writest aught, revise it afterwards, for slips creep in, even into a short letter. Be careful as to grammatical accuracy in the conjugations and genders, for a man's mistakes are ever quoted against him. Endeavour to cultivate a concise and elegant style; attempt no rhymes, unless your versification is perfect. Use no unusual constructions or foreign words. Improve thy handwriting, for beauty of handwriting, the excellence of pen, paper and ink are an index of the writer's worth. Thou hast seen books in my handwriting and knowest how the son of R. Jacob thy master expressed his admiration in thy presence. . . . Be careful in thy diet. It is a disgrace for a physician to suffer himself from intemperance. Shall a man be able to cure others and not be able to heal himself? All thy sickness has been due to eating unwholesome food. Jonadab restrained his sons from many pleasures; I only forbid thee what is injurious. . . . Honour thy wife, for she is intelligent and modest. She is an excellent housewife and no spendthrift. If thou hast to give an order or utter reproof let thy words be gently spoken. . . Be not indifferent to any ailment that comes upon thee or thy children; do not say that it is a trifle; but apply immediate remedies. . . Take particular care of thy books; cover thy shelves with a fine covering, guard them against damp and mice.

Have a complete list of them written out, and examine thy Hebrew books once a month, thy Arabic books every two months and bound volumes once a quarter. If a book is lent to any one make a memorandum of it before it leaves thy house, and when it is returned cancel the entry. Every Passover and Tabernacles call in all books out on loan . . . Enquire after thy sisters in all thy letters and send thy love to them. Read this testament once a day, morning or evening. Take no note of anything that men may say against me, but be silent.

Ibn Tibbon's testament, written about 1190, concludes with a long poetical summary in which chief prominence is given to ethical and religious rules of conduct. Samue , let it be added, gained considerable reputation as a translator, but neither he nor his father was exactly famous for literary style. Maimonides, it is true, spoke well of both, yet one can hardly help regretting that the creation of a Hebrew philosophic terminology was not undertaken by the great master himself.

Moses ben Nachman's testament, which is in the form of a letter to his son, belongs to the middle of the thirteenth century. It was not intended exclusively for private use, and, moreover, its brevity has tended to popularise it. But it well deserves its position in the regard of its readers for its unaffected, if exaggerated, eulogy of humility. Unlike Ibn Tibbon, Nachmanides was content to enjoin on his son the duty of perusing the letter once every week.

Accustom yourself to speak gently to all men at all times, and thus you will avoid anger, which leads to so much sin. . . . Humility is the first of virtues ; for if you think how lowly is man, how great is God, you will fear him and avoid sinfulness. On the humble man rests the divine glory ; the man that is haughty to others denies God. Look not boldly at one whom you address. . . . Regard every one as greater than thyself. . . . Remember always that you stand before God, both when you pray and when you converse with others. . . . Think before you speak. . . . Act as I have bidden you, and your words, and deeds, and thoughts, will be honest, and your prayers pure and acceptable before God.

The fourteenth century presents us with several important testaments, one of which is here published in the original Hebrew for the first time. The Asheri family, in

the older members of which filial affection seems to have been strong, provide three of these ethical wills. *The Ways of Life*, by Asher ben Yechiel, the famous Posek father of famous Posekim, has this especial interest, that it displays in one and the same man a whole-hearted devotion to the legal side of Judaism concurrently with a full appreciation of the importance of its ethical teachings. Asheri was not the only Jew who was at once lawyer and moralist. A son of Germany, he transplanted his country with him to Spain, but though an involuntary exile, his tribulation bears far from bitter fruit in his testament. The lesson of humility and self-surrender which Nachmanides and Asheri inculcate, was being taught at this period by a sterner teacher than they, viz., deadly persecution. Yet Eleazar ben Samuel, whose testament will shortly be given in full, a man who lived and died in the very thick of the dire persecutions that followed the Black Death, utters no word of anger against the persecutors, but counsels his children to deal with Jew and non-Jew alike in a spirit of honesty and friendliness.

Asheri's testament consists of 132 maxims, which in some editions are arranged in daily and weekly portions. It contains a summary of ethics, and, therefore, quotation must be unsatisfactory.

Avoid with utmost rigour pride, hypocrisy, falsehood, mockery, slander and anger. . . . Do not perform the law because of the reward, nor avoid sin because of the punishment, but serve God from love. . . Sleep not overmuch, but rise with the birds. . . Rejoice not excessively, for remember how frail your life is. . . . Look not at him who is richer, but at him who is poorer ; look not at him who is less wise, but at him who is wiser and better than you. . . . Be not hasty to reply to offensive utterances ; raise not your hand against another even if he curse your father and mother in your presence. . . . Give no cause for resentment to a non-Jew, for there is none of them who has not his hour, and their wrath lasts for ever. . . . Associate not with an evil man, a sinner, a man of passionate temper, or a fool, lest disgrace come also upon thee. . . . Do not in secret what you would be ashamed to do in public, and say not, Who will see me? Work to gain your livelihood ; trust

to the help of no man. Trust not in your wealth, for wealth raises envious enemies. Be not unkind or disrespectful to your wife; if you put her off from you with your left hand, draw her to you again with your right hand forthwith. . . . Utter naught but the truth; be faithful to all men, even to non-Jews.

The testament of Asheri's son Judah, written like some of the others in rhymed prose, is an important historical document, which, given to the world by Mr. Schechter, has already been turned to account by Güdemann, and probably by others. Yet, as its value is rather historical than ethical, I must refrain, however reluctantly, from citing lengthy extracts from this very remarkable piece of autobiography. He exhorts his sons, not because they are worse than their contemporaries, but because he would have them like those of former generations. "Better is open rebuke than silent love." He tells how in infancy he suffered from a disease of the eye, and was nearly healed by a Jewish woman who rescued him from total blindness, but died before the cure was fully effected. Driven by persecution to Toledo, his father became Rabbi there, and Judah succeeded to the office twenty-three years later. When in doubt as to accepting the post, he opened the Scriptures at 1 Chron. xvii. 2, and followed the favourable omen.

My parents, by reason of the weakness of my eyes, left me to do my will; they never chastised or rebuked me. How, then, shall I rebuke others? . . . I cannot sternly address my children to their face, lest I make them blush, but my heart impels me to write this letter for them to read once a month. . . . Why do you not walk in the ways of your fathers? why is the fear of God not constantly before your eyes. . . You mix with unfit companions, you do not honour your parents. . . What have I left undone that a father could do? You have been fed and tended; you have many books, and all my thoughts were for you. . . You were not brought into the world to eat and drink, and to dress in fine clothes. . . Read aloud passages from ethical books regularly, but with the intention of practising what you read. . . Never utter a falsehood. There was a man in our family (Eliakim) who

was always held up as a model for truth. . . Play no games for money, for gambling is robbery. . . Avoid scandal, for it leads to many sins. Most men are scandal-mongers. Neither praise overmuch, for that invites depreciatory retorts.[1] . . Eschew pride. A sage was asked, Why do you invariably show respect to all men? He replied, In every one I recognise some quality higher than mine. If he is old, I say he has done more good than I; if richer, he has done more charity; if he be younger than I, he has sinned less, if poorer, he has suffered more; if he be wise I honour him for his wisdom, if he be not wise, then I am the more culpable if I act wrongly. . . . Let your children marry within our family. The women of our family are accustomed to the ways of scholars, and help them to prosecute their studies. They have no luxurious tastes, and do not worry their husbands with extravagant expenditure, and children mostly resemble their mothers. . . . My father introduced in Germany the custom of giving an exact tithe for the poor, and in Toledo he and his children entered into a formal compact to continue the practice. . . . I am very sorry to take a salary from the congregation; I would do without it if I could, but if God be with me, and I can repay the debts incurred through the failure of my partners in business, I may afterwards live without salary, or with only a very little, and the rest might be devoted to educational and religious objects. This would be better than allowing the congregation not to pay me at all, for I should better use the money in this way than they.

The testament of his brother, Jacob Asheri, is shorter and less interesting. He repeats some of his brother's counsels. Like his father, he bids his children avoid excessive talk; strangely enough he forbids the casting of lots, though Judah Asheri, as we have just seen, himself performed an act, "if not of divination, yet as a sign." "Do not," says Jacob Asheri, "indulge in bodily pleasures except to the extent necessary for keeping yourselves healthy for the service of God." It is strange to find the author of the *Turim* counselling his sons not to go in for needless discussion of legal difficulties. It should have been stated above that both these testaments belong to the first half of the

[1] "Too much magnifying of men or matter doth irritate contradiction, and procure envy and scorn." (Bacon on *Praise*).

fourteenth century. Asheri and both his sons seem to have died within a period of twenty years (1327-1349).

The circumstances under which the testament of Joseph Ibn Caspi was written in Elul, 1332, have already been alluded to. Ibn Caspi stands at the opposite pole to the Asheri family; to him philosophy was everything, while they were proudly indifferent to it. Ibn Caspi's testament is controversial, but only in the sense that the presentation of a view warmly upheld by some and violently disliked by others necessarily deals with polemics. Ibn Caspi writes in no bigoted spirit; it would have been a poor recommendation of philosophy to a young and eager mind had the father, himself a distinguished advocate of intellectual culture, betrayed narrowness, or written in a vindictive spirit. He was too securely in the right not to treat with indulgence views he held to be wrong. To those who argued that the end of life was the performance of the "commandments" Ibn Caspi here replies: "True, but then to acquire philosophical insight is the first of these commandments." It was a narrowing of Judaism to make Aristotle's works in Maimonised form the only road to it, and Ibn Caspi's testament inevitably would restrict the number of those who could serve God with truth, for the ordinary mortal is not a philosopher. But he never meant to assert a "categorical imperative." He merely claimed for himself the right to obey the law because his reason justified his faith, while he left to others the right to serve God without a philosophical basis for their faithfulness. Not to believe, but to rationally know that God is, that he is one, to love him and to fear him, are the fundamental principles of Judaism. What, then, becomes of the rest of the laws? All must be kept, for "you cannot observe these four truly without observing all the other laws of God." The ceremonies are profitable both in themselves and for their relation to the fundamental principles. The practical precepts enable man's intellect to assert itself, and aid him to know God. He counsels his son to read the halachic works

of the codifiers Maimonides and Alfasi, but does not attach much importance to familiarity with abstruse points of Rabbinical law. It is no intellectual or spiritual deficiency to be ignorant of these technical points, or of the law regulating disputes in which one is never involved. Altogether he writes with a lucidity not always associated with metaphysics, and with a freedom which proves that he was writing for no unfriendly eyes.

How can I know God, and that he is one, unless I know what knowing means, and what constitutes unity? Why should these things be left to non-Jewish philosophers? Why should Aristotle retain sole possession of treasures that he stole from Solomon?[1] . . . No one really knows the true meaning of loving God and fearing him, unless he is acquainted with natural science and metaphysics, for we love not God as a man loves his wife and children, nor fear him as we would a mighty man. I do not say that all men can reach this intellectual height, but I maintain that it is the degree of highest excellence, though those who stand below it may still be good. Try thou, my son, to attain this degree; yet be not hasty in commencing metaphysical studies, . . and constantly read moral books. . . When you are twenty marry a wife of good family, beautiful in body and character. Look not for a wealthy dowry, as money is only the means to obtain bread to eat and garments to wear. . . . My son, keep from those sciolists to whom philosophy is the handmaid of scoffing. You will prove yourself the better philosopher the more you study the Torah. . . I will confess to you, my son, that though in my youth I learnt a great portion of the Talmud. I did not acquire a knowledge of all the *poskim*, and now that I am old I have often to consult, in the matter of ritual law, Rabbis younger than I am. Why should I be ashamed of this? Can one man be skilled in every work? If I want a golden bowl I go to a goldsmith, and do not blush that he is better able to make it than I am. Once I had guests and a family party, when the luckless handmaiden put a butter spoon into the meat dish. As I knew not the ritual law, hungry and thirsty I went impatiently to the Rabbi. He was seated at his meal eating and drinking wine with his wife and children. I waited at his door until the shades of evening fell, and my soul was near to leave me. He told me the law and I returned home, where my guests and the poor were waiting for me. I related what had occurred, for I did not conceal that I am unskilled in law, though I

[1] See *Mind*, July, 1888, and Graetz's *Monatsschrift*, 1860.

have skill in other branches. Is not the faculty of expounding the knowledge and unity of God of as great weight as familiarity with the law concerning a small butter spoon? I say nothing against those who devote themselves to these halachic matters, but what have the four "commandments of the heart" done that they should be depreciated, or even tabooed? . . . I am asking you to adopt many views that you cannot yet understand. Believe *me* for the present; in time you will appreciate the reasons for things. Let us make a pledge together. *You* do all that I bid you, and *I* undertake that you will enjoy an angelic existence in the world to come. The end of all is, Fear God and keep his commandments, but understand that the latter include not merely practical but also intellectual duties.

A quarter of the century after the above was written there died at Mayence Eleazar the Levite, on the first day of the New Year festival. He was buried on the following day, viz., the 2nd of Tishri, 1357. There are several reasons why I proceed to give a full translation of Eleazar's testament. It is far more representative of its class than any of those from which I have previously quoted. It will give the reader, who may be unfamiliar with the general character of these testaments, a fair impression of the ordinary Jewish ethical will. Eleazar was no great Rabbi, he was a Chazan, and evidently as simple as he was a pure-minded man. Most of the later testaments are variations on one and the same theme, and this of Eleazar, just because of its lack of brilliance or originality, and because it is merely an ordinary specimen of the whole class, may best serve as a type of them all.[1]

These are the things which my sons and daughters shall do at my request. They shall go to the house of prayer morning and evening; they must be careful in the *Tephillah* and the *Shema*. Immediately after the conclusion of the prayers they shall occupy themselves a little with the law, the Psalms, or with deeds of charity. Their business must be conducted honestly, their dealings must be straight-

[1] Dr. Berliner has an interesting article on this testament in the *Jüdische Presse*, 1870, p. 90, etc. My translation was made from a different MS., viz., that contained in the Bodleian Library. Dr. Berliner supplies some valuable references in his article.

forward with Jews or non-Jews. They must be gentle, and prompt to accede to every honourable request that is made of them. They must not talk more than is necessary, and they will thus avoid slander and scoffing. They shall give in charity an exact tithe of their property, and shall never turn away a poor man empty-handed, but they shall give him what they can, be it much or little. If he asks for a lodging over night and they know him not, they shall supply him with money that he pay an inn-keeper. Thus shall they satisfy the demands of the poor in every way that is possible.

My daughters must respect their husbands exceedingly, and they must be always amiable to them; husbands must honour their wives more than themselves.

If they can by any means contrive it, let them live in communities and not in isolation from other Jews, so that my sons and daughters may learn Judaism. Even if compelled to beg for the money to pay a teacher, do not let the young go without this instruction. Marry your children, not too old, to members of respectable families; let not my sons hunt after money by making a low match for that object; but if the family is of low origin only on the side of the mother it does not matter, because Jews always count their descent from the father's side. Let them be careful early on every Friday to prepare everything before the Sabbath begins, while the day is still great, and in winter they shall light the fire before it be dark, in order not to profane the Sabbath. The women must prepare nice candles in honour of the Sabbath. . . As to gambling games, I earnestly entreat my children never to play at them, except on Festivals, and the women on new moons, but without money.[1] My daughters ought not to laugh and speak much with strangers, nor to dance. They ought always to be at home, and not be gadding about. They must not stand at the door (to see what their neighbours are doing). Most strongly I beg, most strictly I command, that the daughters of my house be not, God forbid, without work to do, for idleness leads to sin, but they must spin, or cook, or sew.

I earnestly beg my children[2] to be tolerant and humble to every man, as I was all my life. They must quarrel with none, but seek peace with all their might. Even if they lose money thereby, they must bear their loss and forgive, for God has many ways to sustain men. If any one slanders you do not retaliate by counter-offence, but excuse your calumniators and ask people to be silent about it, and you

---

[1] The MS. is here defective.

[2] Dr. Berliner's MS. refers this only to the daughters; the Bodl. MS. reads "בניי."

yourselves set the example of reticence. Be upright in business affairs, and be not avaricious after other people's wealth.

Now, my sons and daughters, eat and drink only as much as necessary, as our good parents did, who ate moderately. The regular adoption of this course leads to habits of temperance. Be content and happy in your lot. Eat no large and expensive dinners. Our teachers have said, "Method in expenditure is half the cost." But accustom yourselves and wives, your sons and daughters always to wear nice and clean clothes, that God and men may love and honour you. Spend a little more than you can afford in this way, but you must not adopt non-Jewish fashions of dress. Never change the fashions of your fathers in your attire, and let your cloaks be broad without a buckle attached. Accustom yourselves to speak without making vows[1] or swearing to the truth of your assertions, for the breach of vows leads to many ills. Do not say "Gott" unnecessarily, but speak always of the "Creator, blessed be He," and never promise anything without the proviso, "if God wills." Thank God for everything. . . . Be not as dumb cattle that utter no word of gratitude, but thank God for his bounties at the time they occur, and in your prayers let the memory of these personal favours warm your hearts and prompt to especial fervour during the utterance of the communal thanks. When words of gratitude occur in the liturgy pause to silently reflect on the goodness of God to you that day. Be very particular to keep your houses clean and tidy; I always made a point of it, for every injurious condition and sickness and poverty are to be found in houses that are unclean. Be careful with the blessings; accept no divine gift without immediately uttering your thanks. Study the Torah, because it helps the formation of a noble character. Do not scoff, for it begins in chastisement and ends in destruction. Judge every man charitably and use your best effort to find a favourable explanation of conduct however suspicious. On Sabbaths and holidays seek to make happy poor unfortunate widows, and orphans ought always to be at your tables. Avoid gossip, for it leads to slander, hypocrisy and falsehood, all of which are vices abominable in the sight of the Lord. And as you speak no scandal, so listen to none, for if there where no customers there would be no mongers. Accept no invitations to dinner parties except for purposes of מצוה, such as weddings and funerals; and play no games for money, neither with dice nor with anything else. Be one of the first in the Synagogue, do not speak during prayers, but repeat the responses and after the service do acts of kindness which are equivalent to studying the law. I beg of you, my sons, my daughters, and my wife, and the whole

[1] *i.e.*, say "בלי נדר," etc.

congregation, let there be no funeral oration in my honour. Do not carry me on a bier, but wash me clean, comb my hair as in my lifetime, in order that I may go clean to my eternal resting-place, just as I used to go every Friday evening to the Synagogue. Drag me to my grave, and stop every four cubits, that I may get pardon. Put me in the ground at the right hand of my father, and even if it be a little too narrow, I am sure that my father loves me well enough to submit to the inconvenience and to draw me in unto him. If not, put me on his left, or near my mother or grandmother; and if that be not possible, bury me at the side of my daughter.

In striking contrast to the simplicity of the foregoing testament is the elaborate "Letter of Advice" which Solomon Alami dispatched to a pupil from Portugal. As he himself pathetically tells us, he was a participant in the sufferings in 1391, and his testament, written twenty-four years later (in beautiful rhymed prose), gives a very interesting account of the condition of contemporary Judaism. Fly without hesitation, he says, when expatriation is the only means of securing religious freedom; have no regard to your worldly affairs, or to your property, but go forth.[1] Besides the ordinary virtues, among them chastity and continence, Alami strongly inculcates the necessity of decorum in prayer. He laments the low esteem in which the Rabbis were held; and declares that Jews preferred educating their children for the meanest trade rather than devote them to the ministry, so low had it fallen in public opinion. People talked and laughed in Synagogue and ignored the Rabbi's exhortations, who, in fact, often failed to denounce abuses. "See how the leading men of the congregation either doze or talk in Synagogue during the sermon, while the women babble. It is not so in Churches; Christian men and women listen with wrapt attention

[1] "If you should, God forbid," says Alexander Suesskind to his sons "ever actually come to the necessity of becoming martyrs for your faith, from which God deliver you and כל עם הקדוש, meet death with the completest joy, so that God will receive you in the worlds above, and will say: 'Behold what a noble being I created; he spared not his body but bore chastisement or my honour, and gave up his life for the sanctification of my name

while their preachers address them. Christians are dumb, but Jews are deaf when the clergy reprove them." In prayer one should pray not for his own needs, but on behalf of the afflicted; and return good for evil.

Avoid listening to love-songs which excite the passions. If God has graciously bestowed on you the gift of a sweet voice, use it in praising Him. Do not set prayers to Arabic tunes, a practice which has been promoted to suit the taste of effeminate men.

Similarly, he deprecates all attempts to foist Greek philosophy on to the Bible.[1] He strongly upholds the dignity of labour, but he also lays considerable stress on the minor amenities of social intercourse. One must not point, nor stroke one's beard, in company. He enunciates many minute rules for behaviour at meals; enjoining his pupil not to be the first to begin to eat, not to swallow his food ravenously, and to be tidy in his dress and ways. Though he condemns luxurious expenditure in dress and jewellery, he nevertheless keenly feels the hardship of the enforced wearing of a distinctive Jewish attire. He strikes a local note when he deprecates undue consideration for descent. Family pride is a poor substitute for personal merit; it is a reliance on buried predecessors who lie in their graves. The whole of Alami's "Letter" deserves translation, but I could not find space for more than the foregoing summary.

The Jewish ethical testaments are written in Hebrew. To this general statement there is hardly an exception. In later times some of the most widely read have been rendered into German or jargon, such as those of Asher ben Yechiel, Nachmanides, Elijah Wilna, Alexander Suesskind, Judah Chasid, Naphtali Cohen and Moses Sofer. Ibn Tibbon's testament, together with that of Maimonides, were translated into English, but rather as literary curiosities than for devotional use.[2] The testament of the late Chief

[1] Comp. and contrast the 15th century ספר המוסר of Ephraim of Modena (Lyck, 1871).

[2] Israel Luepschuetz bids his sons immediately after the week of

Rabbi, Dr. N. Adler, was recently published in abstract in English, but it was presumably composed in Hebrew. About two years ago the ethical will of a certain Harris Hershfield was published in Kansas City in the vernacular. An undated, but evidently modern, Jewish Testament in Provençal French verse, is possessed by the Library of the British Museum. But so far back as 1410 the will of Don Judah,[1] a Jewish native of Alba de Tormes, was written in Spanish, being dictated by the author from his death bed. It appears that one of his sons was wounded in the massacre of 1391.

> Good and honourable is the man who in his last days and in old age dies to live. God grant it to me; my hope was always in his love. . . . Do not bury me upright or lying down, but a strong chair shall be placed in the grave and my body must be seated thereon facing the east towards the rising sun.

Another ethical will was dictated in the same manner by the dying testator, and is thus given in the words of the bystanders. In 1653 Nathaniel Trabotti lay on his death-bed in Modena, and when after a long sleep he awoke, the spirit of God inspired him, and he called his pupils round his bed, and was to them like a king on his throne. He summoned the heads of the congregation, and, having washed his face and hands and sanctified himself as an angel of God, said: "I am 86 years old, and I know that the owner of the trust is coming to seek it back from me. If I have sometimes rebuked you harshly, forgive me. I did it only to turn you from sin." Then they wept and said, "We know it, and our sins are many. Forgive us for the trials we have caused you." "Fear not," he replied;

---

mourning to translate his testament for the benefit of his daughters, and this is not the only instance. Isaac Levinson wished his will translated into Russian, but that was for legal purposes.

[1] Mr. Joseph Jacobs called my attention to this testament. See, *Amador de los Rios*, II., p. 615. A full translation of the will was kindly made for me by Mrs. Isaac Benoliel. I have to thank Dr. Friedlander for bringing Trabotti's testament under my notice.

" purify your hearts, remove hatred and passion. Support the study of the Law, be merciful to the poor, and open wide your storehouses to them. . . My sight was weak, and you have all come to my house to study to save me from the trouble of walking to and fro to the College. After my death let the study be conducted in the Synagogue. . . Appoint an officer to go every Friday to announce to all Jewish merchants that the Sabbath is nigh, that they may shut their shops. . . Let not the men who idly frequent places of amusement to play dice, or games with the cards which they always carry in their pockets, let them not mention the name of God, as is their wont. If they act honestly and speak the truth with heart and lip, and do not use the divine name wantonly, their sins will be forgiven. . . Those who have bought all the *mitzvoth* for the whole year must pay the amount forthwith to the treasurer. If they refuse they must be brought before the civil courts."

Nathaniel then called for Abraham Gratiano, whom he wished to succeed him; he placed his hands on his head and " imparted his honour to him." He gave directions for the disposal of his property, but the reporter omitted all these as of no importance! The whole of this scene is impressive, and would be more so but that it is obviously an echo of the Talmudic description of the death of Rabbi.

The disregard of money, indicated in the preceding paragraph, is paralleled in many of the testaments. Masus feelingly remarks:—

> Let not your hearts be sore because I cannot leave you any inheritance as other fathers do; but my destiny was not for wealth, and for wealth I never strove. Each day's bread to eat, and clothes to wear, was all I sought to acquire. Naked I came into the world, naked I leave it. Man has other aims, and my testament will teach you what they are.

One point that I have omitted from Trabotti's injunctions will recall a similar direction given by Eleazar the Levite. Trabotti desired that his bier should be roughly

dragged to the grave to chastise his body for his sins. But the bystanders tearfully entreated him to release them from the obligation of dishonouring his remains, and he consented to withdraw the order. But in many of the testaments even more violent measures are seriously suggested. The coffin is sometimes ordered to be thrown to the ground and other indignities to be shown. In order to avoid needless repetitions I will quote the form that these directions take in the will of Masus ben Judah Loeb. Masus not only carries the idea to an excessive length, but supplies the explanation.

At the time when my body is removed from the bed to lie on the ground two shall come, and one shall take my two hands and shall seize me round the neck, one hand with outstretched fingers to the right, the other to the left. He shall make the fingers meet, and press tightly like a cord or cloth, as though carrying out the sentence of execution by strangulation. Some men shall seize me by the legs roughly, and shall lift me out of the bed, and shall throw me on the ground ; typical of death by stoning. They shall drop on my heart three drops (neither more nor less) of wax from a lighted candle, to symbolise death by burning.

They shall take a stone and place it as a pillow under my head, and my head shall remain on it for some minutes, as though I were to be executed with the sword.

Then shall all say, "If this man during his life has incurred the penalty of death by one of the four legal modes of execution let this be now taken in place of it, and his sin be pardoned, so that in all it be the same as though he had suffered in his life-time."[1]

Often the testator directs that his wife and children are not to participate in the preparations for the interment ; and, moreover, that the sons are not to follow their father's funeral. Some command the *shofar*[2] or ram's horn to be sounded after the purification of the body, to drive away

---

[1] Similar directions are also given by Aaron of Karlin, (who repeats the order), Ezekiel Katzenellenbogen (who has a curious passage on the subject), Naphtali Cohen and S. Kluger.

[2] Perhaps originally this was merely a public announcement of the death. See *Moed Katon*, 27*b*.

the "destroying children," who would otherwise come to claim inheritance with the true children of the departed.[1] Many again leave specific directions as to the reading of the Mishnah and Talmud during the year of mourning; the orders vary very greatly in detail, but the main idea is the same. The father, if an author of religious works, usually asks his children to read and re-read his books, and fain would have the preacher quote passages therefrom in the funeral oration. But almost without exception the testators earnestly entreat that no eulogistic address be delivered over their remains. Some urge this self-denying ordinance with singular tenacity, and even anxiety. The preacher, in the presence of the dead, might be inclined to exaggerate the praises of the departed, and thus be guilty of falsehood and flattery. This is the chief motive for declining the honour of a *hesped*, but many were equally moved by a sincere humility of disposition and a sense of their unworthiness.[2] The testament itself was mostly ordered to be read at stated intervals daily, weekly, or monthly, or four times a year. Fasting on the Yahrzeit, or anniversary, of the father's death, is a common Jewish practice, and is often enjoined in the testaments.[3] Israel Luepschuetz, however, restricts the fast to only half the day, "for so my fathers bade me." This statement gives an excellent insight into the way in which family traditions grow up. The same testator frees his sons from the obligation of wearing black, and very thoughtfully tells his daughters that they are only to put on mourning if their husbands approve. Joel Shamariah, who died on the 1st of

[1] Some are very particular in their directions on this point. Kluger repeats the order no less than three times. See Erubin 18*b*, and the account given in the Travels of Benjamin, II., p. 171.

[2] Aaron of Karlin says that any one that has anything to say in his *dispraise* may say it.

[3] David Altaras orders his children to fast on the following days :— (1) the day of his death, (2) at the end of the week of mourning, (3) at the end of the month, (4) at the end of the eleventh month, (5) at the end of the full year.

Nisan ("for he was needed in the College on high"), and who fasted every day except Sabbaths and festivals, is anxious to be buried in the old cemetery by the side of his father. Naphtali Cohen wished wax candles to be placed on his seat in synagogue during the first year after his death, and his wife, "whom I love as myself," is entreated to go to his grave and pray for his soul on the day before every new moon. Aaron of Karlin desired that no man should be buried near him who was not confidently known to be one whom he (Aaron) would like to have as a neighbour.[1] Masus ben Judah pathetically says:—"In my life I dwelt in narrow and straitened circumstances; deal not so with me in my death. Inter me not in a narrow grave, but enlarge the place of my eternal rest." At times these burial orders have utilitarian motives. Solomon Heine (1844) enjoined that his funeral was not to take place within seventy-two hours of his death, in order that life might be proved to be extinct. He asks to be buried at eight o'clock in the morning, and, despite his enormous wealth, without any pomp and ceremony. Among his munificent charitable bequests were two each of 4,000 marks—the one towards the building of the Church of St. Peter, another in aid of the re-building of the Church of St. Nicholas. Ezekiel Katzenellenbogen minutely ordered that seven square holes should be bored in his coffin, and gives the dimension of each, with a diagram. Jonah Landsofer, with prophetic foresight as to the indiscretion of modern biographers, orders that only those of his papers that were so marked were to be published, and even with those the editor was to exercise a selective discretion. Samuel Aboab, the opponent of Sabbatai Zevi, takes the famous utterance of Micah vi. 8 as his text. He orders that a scroll of the law shall not be placed on the bier. Several even write their own epitaphs, which are of a

[1] Naphtali Cohen begged that no one should take part in preparing him for burial but those possessing an affinity with his soul.

severely simple character. Akiba Eger left his own epitaph: "Here lies R. Akiba Eger," but the Posen congregation converted the conventional "R." into the honourable "Rabbenu." Aaron ben Abraham asks his children not to incur much expense in buying a grave to bury him among the great, for he did not desire that. So Kluger wished to be buried not among the great and wealthy, but near the poor. One father[1] urges his son not to postpone his marriage until the end of the year of mourning. This individual had been throughout his life an ardent matchmaker. Chayim Vital (1620) ordered his cabbalistic notes to be buried with him; Herrara, on the other hand, left a large sum to defray the cost of publishing his own mystical writings (1639).[2] Perhaps the most remarkable request is that of Saul Hirschel, who died in London in 1794. He had been concerned in a controversy as to the genuineness of a work (בשמים ראש) which he was suspected of forging, and seems to have lived a rather friendless life. He directs that he was to be taken as he was found, and buried in his clothes in some forest, or wherever else they liked, "provided that it be distant from the graves of other men." His wishes were not fulfilled, indeed, his testament was not found until after his interment. At peace with men, among whom living he had found no peace, he was buried with every honour, and his name is still, strangely enough, mentioned in the memorial roll of the official Rabbis of London. We note other differences of sentiment, as, for instance, while one testator wishes his sons to weep bitterly, another begs them not to give way to excessive grief. One testator orders some sods of treasured Palestinian soil to be buried with him; another that he was to be buried in the cerements he always carried with him on his journeys wrapped in a black cloth. David Altaras was wise in his generation when he bade that no rhymes should be engraven on his tombstone. Strangely enough, he also

---

[1] *Book of the Pious*, § 505. [2] Graetz, x. 127, 129.

tells us that he never ate meat during Lent, because the meat sold was often stale, owing to the Christian butchers killing no animals at that period.

Some of these directions and prohibitions are curious enough, but the testament of Judah Chasid, who lived at the beginning of the thirteenth century, is a curiosity throughout. There can be little doubt that the testament is spurious, but whoever be the author it contains a mass of superstitions, many of them in direct conflict to express statements in the Talmud.[1] This would seem to confirm Güdemann's hypothesis that the school, from which the *Book of the Pious* (with which Judah Chasid's testament is usually printed) proceeded, was animated by a spirit antagonistic to Rabbinism and the Talmud. While it is regrettable enough that Judah Chasid's commands found obedient and willing executors, the common sense of the Rabbis enabled them to triumph over this attempt to foist on to Judaism extraneous elements of the most pernicious and undesirable nature. Ezekiel Landau was actually consulted as to whether a man might marry a girl whose father was his namesake—an alliance forbidden in Judah Chasid's testament, section 22. The response of Landau is a fine piece of

---

[1] Ezekiel Landau נודע ביהודה question 79 of אה"ע. To the passages there quoted add Tossefta on *Sabbath*, which characterises as idolatrous the popular objection to "crowing hens." It is strange to note how many of Judah Chasid's injunctions are still popular superstitions in England. For Judah Chasid see Güdemann, "Cultur Geschichte," 1880, and the same work, p. 245, for other testaments. The *Responsa* (שו"ת) in general contain many entries which have an intimate bearing on the testament literature. Many of these passages naturally however concern legal rather than ethical subjects. See ברך של רומי 36*b*, where a צוואה by the author of שולחן גבוה is quoted. In Joseph Caro's אבקת רוכל § 74 there is a question concerning a צוואה (the writer left a *soltano* for the scribe who wrote the document). In שו"ת פרח מטה אהרן Part I. § 65, the case is considered of a man who "ordered (צוה) that his eldest daughter should be married to the son of a certain sage, and that they should acquire for her one handmaiden." See also קורא הדורות ed. Cassel, p. 46*b* and 36*a*. These are only a few of the many such that must occur in these interesting collections of Rabbinical correspondence.

indignant and scathing contempt for such puèrilities. Yet he deals tenderly with Judah Chasid himself. True, said Landau, many of the things he forbids are in contradiction to the Talmud; but the author meant his remarks to apply exclusively to his own descendants. "By prophetic foreknowledge he saw that certain marriages would not prosper if contracted in his family, but he did not mean to apply the same rule to Jews in general." Yet Landau's loyalty to a great name did not prevent him from denouncing the question of his correspondent as unworthy of serious consideration.

From many of the testaments, which I cannot hope to quote at any length, I have already made some citations in the preceding paragraphs. From the sixteenth century onwards the number of Jewish ethical wills becomes ever greater. These testaments it is unnecessary to arrange in chronological order, but the internal history of Judaism continues to mirror itself forth in their pages. The controversy anent the study of philosophy died a natural death, or rather solved itself by general indifference. With Mendelssohn a new question was brought to a culminating point, and Judaism has not yet passed beyond it.

We may note in some of the later testaments indications of the writers' views on the adoption of a pure language, on the maintenance of a distinctively Jewish dress, on the use of the vernacular in prayer. As the centuries pass, ancient custom loses its hold on the people's hearts, and some of the testaments betray the anxiety of fathers that their children at least shall not displace the old for the new. But besides these less important and evanescent matters, the durable and fundamental rules of moral conduct continue to gain in emphasis, and are enunciated in more modern language. The time was, for instance, when, under the heading of gambling, dice-playing was denounced; from the fifteenth century, card-playing is raised to this bad eminence, in the eighteenth, lotteries and betting. The latter, which is a characteristically English vice,

accordingly recurs in the testament of Leb Norden, an English Jew (1741), whose objection to betting was based on the consideration that "the gambler evinced a desire to become rich contrary to the will of God"; while it also involved waste of time, and led inevitably to destruction. The denunciations of mere money-making and of usury are as vigorous as of yore, and the entreaty to freely pardon injuries becomes even more earnestly eloquent.

Do good to all men, evil to none; even to the non-Jew in the street, even to an enemy who has pursued you with relentless hate. If you have an opportunity of revenge, do not avail yourselves of it, but load your adversary with favours. Never refuse a favour to any person, be he non-Jew, or even an enemy. If your foe is seeking your hurt you may prevent him, but you must not injure him beyond the point of rendering him powerless to harm you. If an opportunity offer of serving him, thank God for the chance, and though he has done you the most fearful wrongs, forget the injuries you have sustained at his hands. Make yourselves wings like eagles to succour him, and refrain from reminding him by a word of his former conduct.[1]

The same moral is enforced in the testament of Joel Shamariah by a piece of practical psychology.

If any one did aught to injure me, yet I loved him in my heart. If I felt inclined to hate him, I at once began to *utter* praises, so that gradually I brought my heart to genuine love of the man who had wronged me.

Fidelity to one's word must be resolutely preserved; but a vow to do wrong may be broken.

Charity is enforced sometimes quaintly enough, always strongly.

Love thy neighbour as thyself; hence, when I saw any one ill, I dosed him with remedies I had myself tried.[2]

No one ever became poor through giving too much in charity.[3]

Be careful with the legacy of money I leave you, for miracles do

---

[1] Israel Luepschuetz. There is one enemy, however, whom he can hardly forgive, that is the censor who wickedly mutilated his works.

[2] Alexander Suesskind. [3] Joel Shamariah.

not happen every day. But, be not a miser when almsgiving is concerned."[1]

Saul Wahl, whom legend places on the throne of Poland (1630), was presented with a magnificent chain studded with jewels, in return for important State services. He directed, in his testament, that this chain was to be sold and the proceeds distributed among the poor.

If a beggar comes to you, give him what you can and do not put him to shame, for God stands at his right hand.[2]

Zechariah, of Porto, who had no desire for fame during his lifetime, left behind him a compilation forming an index to the texts adapted to the use of *darshanim* or preachers. It belongs to a class of books become obsolete; and would hardly now serve the author's purpose of enabling a *darshan* to see at a glance whether his own ideas were original or not! The bulk of his property, which seems to have been very large, he bestowed in ways at least intended to be charitable.[3] The directions as to almsgiving are cast in so generous a mould in these wills that it is only rarely that discrimination is counselled. Personal service, the invitation of the poor to meals, are, as of old, favourite precepts of Jewish fathers. As to posthumous reputation, Kluger was so little ambitious of it that when directing the publication of his MSS. he said that if his executors wished to print his writings *as their own* he did not object; but he wished them published at all hazards.

Moses Sofer will not have his children read the books of Moses of Dessau (Mendelssohn); they must never go to the theatre; his daughters are not to read German novels.[4] "Say not that the times have changed, for our Father never changes." The Rabbi who is to succeed him must

---

[1] Leb Norden. [2] Sabbatai Hurwitz.

[3] See אכף המזכיר Venice, 1675, preface.

[4] Similarly Abraham Danzig; Jonah Landsofer permits praying in German, and says, "Teach your daughters to read books printed in German and see that your sons' wives can do likewise."

preach in jargon. Sofer impresses on his daughters and his sons' wives that they must not wear low-necked dresses, nor even wear false hair. He does not neglect moral injunctions, however, and lays particular stress on the folly and sinfulness of pride.

We are the sons of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, pupils of Moses, our master, servants of David the king. Our father said, "I am dust and ashes," our master asked, "What are *we*?" our king declared, "I am a worm and not a man." The King for whom we hope will reveal himself in the guise of a beggar riding on an ass. Whence then should we derive pride?

Centuries before, Solomon Alami had spoken against the "pride of place," which is a subtle and baneful form of the vice.

If you go up to read the law, be called up like everyone else, and do not make a fuss about being first or last.

Abraham Danzig[1] (1738-1821), the author of the popular *Life of Man* (חיי אדם) and similar works, is as opposed as Sofer to the assumption of ordinary attire. With the German Jews, he says, things were different, for they always dressed like other Germans; hence their example was not a precedent for imitation. He enforces quaintly, but effectively, the serious calls of life.

In your business be honest and upright. Do not devote yourselves to the acquisition of wealth and to the enjoyment of worldly pleasures. If you engage in a pious and honourable life, you need not entirely forego these pleasures, but do not make them your first thought. A man goes to Leipzig on business: he trades energetically, and then buys some ornaments for his wife and children. This rejoices them. If, however, he wastes his whole time in buying gew-gaws to the neglect of his business, and on returning has only the presents to show and no merchandise, his wife slaps his face and says: 'Fool, what do I want with this rubbish? Why did you not attend to your business?"

Virtue is praised and vice blamed; as the one is conducive,

---

[1] He particularly asks that his testament shall be printed without errors. However this may have been in the first edition (1821), the second edition is disfigured with many misprints.

the other antagonistic, to the love of God. Tears are declared of the utmost efficacy in prayer, and Masus laughs to scorn those who would maintain that people cannot cry at will.

Tears are the only refuge against oppression and suffering. I have wept so much that my sight has been dimmed for many years.

On the other hand, while enjoining his sons to weep copiously at their night-prayers, Moses of Prague nevertheless adds later on:

Always pray joyfully and be cheerful; for melancholy is a great evil.

As Francis of Assisi proved in his own character, tears are not necessarily associated with austerity.

The saving power of family concord finds much prominence. Dissension is heartily condemned, and daughters-in-law are especially warned against rivalry and quarreling. Brothers and sisters must pay one another attentions, and keep one another informed of their good or bad fortunes. The Gaon Elijah entreats his mother and wife to mutual honour and to live in peace during his absence from them.[1]

When brother parts from brother or sister, or when you meet, always embrace; but, my sons, kiss your sisters on the hand, kiss the lips only of your brothers. Help one another. . . . Every Nisan and Elul write mutual greetings; on the birthday of each, let all the rest send their congratulations.[2] . . . Throughout my life, whenever I read my prayers, I felt as though I still stood a child before my dear and pious mother, who dictated every word to me.

The worshipper was to utter an especially fervent "Amen" after the prayer daily repeated for peace. This mildness and consideration was to be extended by employers to their servants. "I never abused, much less did I ever strike a servant," says Suesskind; while others go yet farther: "I

[1] "Honour your mother, and never cause her any sorrow; and see that your wife treats her with respect." (S. Kluger.)

[2] A list of the birthdays of the family follows this injunction of Luepschuetz.

never asked my servants, Jewish or Christian," says Lüpschuetz, "to do unpleasant services for me. When I was a child and I asked the Jewish servant *who was sitting at table with us* to give me some water, my mother rebuked me."

The head of the family must take an intimate interest in the welfare of the whole household. "It is proper to address them for half an hour a week on any matter that needs exhortation." The following is an amusing piece of family advice:—

My daughters and daughters-in-law, if your husbands are angry, go outside and do not return until their rage is over and then reprove them."

The same father, Sheftel Hurwitz, will not permit dancing by members of the opposite sexes, even if the couple do not touch hands. "If you dance face to face, Satan dances between you."

Alexander Suesskind stands out as a remarkable personality. To every act of his life, he was impelled by the love of God; no incident however small, but had its place in the divine purpose. This is shown in the noble tone of his whole testament, which has become deservedly popular, as well as in some very curious traits.

If ever I wanted anything and found that I possessed it and need not borrow it from others, I thanked God. When I took snuff I did likewise because one might be too poor to buy it. I always said God is just whenever calamity came on me. Thus did I when I spilt my snuff. If I found that though the box fell, none of the snuff dropped out, I thanked God with lips filled with joy. If I could not find the box I accepted צדוק הדין the divine judgment, and when an hour later I found it, I rejoiced and thanked the Lord!

His acute sensibility is further seen in the following touching entry:—

It is a common practice with Jews that when a member of the community has died during the night, the beadle when he comes to summon us to synagogue, gives only two instead of the usual three knocks, as a sign of death. When he only knocked twice I sighed, but when thrice, my heart leapt up with joy!

An almost equal moral sensitiveness marks the suggestion of Sheftel Hurwitz to keep a written account of one's sins in order to ensure due penitence.[1] Sensitiveness of another character is shown in the following utterance which might easily be paralleled from other ethical wills.

It is said that at the time of death Satan stands by a man tempting him to deny his faith, and a man is weak in his mind at that hour, and does not know what he is doing. Therefore I declare that any evil thoughts that may enter my mind at that time are not my thoughts but are hereby annulled.

The controversies of the seventeenth century raging round the Cabbala and pseudo-messiash, are reflected in the testaments of the period. Prophecies and dreams are not to be regarded; astrology is forbidden. The antipathy to the new Chassidism led one testator to leave as a condition to a charitable bequest, that no member of that sect should participate in its benefits. This one can understand, seeing that some members of the sect were professional beggars.

Decorum in synagogue, on which Alami expressed himself so strongly, is a subject that recurs in the later wills. It is better not to go to synagogue at all, than to go there and talk even concerning matters of Torah. The custom of the Sephardim who kept the children in order by overawing them is in one instance lauded. The children, small and big, were located together, and an overseer stood over them to enforce good behaviour with a stick.[2] According to another testator, slovenliness in utterance was the cause of the continued trials of the Jews, for their prayers were not efficacious from being indistinctly enunciated. If necessary, to ensure devout attention, the eyes were to be closed

[1] Cf. Howell's *Familiar Letters* (ed. Jacobs, p. 335). "Before I go to bed, I make a scrutiny what peccant humours have reign'd in me that day; and so I reconcile myself to my Creator, and strike a tally in the Exchequer of Heaven for my *quietus est*, ere I close my eyes, and leave no burden upon my conscience."

[2] This passage is not actually in the testament, but in the תוכחת מוסר that precedes.

during prayer; while one father, following a precept of the *Book of the Pious*, counsels his son to stand on his toes to recover his self-possession, and drive away strange thoughts. Prayers were not to be mechanical; private joys and sorrows were to be introduced in extemporised thanksgiving or in silent, grateful meditation when the communal thanks were being expressed. Elijah Wilna in his testament, advises his wife and daughter not to go to synagogue at all. Pray at home, for in synagogue you cannot avoid scandal and frivolity. The daughter might see others better dressed than herself, and feel envious, and gossip about it when she got home. Elijah felt so keenly the evil effects of the habit of scandal-mongering on the character, of harsh words and of falsehood, that he enjoined that if these offences were committed by his children, the latter were to be severely beaten. Yet instruction was to be imparted gently; rough methods were to be avoided, and gifts were to be bestowed in order to encourage the children to progress. It will be noted that daughters receive full attention from their fathers in these testaments, though in matters of education, they were not placed on a level with the sons. Jonah Landsofer of Prague, particularly desires that his daughters and his sons' wives should be taught to read German. Marriage must not be deferred, yet very early marriages are strongly deprecated. Originally, says Jonah, Jews married much earlier, but physical development is slower now than in ancient times.

When you are arranging a marriage between two parties, never exaggerate, and always tell the truth. Therefore it was that in the first times, none but students of the Law were *shadchanim* (match makers).[1]

The injunctions as to the choice of a wife are naturally numerous and minute. Moral excellencies are to be sought, not beauty or riches. Wealth coming as the bridal dowry,

[1] This is against a statement in the Talmud. Maharil, I may add, was a *Shadchan*, but accepted no fees.

was esteemed a blessing only in so far as by relieving the husband from the need of constant devotion to business, it supplied the necessary leisure for "higher culture," to use the modern phrase. Children were a loving grace of God, in the service of whom they might renew the father's own life.

And in the same way we could follow these moral guides into other phases of life, but for the present as in the conventional three-volume novel, we will stop short with the arrangements for marriage. Many of the sentiments that I have quoted in the course of the preceding passages are of Talmudic origin, and others are the common property of Jewish ethical writers of all ages. Perhaps at some future date I may carry the enquiry further, and attempt to discuss in how far the children practised what the fathers preached. Yet it cannot be that so much simple goodness thus simply expressed fell in dead words on dead ears; it spoke with a living voice pleading for the right, when the grave had claimed its own, echoing the one constant refrain—

"In your virtues show yourselves our sons."

I. ABRAHAMS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.[1]

AARON OF KARLIN (Johannisberg? 1855? 8vo. Also Warsaw, 1878, in דברי קדושים).

AARON BEN ABRAHAM AT RAWICZ (ספר הדרכה, Breslau, 1830, 4to).

AARON MOSES, מגזע צבי (Czernitz, date כי טוב לישראל).

ABRAHAM BEN SABBATAI HURWITZ, ספר יש נוחלין, Prague, 1615, 4to., Amsterdam, 1701. Also ברית אברהם).

[1] I have derived a considerable part of the works here enumerated from the Catalogues of Zedner, Steinschneider, Neubauer and Ben Jacob (*Ozar Hasefarim*).

ABRAHAM DANZIG (בית אברהם, Wilna, 1821; Warsaw, 1841; Königsberg, 1845).

ADLER, Dr. NATHAN (*Jewish Chronicle*, London, Jan. 1891).

AKIBA EGER.[1]

ALEXANDER SUESSKIND BEN MOSES (Grodno, 1794, 8vo. Often reprinted).

ASHER BEN YECHIEL (ארחות חיים, Venice, 1578, 32mo.).

BENJAMIN (ZEEB WOLF) FISCHHOF (published in מקור חכמה, ed. 2, Berlin, 1711).

DAVID BEN SOLOMON ALTARAS (צו"ף דב"ש, Venice, 1714, 16mo.).

DAVID FRIESENHAUSEN (Vienna, 1820, 8vo.).

ELEAZAR BEN ISAAC (the Great) OF WORMS (ארחות חיים, Venice, 1623, 12mo. This is not the same as the ארחות חיים לאהרא"ש).

ELEAZAR BEN SAMUEL THE LEVITE. The Testament of Eleazar will, I hope, appear in the next number of the Review. Portions of the will next in my list will also be given. This latter MS. I have now acquired through the kindness of Dr. Berliner. Also the testament of Leb Norden will probably be published in the July number.

ELIJAH, כבא אליהו דרושים וצואה מר' אליהו במהרש"ל

ELIJAH WILNA (אגרת לבני ביתו, in ספר עלים לתרופה, 1856, 8vo.).

EZEKIEL BEN ABRAHAM KATZENELLENBOGEN (Amsterdam, 1750, 8vo. Second edition, Wilna, 1871).

HARRIS HERSHFELD (Kansas City *Times*, Oct. 28th, 1888).

ISAAC BEER LEVINSON (written 1859. ספר הזכרונות. Warsaw, 1878).

ISAAC PINTO (רוח נדיבה, 1844).

ISRAEL BAALSHEM (ספר צוואות ריב"ש והנהגות ישרות, Zolkiev, 1820, 8vo.).

ISRAEL BEN ELEAZAR LESNENSIS (Derenfort, 1694).

---

[1] The testament of Akiba Eger I know only from the references in the תולדות ר' עקיבא איגר, Berlin, 1862.

ISRAEL BEN GEDALIAH LUEPSCHUETZ (תפארת ישראל, 1861, 8vo.).

JACOB ASHERI BEN הרא"ש (ed. Schechter, Pressburg, 1885, 8vo.).

JACOB OF LISSA (published in some Siddurim ?).

JOEL BEN ABRAHAM SHEMARIAH (Wilna ? 1800 ? 8vo.).

JONAH LAND-SOFER OF PRAGUE (in the דרך טובים, F. o/M., 1717, 32mo., by Abraham ben Reuben Deutz. Also in מעגלי קצירה).

JOSEPH IBN CASPI (ספר המוסר, in Eleazar Ashkenazi s טעם זקנים, F. o/M., 1854, 8vo.).

JUDAH ASHERI (ben הרא"ש. See Jacob Asheri).

JUDAH CHASID (see Cat. Bodl., column 1323).

JUDAH BEN SAUL IBN TIBBON (ed. Steinschneider, Berlin, 1852, 8vo.; and Edelmann, London, דרך טובים. This is not the same work as mentioned above).

JUDAH (DON) DE ALBA DE TORMES (1410, Amador de los Rios, vol. II., 615-7).

JUIF (Testament d'un Juif de la Ville de Carpentras. Modern Provençal French).

LEB NORDEN. The MS. of this צוואה is in the library of the Beth Hamidrash, London.

MASUS BEN JUDAH LOEB (1800 ? 4to.).

MEIR, פישל (MS. Breslau Seminary, No. 16).

MOSES (CHASID) OF PRAGUE (דרך טובים, 1717, and partly as אגרת מוסר, 1720. Also in Siddurim).

MOSES MAIMONIDES (see Judah Ibn Tibbon. The First edition, which does not contain the first portions, Venice, 1544, 8vo.).

MOSES NACHMANIDES (אגרת של הרמב"ן in ספר תפוחי זהב, by Elijah ben Moses de Vides, 1623, 8vo. Also with Elijah Wilna, *q.v.*; and in Siddurim דרך החיים).

MOSES BEN SAMUEL SOFER, ספר צוואות משה, Vienna, 1863, 8vo., Ungvar, 1864).

NAPHTALI BEN ISAAC COHEN (8vo., 1719 ? Berlin, 1729, 12mo., Frankfort o/Oder, 1750 ? Wilna, 1803; Warsaw, 1878).

NATHANIEL TRABOTTI (Berliner-Hoffmann, *Magazin*, Berlin, 1887; IV., 11-22).

SABBATAI (SHEFTEL) HURWITZ (Frankfort o/Oder, 1690, 8vo. Also with שולחן ארבע, 1783).

SAMUEL BEN ABRAHAM ABOAB (Ghirondi, תולדות גדולי ישראל).

SAUL BEN ZEVI HIRSCHEL (written 1794, published in *Orient*, 1844, p. 712).

SOLOMON ALAMI (אגרת מוסר, Jellinek, Leipzig, 1854; Vienna, 1872).

SOLOMON HEINE (רוח נדיבה. See Isaac Pinto).

SOLOMON, son of the Martyr Isaac ben Zadok (MS. Steinschneider, Cat. Heb. MSS. in Lug. Batav. Warn., 59[3]).

SOLOMON KLUGER (לשון צדיק, together with שערי בנימין, Ungvar, 4to., 1870).

SELKE LICHTENSTADT (תומר דבורה, Wilmersdorf, 1719, 8vo.).[1]

---

[1] Jacob Emden, Chacham Zevi, and one or two others I know, wrote צוואות, but I have no information as to publication. The testament of Phineas Katzenellenbogen (Bodl. Cat., Neubauer 2315), hardly belongs to this series.

JAIR CHAYIM BACHARACH.

(*Concluded.*)

MEANWHILE, Bacharach's friend, R. Meir b. Judah Selke Grotwohl, of Frankfurt, had taken his place in Coblentz. This friendship ended in becoming a source of great comfort to Bacharach when his son Samuel Sanvel [1] wedded the daughter of Grotwohl. The wound that had been inflicted upon the heart of R. Jair was still fresh when this marriage was solemnised. Sad and full of grief, surrounded, or imagining himself surrounded by foes, and apparently forsaken by all, he eagerly grasped at the hand of friendship extended lovingly and reverently to him by his successor Grotwohl.[2] As in the days when they had promised in Frankfurt to interchange letters at least once a week,[3] and R. Meir had always heard news of Bacharach through R. Meir b. R. Moses Sofer [4] and R. Meir Stern,[5] so now a lively correspondence was kept up between the two friends drawn closer to each other by family ties. The intimacy with so great a scholar in the Talmud, the Cabbala and other branches of learning as R. Meir

---

[1] חות יאיר, No. 31. Cp. the inscription in the old Jewish cemetery in Vienna, No. 339, where his son, Samuel Sanvel, who died in Vienna, 1721, is mentioned. According to this source he also received the name of Meir, after his grandfather, מצד אם נכד הרב מהר"ר מאיר גרוטוויל [printed wrongly ונכד]. This son of R. Jair is called after his maternal uncle, Saul Samuel Sanvel Brilin; *v.*, the *Memorbuch of Worms*, p. 26.

[2] חות יאיר, in the introduction to *Resp.* 31. [3] *Ib.*, No. 26.

[4] *Ib.*, No. 25, where Grotwohl calls him להר"ר משה ספרא רבא. *V.* also the beginning and end of No. 66. R. Moses died in 1687, and is the great-grandfather of R. Moses Sofer of Pressburg; *v.* Horovitz, *Frankf. Rabb.*, iii. 91. [5] *Resp.* 27, and end of 75.

Stern, who took deep interest in his misfortunes, could also only tend to encourage R. Jair.[1]

But the true balm for his wounds was the unremitting study in which he persevered, learning and teaching at the same time with undiminished zeal. The post of teacher in Israel, that had been denied him in a congregation, was now to be granted to him by his writings: as he was prevented from bringing into play his activity in the sphere to which he thought he was born, he felt himself led to labour in another field for the benefit of the general public; he was, in short, impelled by the desire to become known by his literary labours.[2] Study became his consolation and his revenge, his weapons and his passion. Engaged in research and writing, he spent his time at Worms as an ordinary private person, being only connected with the external world by his pupils and his Responsa, which were asked of him both by friends and strangers.[3] His house was a house of learning—a retreat whither men[4] of the community eager for knowledge resorted, and pupils[5] crowded round to drink in deep draughts from the well of his full scholarship. There was formed a society of the members of the community to whom

---

[1] *Resp.* 66 belongs to this period, therefore R. Meir uses these words in the opening of his letter to R. Jair: יאיר אף יזריח ׳ על אויביו יתגבר יריע אף יצריח ׳ כל צורריו בהם יפיח. The words on pp. 70, 71*b* refer to his work that was put an end to by his expulsion from Fulda.

[2] *V.* p. 230*b*. [3] *e.g.*, Nos. 103-104 of the years 1677-8.

[4] *Resp.* 61 and 102.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 234*a*, where R. David Oppenheim eulogises his industry and his ability as a teacher:—ולא פסק פומי׳ מגירסא גם בלילה לא נתן תנומה לעיניו כי נ״ר תלוי למעלה ממיטתו שלימה ונאספו אליו עדרי׳ תלמידים וחברים המקשיבים לקולו קול הוד והדר. So also R. Aaron Teomim speaks of him, p. 232*b*:—ישב אהל ומקנה קנין אבי כל תופס כי נו״ר ואִשָּׁתו ׳ מפיו נוצצין ולא זז מכותלי בית מדרשתו ׳ בהתבודדת ולעפעפיו לא נתן שינה ותנומתו. And R. Wolf Traub, *ib.*, p. 235*a*, observes:—בחורי חמד המקשיב(ה)[ים] לקולו ושתילי זית לשלחנו הי(ה)[ו] סביב ׳ ולא מש מתוך האוהל אהלי שם ועבר.

he delivered daily lectures upon the Code of the Law by R. Joseph Karo, and a second one which he instructed in the Mishnah. In the evening he held a class to a third society upon the interpretation of the liturgy, which lesson alternated with the explanation of a passage from Rashi or the Prophets or Psalms. He also imparted instruction to a certain religious student of the mystic doctrines of the Cabbala.[1] But the flower of his time was devoted to the composition of the work that was to be called after his name Ez Chayim (the Tree of Life) to be divided into three parts, each containing three, or, more accurately, six sub-divisions, and embracing eighteen[2] different topics of Jewish learning. But as he saw that this encyclopædia would require more than two hundred sheets,[3] and there was no possibility of his being able to publish so large a work, he devoted his attention to his notes upon the first volume of the Code of Jacob b. Asher, the Orach Chayim, so as to present a specimen of the whole by the publication of this portion, which dealt with the ritual practices of Judaism.[4] Thus through his misfortune, Bacharach was destined to be the first[5] author of his family. But in spite of having good cause for his doings,

---

[1] *V.* Preface to יאיר נתיב. The מוהרר"ש mentioned here is perhaps R. Löb Schuch, about whom we learn more in the index of vol. IV. of his collected works, *e.g.*:—ג"ז [דיני'] י"ד דף קפ"ז · שאלה ממהור"ר אהרן משפייאר שנחלקו הוא ומהרר"ל שוך בפני הב"י בי"ד סי' קפ"ט בקביע' וסת ותשובתיי דפין גדולים מעובר' וכו" ; ג"ז [דיני'] י"דדף קצ"ט · ממהרר"א—also משפייאר שנתקשו ונחלקו הוא ומהרר"ש בביאור דברי הרשב"א דבב"י ששמעון טוען שהוצרך ללות ברבית ח"מ סי' פ"ז ע' כרך ה' דף ל"ב ע"א : ג"ז י"ד דף רי"ש עד קידושון שהוא (ש)שני עם החתן שאלה ממהרל"ש and, *Resp.* 19 refers then to the son of—הנ"ל ע' כרך ה' דף ל"ט דפין גדולים נדפס. R. Löb Schuch, *Resp.* 163, in חות יאיר, mentions a society of clothiers who had their own teacher, but not probably in Worms itself.

[2] *V.* p. 230*b*, and preface to חוט השני.

[3] P. 230*b*; ואם יהיו יחד סדורים · אפילו בשני מאות ניירות אינם גדורים

[4] See preface to this work, entitled מקור חיים ; also pp. 231*a*-232*a*.

[5] In the preface to חוט השני he remarks : — לא טוב אתה מאבותיך אשר קטנם עבה ממתניך לילך בגדולות ונפלאות ולעשות נוראות הלא

he held a confirmed opinion that it would savour too much of egotism to allow his literary productions to appear in his own name, whilst nothing that had been written by his grandfather or father had ever been published. He, therefore, set to work collecting the *Responsa* of R. Samuel and R. Samson Bacharach, which he resolved to issue, together with his own, as a *Threefold Cord*. But even this placing of his own works, as signified in the title, upon a par with the others, seemed to him improper, so that he determined to remain silent about himself, and name the *Responsa* of his grandfather and father, the *Twofold Cord* (1679), letting his own contributions pass unnamed and unnoticed. To the initiated, however, his part in the book was so evident,[1] that it caused his erudition to appear in the brightest light. As soon as the book was published, an invitation to go to Poland, where ample scope for spreading his fame could easily be afforded, was held out to Bacharach by Moses b. Shalom Friedmann, a brother-in-law of Tobias Moschides, the half-brother of R. Jair, who in his youth had been a pupil of R. Samson Bacharach in Worms,[2] and, on returning to Poland, the home of his father,[3] was appointed director of the schools by the nine communities in the district of Chelm. But Bacharach was not willing to leave Worms upon empty promises. He knew well that if anyone wanted him, they would find him easily enough. The community of Lissa, in Poland, had invited (1677) R. Aaron Teomim,[4] who, in this respect too, was more fortunate than he, to transfer his Rabbinate to their midst, but in vain. For many years Bacharach had buoyed himself up with the hope that some day the choice of some community would fall upon him, and often must his courage have risen

---

המה הגבורים אשר מעולם ראשי ישיבות ועמודי גולה ולא יצא טבעם בארץ בהדפסת שום ספר :

[1] Cp. the testimony of approval of R. Süsskind Rothenburg to the מקור חיים in חות יאיר, p. 233*b*. [2] *Ib.*, No. 92, p. 89*b*.

[3] R. Jeremiah Shalom b. Judah of Lemberg died in Worms; *v.* קבץ על יד, iii. 20. [4] בכורים i. 22.

when in his heart he compared himself with his spiritual chief; but now he saw how he had deceived himself, and on whose side fortune fought. Full of quiet resignation, he listened to R. Aaron, and although the tendency of his sermons was almost unbearable to him, yet he had to endure them, and to look on as fame spread his name upon her wings. But now Teomim became desirous of making an attempt at authorship. In 1675, when, immediately after the celebration of the first eve of Passover, he was stricken with an almost fatal illness, he had vowed, if he recovered, to write an exhaustive commentary to the Seder-hagada for his children, which should clear up all difficult points, and should bear the title of the *Rod of Aaron*.[1] In 1678 the book really appeared. All the methods that so much displeased Bacharach in the sermons of the author, an ingenuity that betrayed its own weakness, and in which general allusions took the place of truth, frivolous questions untenable premises, distorted quotations, vague references to the most unknown and undiscoverable passages from ancient literature, in fact, all the strange devices which disfigured his labours in the pulpit, found a place in this work. The simplicity of the text that was being explained contrasted sharply with the extraordinary style of the explanations: the art of rendering simple words inexplicable was carried to perfection in this book. But the untenable theories and the unnaturalness of the whole method, nay, even the introduction of the Pilpul into the region of sermons and explanations, were not the chief causes of

---

[1] מטה אהרן, Preface. R. Aaron there also mentions his volume of sermons that was still in MS. וה"ב"ה יזכיני להדפיס חיבורי הגדול על כל התורה ועל חמש מגילות הנקרא בגדי אהרן. Bacharach, therefore, also knew this title, which fact has escaped J. M. Zunz, עיר הצדק, p. 145. S. Hosmann, in his *Das schwer zu bekehrende Juden-Hertz*, 1701, appendix, p. 45, only knows to quote חד גדיא from the *Matteh Aaron*, "a book written by a Rabbi at Worms, named Aaron (who, after having been about six years in Cracow, died in prison, into which he was cast for some debts, as the Jews tell)."

annoyance to Bacharach. His keenest indignation was directed against R. Aaron's manner of supporting his statements by references to passages from other authors that he either misunderstood or wilfully perverted, and by quotations that were often utterly incorrect. This would have made him unhesitatingly throw down the gauntlet of challenge to R. Aaron, relying upon the example of the most noted men, who, out of their love for truth, did not shun a conflict. But again the thought of the position of the chief of the community restrained him. He[1] would certainly not have feared the excommunication which R. Aaron could have fulminated against his assailant; he was man enough to oppose it, and to reply with a counter-ban; but then R. Aaron was the Rabbi of Worms, and Bacharach a humble private person, who had to be cautious in his behaviour. The possible suggestion that it was all through jealousy of the successful head of the Rabbinate, and that the assertion of his incapacity as a preacher, was a case of "sour grapes," like the fox in the fable,[2] Bacharach could have afforded to disregard, being justly confident in the truth of his cause and his well-recognised and assured ability as a preacher; but the fear of personal motives being considered the source of his opposition withheld the brave man from taking public steps. He therefore determined to give vent to his anger in secret, but to hold his lance in readiness to defend the truth. Suppose it were again his fortune to leave Worms and be appointed to a Rabbinate! But even if this was not to be, still the time when truth would conquer must come, and then the seal that kept this book closed would be removed, and his testimony against

---

[1] A misunderstanding of Bacharach's words (בכורים, I. 19), in which he discusses the probability of an excommunication which he might draw down upon himself by his conduct, has misled J. M. Zunz (*ib.* 145) to invent the fable, that Bacharach had already before been excommunicated by R. Aaron, and had been stirred up to take revenge.

[2] In בכורים, I. 23, Bacharach uses the parable of the Cat and the Meat.

falsehood prove no idle word.[1] Scarcely a year had passed after the publication[2] of the *Rod of Aaron*, when the work of Bacharach attacking it was written. It was to bear the same name, but rather as a rod for the back of the perverse Rabbi, and to serve as a work in which the true meaning of tradition was to be set forth. The coincidence that the numerical value of this Hebrew title, and of his name, Chayim Bacharach, amounted to the same, was only a further reason for copying this title.[3] In the first part of his reply,[4] Bacharach collects the passages in Teomim's book, which he attacks, quoting them accurately, but concisely, and in addition stating his real objections; whilst in the second part he undertakes the correction of the misunderstood references, and the proof that many of the citations adduced are either nowhere to be found or attributed to wrong sources. Only a man so marvellously well versed in ancient literature could have ventured to assert that a certain quotation was not to be found in the whole of the Midrash or the Zohar. The *Rod of Aaron* blossomed in secret. The object of its criticism was probably unaware of its existence.[5] It remained hidden in the possession of its author, who continually polished and improved it, and also made its tone gentler, and less severe. For, if he found nothing in the actual remarks of his attack that required alteration, he

---

[1] *Ib.*, 20.

[2] *Ib.*, 15, אף כי מיום יצא לאור עדיין בעת לא יצא שנה וכללותיה.

[3] *V.* the appendix. The text has been omitted by Jellinek (בכורים, I. 20). מטה אהרן = 310 = חיים בכרך

[4] It consists of 30 pp., and lies in MS. in the Beth Hamidrash of Vienna. Pp. 2-6 form the Introduction; pp. 6-17, the first part; p. 17, the conclusion of this part; and pp. 18-31, the second part. A page at the end seems to be missing.

[5] Owing to a gross misconception of Bacharach's words in בכורים, I. 23, note 2, Carmoly (הלבנון, VIII., 24) has concocted a story of a ban that B. issued against R. Aaron and his works. The continuer of the צמח דוד, David Reindorf, learnt the news of Teomim's murder too late to be able to mention it in his work; he would not have mentioned a banned man.

was displeased by the vigour and violence of his own language, especially when the terrible fate of his opponent was made known to him. Ten years after he had composed his reply, Bacharach was informed that Teomim, who had advanced step by step, and had ultimately succeeded in being elected preacher to the great community of Cracow, had fallen a victim to a murderous assault. When he wrote an account of this sad event upon the margin of his book[1] he may at the same moment have struck out the bitter observations that he had been led to make in the zeal for his cause, and have thus tacitly adjured posterity to leave all his violent expressions unpublished.[2] Thus the relations between the two men never changed. If it was only a hollow peace that existed between them, at least it never broke out into open acts of hostility. R. Jair did not pass over his spiritual chief when, according to the custom of the time, he was seeking from the authorities in Germany letters of approbation for his book, *Mekor Chayim*,[3] that he intended to issue after his work of *Responsa;* and the approval of R. Aaron, though given in somewhat measured terms, yet contained sufficiently genuine and hearty praise and recognition of the author's merits. Nor did R. Jair lack appreciation and encouragement from other quarters. He had the pleasure

---

[1] In Jellinek's edition, the marginal note of the ten years was afterwards admitted into the text, בכורים, I. 22. The printer's error of תמ״ד for תמ״ט has led to the blunder in J. M. Zunz, p. 131.

[2] בכורים, I. 23. In the MS., p. 18[a], Bacharach repeats this caution in a note on the margin :—הריני גוזר בחרם חמור כל מי להעתיק כ״ש להדפיס דבריי הן פה בחלק השני או בראשון או בהשמטות יסיר ממנו כל דברי קנטורי׳ ודברים קשים • וקצתם עשיתי רושם עיגולי סביב אבל לא על כלם מפני שקשה מאד לעשות כן כי ע״י זה תשחת המליצה ומ״מ לא סגי בלאו הכי ומוטל על המעתיק והמדפים לשנות הלשון שכתבתי וישים לו תמונה אחרת עד כי יהיה השגה ותימה וגילוי מה שכיסה או הוסיף או שינה בלי קנטור. The most violent passages have really been noted in this way as here advised.

[3] חות יאיר, p. 232*b*; the beginning of *Resp.* 155 mentions a criticism that was written of this work.

of receiving the most honoured rabbis of Germany and other countries, in his house at Worms. Thus, in 1679, he was visited by the most distinguished Talmudical scholar of his age, R. Gershon Ashkenazi, Rabbi of Metz.[1] The aged Rabbi of Bingen, Joseph Josel b. Abraham and R. Mordecai Susskind Rothenburg, Rabbi of Witzenhausen, in Hessen, were his guests in 1681, when he was thinking of publishing his book.[2] In connection with this work, he also appears to have left Worms at that time, and on his journey to have shown specimens of it to various friends, as, for instance, R. Enoch Fränkel, Rabbi of Hanau, and R. Jeremiah b. Judah, the District-Rabbi of Ansbach, in Gunzenhausen.[3] He was so determined to wait no longer before printing this work, that, in spite of a death in his family, he resolved, directly after the time of mourning was concluded, to journey to Amsterdam, and there superintend the printing.[4] In the collection of testimonials of approval that he possessed we have a full description of the way he was appreciated by the highest authorities, as well as of his connections with learned men.

It is no wonder, then, that his whole heart was intent upon the publication of this book. He had no other hope of greatness than the fame that this work would found for him; it was his consolation, this confident expectancy for the future. When the trials and disillusions that he had experienced in life threatened to overwhelm him, when he was filled with grief at the thought that he was isolated among all his children,[5] having no one to continue his life's

[1] *Ib.*, No. 158, p. 145*b*; *v.* Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung*, p. 224 *sqq.*

[2] חות יאיר, p. 235*a*, and R. Mordecai Susskind Rothenburg, *Responsa*, No. 13, p. 34*a*.

[3] חות יאיר, p. 236*b* and 236*a*. About Fränkel, *v.* Kaufman, *ib.*, p. 196, *sqq.*

[4] M. S. Rothenburg, *Responsa*, p. 34*b*:—כי עם לבבי בהסכמה מוחלטת ליסע תיכף אחר עבור זמן איבלותי לק"ק אמשטרדם האל יגמור בעדי. The copyist, האלוף כהרמ"ס, whom he names there, may have been his friend Moses Sofer, of Frankfurt.

[5] He thus expresses himself in the preface to this book, *v.* חות יאיר, p.

work—the study of the law, then the longing to see his intellectual heritage saved from destruction, and to come forward with what he hoped would be a great and enduring work, naturally grew all the fiercer within him. He might well be pleased with the choice of his subject. With his accurate powers of observation, he had discovered a public literary want,[1] inasmuch as he aimed at expounding and exhaustively dealing with the ritual code of

---

231*a*:—בראותו כי הציבו הזמן כמטרה לחצי היגונות בתלאות שונות וכל היום ישבע ריש ויפגעו בו ממכות הארץ ותחלואיה ולא. נתנו הזמן הבוגד לאכול ממגד מיטב הארץ ולהתענג בנופת פנג תענוגי הזמן אף כי בראותו ילדיו מעשה ידיו אינם מושלמים די ספקם מספיקי למלא את מקומו ולתת כבוד לישמו. Similarly he also observes in the preface to the חות יאיר:—ובאשר בע״וה גם בזה חסרוני ומומי כי אין לי בן ממלא מקומי. J. Kanreuther (in the *Israelit*, 1862; *Isr. Anzeigeblatt*, p. 181, note 1) has already pointed out Lewysohn's misunderstanding of this passage. The epitaph of Samuel Sanvel, which as published in the *Israelit* is mysterious, because it is undoubtedly given incorrectly, shows at any rate that this son did not follow in the footsteps of his father, and had much to repent of. Cp. *ib.*, p. 190; and 1863, p. 505. We learn about a second son of Bacharach, Samson, from a Scroll of the Law and its mantle in the Synagogue at Bucharest for the Asylum for the Aged (בית מחסה לזקנים), which mantle, tradition relates, was given by R. Jair. Rev. Dr. Beck, to whom I owe this information, describe the writing as being of rare beauty, the letters are of an unusually large size, and the parchment is about eight handbreadths wide. Upon the front of the mantle is the following inscription, that is rather difficult to read:—ז״נ האלוף מהר״ר שמשון בן הגאון המפורסם מוהר״ר יאיר חיים זצ״ל בבד״ו וזוגתו הצנועה מרת חיילה בת האלוף הר״ר יצחק ברין זצ״ל תסו לפ״ק. On the back are the words, כתר תורה לזכרון עולם יהי׳ הס״ת עם התיק שלו מהגאון • המפורסם המחבר חוות יאיר • קנה ה״ר עזריאל נרו יאיר בהמנוח מוהר״ר • אשר באט זצ״ל בשנת תאיר • מעשה ידי בתו מ׳ שרה תחי׳ בת הצנועה מ׳ רבקה תנצב״ה. Asriel Bot, a clothier, who immigrated from Tismenitz, in Galicia, into Roumania, and who adorned this Scroll of the Law for this Synagogue, that has been abandoned now for some six years, obtained the mantle in Freiburg, in Moravia, from some country-people. According to this, the remarks in the preface to the שו״ת כח שור (Kolomea, 1888), to which Rabbi Ch. N. Dembitzer called my attention, are to be corrected. The letters בבד״ו, which Rev. Dr. Beck explains to mean בכל דור ודור, ought, perhaps, to be read בכרך.

[1] Cp. Dembitzer, כלילת יופי, pp. ס״ד—ע״ג.

Jacob ben Asher, which had hitherto been rather neglected and cast aside. It may have suggested itself to him as an ideal in which his more fortunate rival in the same field, R. Abraham Abele Gumbinner, afterwards succeeded so well, namely, to put into the hands of his co-religionists a book, by means of which his name would be continually connected with their daily ritual life. But he seemed fated never to succeed. Was it, perhaps, the tidings that in 1681 Samuel b. Joseph had anticipated him with a commentary to the same book that appeared in Amsterdam,[1] or was there another reason that stopped his journey and the giving of his book to the Press? At any rate he was again the poorer for a hope, and the richer for a book that remained unprinted. How many things would he have said better than those who wrote after him; how many errors and misunderstandings others would have been able to avoid if his book had seen the light of day! But it was, at the best, a doubtful satisfaction that the consciousness of this thought awoke to him, a source of ever fresh displeasure, a continually repeated outbreaking of the wound of his ill success. He had not, however, altogether given up the idea of publication. For more than ten years he continued to hope in silence that his book would after all be printed. The number of letters of approval in his possession meantime went on increasing, and among them was that of the youngest of his friends, his compatriot and relative, R. David Oppenheim.[2]

Like a joyous promise, the gentle light of this rising star fell upon Bacharach's clouded life. The high esteem in which Oppenheim, when still at home, had always held the famous and revered scholar only increased during the years he spent as a student in Metz, in the Talmudic school of R. Gershon Ashkenazi, who was bound to Bacharach in indissoluble bonds of friendship. There thus arose between

[1] In the preface to the חוות יאיר, he indeed only mentions the commentaries of Gumbinner and R. David Halevi, that appeared for the first time in 1692.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 234*a*.

these two men, who were separated from each other in age by the space of a generation, an intimacy that was maintained and strengthened by a learned correspondence. Oppenheim's questions and opinions were a source of interest and deep enjoyment to Bacharach,[1] as well as an opportunity for developing his own powers and exercising his intellect. It must have afforded him no little satisfaction to be able to instil rich seed into the mind of his younger friend, and to find him able, owing to his unlimited means, to make a reality of that to which he himself could only aspire with ardent zeal and all-embracing intellect—the foundation of a collection of manuscripts and books of Jewish writings in every branch of knowledge.

Besides this correspondence, that already in 1683 had become a very active one,[2] the numerous Rabbinical questions that he was incessantly receiving occupied the time of Bacharach, and showed him that, even in his position as a private person, he had risen to the rank of a Rabbinical authority in Germany. In this way he had the opportunity of engaging in a frequent interchange of opinions with such diligent students of the Talmud as R. Gershon Ashkenazi,[3] in Metz, and R. Isaiah Hurwitz,[4] in Frankfurt-on-the-Maine. He even held communcations of this sort with the Rabbi of his community, R. Aaron Teomim, as they both often had occasion to express their opinions about the same matter, even as late as the year 1687.[5]

---

[1] *Ib.*, p. 212*b*. תורתו של הגאון נר״ו שעשועי ושמחת לבי ואגב חביבות׳ יתירת׳ וגעגועי׳ שיש לדו״די לי ואני לו לכן מטיבות׳ וענותנותי׳ ונטילת רשות והרמנא אמינא מה שיש להנדז קצת בדבריו לא כמשיב רק כמתענג ׳ ומשתעשע במתק צוף אמריו כי נעמו.

[2] No. 23. as we learn from the manuscript *Responsa* (IV. 3) of R. David Oppenheim, from the words סיון שנת זכיות לפק פה לנצבורג, was sent by him to B. as early as 1683. The heading in it runs as follows:— אל אח בלבנון חריף ושנון אף בפתחי נידה וקינון ותלמודו מסודר ושנור בפיו כמונח על תמחוי וקבון ׳ אחריתו מנון בצל שדי יתלונן ׳ עד ביאות שמו ינון ׳ ה״ה הגאון המופלא ע״ה פ״ה נ״י כ״ש מוהר״ר יאיר חיים נר״ו.

[3] *E.g.* Nos. 86-7. [4] Nos. 115, 117. [5] No. 125.

Thus, year after year of Bacharach's life was spent in useless waiting and deceptive hopes, until a change in the state of public affairs, which had hitherto brought him but little advantage, now threatened to destroy the little home of the hermit, who had seemed forgotten by the world. The French had forced their way into the Palatinate; every day brought the dreadful tidings of new conquests and struggles. All the cities in turn opened their gates to the invaders; all resistance was futile; and when so man stronger fortresses had been compelled to surrender, no choice remained for Worms but to do the same. On the 1st of October, 1688, the enemy appeared before the city; the terms of capitulation were signed,[1] and Worms became a French town. For the Jewish community this conquest brought special dangers, besides the distress that was felt by all alike. Every dealing of the Jews with the enemy was looked upon as treachery, which seemed to be completely proved by the more humane treatment that they received from them.[2]

In this storm-charged atmosphere it was more a deliverance than a promotion for R. Aaron Teomim, the Rabbi of a congregation now in such a precarious condition, when one of the largest Jewish communities, that of Cracow, just at this time invited him to become their Rabbi.[3] He had witnessed enough misery in his rabbinate, but he was spared the worst part. A general depreciation in the value of goods set in, and those who could obtain purchasers for half the usual price[4] might consider themselves fortunate. The consternation that was caused by the sudden predatory

---

[1] F. Soldau, *Die Zerstörung der Stadt Worms im Jahre* 1689, p. 7.

[2] *Ib.*, pp. 9, 10, 13, 21.

[3] Owing to a misprint in בכורים, I., 22, of תמ"ז for תמ"ט, J. M. Zunz, in עיר הצדק, p. 131, causes R. Aaron to remain in Germany three years before entering upon the Rabbinate of Cracow. On Sunday, the 5th of June, 1689, י"ז סיון [read א'] יום ב', R. Aaron, then in Hamburg, had only heard of the dangers that were impending in Worms, but not yet of the final catastrophe, *v.* אבן השהם, *Resp.* 65.

[4] According to חות יאיר, No. 44.

inroad of the enemy produced a wild state of confusion. Everyone began to try to rescue and hide all the movable property he could snatch from the plunderers; panic seized the inhabitants of the villages, who hurried into the towns, whither they had often conveyed their goods, with bundles on their backs, without having even received the customary permission to enter.[1] But loss of property and panic were only the forerunners of complete destruction. And in all this no one was more unfortunate than Bacharach, whose last hope was now frustrated. If after the departure of R. Aaron he might have indulged for a moment in a vision of hope, seeing that in the absence of a Rabbi all rabbinical questions upon communal matters were submitted to him,[2] his expectations of the fulfilment of his desire that now seemed so close at hand were utterly shattered when annihilation began to threaten his congregation. Louvois had issued the command, that all towns that could not be held by troops should be converted into a heap of ruins. The Palatinate became a scene of desolation; so many blossoming lives, so many famous reminiscences, so much human fortune and industry, culture and art—all found a grave in the flames that rose to heaven. Whit Tuesday, the 31st of May, 1689, was the fateful day for Worms.[3] In the afternoon, when the hour of four had struck, the signal for the destruction of the town was given, and it was set fire to from all sides. In the general ruin the Judengasse,[4] with its historical memorials, the jewels

---

[1] *Ib.*, No. 165. [2] I infer this from the end of No. 213.

[3] R. David Oppenheim (in אבן השהם, *Resp.* 66) mentions distinctly Tuesday; [read יום ג׳ לסדר ויקרא שם המקומות בערה [שם המקום תבערה כי כער בם אש ה׳, with the week, described in words taken from Numb. xi. 3, as the day of the conflagration. If Bacharach (חות יאיר, p. 125*a*) names Wednesday (ביום ד׳ י״ג סיון תמ״ט) as this day, he must have had in his mind the day when the burning of the town was finished; *v.* Soldau, *ib.*, p. 28.

[4] We have distinct evidence against the assertion of Lewysohn (Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 17, 361) that he regards as historical that only "the Judengasse remained undestroyed." Thus R. David Oppenheim (*ib.*) ob-

of its past that had been preserved with so much pious care, also sank in the flames. The synagogue, with its so-called prayer-chamber of Rashi became a heap of ashes. The congregation was scattered in all possible directions.[1] Each one fled to the place where he hoped to find shelter and maintenance, some even over the Rhine, although the enemy had only indicated the towns outside of France that might serve as an asylum.[2] In the first moment of terror Bacharach had fled with his family to Metz, where he hoped to find shelter with his friend, R. Gershon Ashkenazi, and his kinsman, Grotwohl.[3] His younger son, Samson, who was named after his father, must have left Worms before the invasion, as we find R. Jair composing for him a poetical narrative of this sad period and its calamities.[4]

Thus the oldest community of the German Jews disappeared from the face of the earth. It was a community possessed of venerable and strong traditions, with numerous customs peculiar to itself[5] and marked by a vigorous piety, that was thus swept away. How could the sundered

---

serves:—נשרף המקום והרחוב של היהודים וירמייזא עם עקרה ושרשה עם המקדש מעט גם בה"כ של רש"י ז"ל וכל בית ישראל יבכיון את השריפה. In the document of agreement between the community and the city of Worms, of the 7th of June, 1699, occurs the phrase, "In the present re-building of the citie of Wormbs and also of *the utterly ruined Jews'-street*"; *v.* Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Worms*, p. 96.

[1] חות יאיר, p. 119*a*; בני ק"ק תוב"ב שנתפזרו כבמזרה (according to the words in Jer. xv. 7). [2] Soldau, *ib.*, 24.

[3] חות יאיר, p. 125*a*, ברחתי עם כל [read לשם] בק"ק מיץ אשר להם אשר לי. About the family of Grotwol, in Metz, *v.* *Revue des Etudes Juives*, vii. 107, 115.

[4] In vol. IV. of his MSS., p. 166*b*, Bacharach had stated, מה שכתבתי לבני שמשון במצוק ק"קו מצרפתי' בחרוזים מהשעוריה. In vol. II., p. 82*b*, we further read, קברות [בית] אשר העיר [Neh. ii., 3] מ"ש בנחמיה אבותי חֳריבה • ומספר מה שאירע לו בחרבן ק"ק ווירמישא תוב"ב

[5] *Ib.*, p. 260*b*, note to p. 119*a*, וכן כמה מיני פרישות שנהגו בק"ק כנון שנזהרין מחמאה של גוים וכרוב כבוש ופרות יבשים. The Jewish women, who sold milk, milked it on the farms of Christians into the pails out of which they sold it in the street; *ib.*, No. 198.

members of this ancient body regard themselves as bound to carry out its rules, if the bond that had united them was broken, and no hope of their re-union seemed remotely possible? There was only one man who clung to the belief in the reorganisation of the community, who spoke, indeed, of exile, but would not believe in the destruction of their ancient union. This man was R. Chayim Bacharach. He looked upon the preservation of the synagogue valuables and the communal books as a pledge of its re-establishment. The symbols of the existence of the old synagogue, that formed its historic centre, were still secure; it was only a question of "When?" not that all hope of restoration was to be abandoned. With the bold though sure glance of the seer he made public this conviction, and declared the traditions of the old congregation binding[1] upon their children, thus preserving its separate existence through and beyond the period of dispersion. On the 1st of January, 1691, we find him in Heidelberg, where soon after the time of destruction life began to move and thrive afresh at the house of the wealthy warden, Moses Oppenheim, sen., whose son Solomon had married Bacharach's daughter, Dobrush.[2] He most probably did not care to continue in exile in Metz, where his family still remained; the necessity of procuring a permanent livelihood had caused him to wander about. In the summer of 1690, we meet him in Frankfurt-on-the-Maine, in the house of Hirz Wahl, the uncle of R. David Oppenheim, where he perhaps for the last time enjoyed the society of his friend and beloved pupil,[3] before the latter went to Nicolsburg to act as Chief Rabbi of Moravia. Without feeling the slightest envy against the fortunate young man,

---

[1] *Ib.*, No. 126, ומה גם עיר ואם בישראל וק״ק ישן גושן כזו והרי עדיין ס״ת וכלי קודש וכל פנקסי קהל סגורים ומובחרים.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 125*a*, Moses Senior Oppenheim, as he is called on the tombstone of his son Solomon (*v.* Lewysohn, No. 43), died at midnight, Sunday, 11 Ab, 1701, at Heidelberg, but was interred at Worms, *v.* קבין על יד, III. 22.

[3] No. 166, בר״ח תמוז שנת ת״ל [read ת״ן] בימי עוניי ומרודי ונודי ק״ק ורקפורט.

but full of bitter comparisons with his own unhappy lot he makes a note[1] of the fact that his friend was scarcely thirty years old when called to this important post. Perhaps it was on this occasion that he formed the resolve to betake himself to Heidelberg, where the most prominent members of the family of Oppenheim had already settled, or had sought refuge after the destruction of Worms. Samuel, the imperial chief court-agent of Vienna, had been denoted by the name of Heidelberg,[2] his previous residence, even in later years, long after he had already settled in Austria. His brother, Moses Senior, who was related by marriage to Bacharach, had settled permanently in Heidelberg as district warden of the Jews of the Palatinate. His brother, Abraham, the father of R. David Oppenheim, had just fled hither from Worms. This was the Abraham Zur Kandten,[3] *i.e.*, the owner of the house that had a sign-board with a pot painted thereon, whose duty it had been, as warden in Worms, to receive the French general d'Huxelles on the 2nd of December, 1689, in the name of his congregation, and who now in his exile watched over the interests of his dispersed community, that was even yet in danger, with no less zeal than before.[4] Bacharach, therefore, met with many friends when in the spring of 1691 he arrived at Heidelberg. It almost seems as if for a brief period he fulfilled the functions of the Rabbinate here; at least, R. Hirsch Fränkel, when he afterwards became Rabbi of Heidelberg, and in 1705 had a dispute with R. David Oppenheim about a bill of divorce, appealed to the decisions that R. Chayim Bacharach had pronounced whilst staying there.[5] But even if Heidelberg

---

[1] In vol. III. of his MSS., p. 120, he writes: שאלה מה״ה מהרר דוד אשר נתקבל לאב״ד בק״ק נ״ש והמדינה לפני היותו בן שלשים · בדפין גדולים.

[2] Kaufmann, *Samson Wertheimer*, 3, note 1. [3] Soldau, *ib.*, 13.

[4] Lewysohn, in *Frankel's Monatsschrift*, vii. 363, note 4.

[5] In the MS. *Responsa* of R. David Oppenheim, נשאל דוד, III. 34; וגם הרב המופלג מוהר״ח ז״ל בעל חות יאיר סידור גט כאן בהיידלבערג ג״כ כנ״ל

had again begun to be well populated, it had not yet lost all traces of the terrible ravages committed in it. People were still afraid to display openly their property that had been saved from the pillage; if Bacharach wanted a reference-work upon Rabbinical literature, he could not procure a copy from any of the community; all his decisions had to be arrived at from the fulness of his knowledge without the assistance of books.[1] He, therefore, could not remain long in his friendly place of refuge. Frankfurt-on-the-Maine, that had already become the natural asylum for every fugitive from Worms, seeing that it had afforded shelter to the magistrate of that town,[2] he resolved, should also be his permanent home,[3] where he could wait hopefully for the fulfilment of his great desire, the re-establishment of his congregation and their old dwelling-place. He sent for his family and his property from Metz to come to him, so that, surrounded by his books and manuscripts, he could resume the thread of his researches and labour at the point where he had been compelled to break it off, owing to the invasion of Worms. The most intimate friend[4] of Bacharach in this town was R. Samuel Schotten,[5] formerly Rabbi in Darmstadt, and at this time head director of the Manes-Darmstadt Klause college. He was distinguished, not only for his extra-

---

[1] חות יאיר, p. 125*a*, ואין פה בידי לא ש"ס ולא פוסקי' כי גם הב"ב פה הבריחו את אשר להם מפני חמת המציק. Cp. also No. 213.

[2] Soldau, *ib.*, 33 *sqq.*, 38.

[3] The play upon his name (at the end of *Resp.* 15) in the sentence, לו לי"א האמנתי לראות בטוב ה" בארץ החי"ים ושם יא"יר נרי נר תמ"יד, may be taken to allude to the date Iyar, 1694.

[4] In the summer of 1699, B. gave him, perhaps as a token of remembrance, a whole volume of manuscript Cabbalistic notes, as a present, as he remarks in the list of contents to vol. XXIII. of his MSS., ברך גדול קבלה מעשיות • נתתי במתנה להה" אב"ד ראש ישיבה קלויז מהרר שמואל שאטי בהיותי שם ורנקוורט קיץ תב"ט.

[5] About him, cf. Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rabbinen*, II., 57, 60, 73, 77, *sqq.*, 4 , *sq.*, and Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, vii. 160, *sq.*

ordinarily profound Rabbinical erudition, but also for his general culture, most astounding for a Rabbi of this time, and he was even, thanks to his knowledge of Latin, well read in Christian theological literature.[1] It was probably through him that R. Chayim made the acquaintance of the Christian scholar, Rudolf Martin Meelführer, who, notwithstanding his youth, was already deeply versed in Rabbinical literature, and who knew how to value the manuscript treasures in Bacharach's costly library.[2] But on the whole, the exile from Worms led a rather retired life here. Prematurely aged, inwardly broken by his misfortunes and mental troubles, deprived almost entirely of the sense of hearing, and so having to rely completely upon his own resources, he was cut off from intercourse with the outer world, even before bodily suffering kept him to his house. Overcome by grief and melancholy, he describes himself to us[3] as one isolated and a stranger with difficulty crawling about with the aid of a stick, and even compelled to omit his attendance at synagogue owing to his weakness. In this situation R. Hirsch,[4] the son of his friend R. Enoch Fränkel of

---

[1] This remarkable fact in the history of culture, we learn from Rudolf Martin Meelführer, *Carsas Synagogæ errantis sive impedimenta conversionis Judæorum*, p. 21*n*: "Præest Synagogæ Francofurtensi ad Mœnū Vir modestus ac pereruditus R. Samuel vulgo Rabbinus der Clausen cœtis literarii qui ibidem colligitur, vocatur, hunc sæpe accessi et cum eo contuli de variis capitibus doctrinæ Christianæ, aliquando scriptis Germ. Dn. D. Speneri cura singulari invigilantem in Museo deprehendi, ubi illico mihi quæ in vastis voluminibus legerat reddebat promtissime et fere totum diem dicendo de theologorum nostrorum controversiis exprimebat."

[2] Bacharach had the supercommentary of Joseph b. Elazar (צפנת פענח) to Ibn Ezra's commentary to the Pentateuch, in MS., *v.* R. M. Meelführer, *Ex historia Hebræorum literaria sive de meritis Hebræorum in rem literariam* (Wittenberg, 1699), § 3: "Hic MStus Francofurti ad Mœnum in Bibl. celebris Rabbini, *R. Chajim Bacharacensis* extat."

[3] See the commencement of the Preface to חות יאיר, and beginning and end of *Resp.* 15.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 229*a*, וסופר מהר"ר ולמדן מפלוג פה על הטוב יזכר שמו כהר"ר הירש בן הגאון כמוהרר חנוך זצל"הה שהיה אב"ד ור"מ בק"ק הענא לפנים Cp. Kaufmann, *Die letzte Vertreibung der Juden aus Wien*, p. 199, *n.* 5.

Hanau became his faithful assistant. The one thought that sustained him in all his distress was to render his works accessible to posterity, and he found tranquillity and comfort in directing the work of Hirsch Fränkel, as he arranged and copied his manuscripts to prepare them for the press. In this town, where an excellent firm of Hebrew printers was established, during his enforced leisure his long-delayed plans for publishing his works must have been revived with renewed vigour. It seemed as if he had only to stretch out his hand to bring forth the fruits of his industrious and richly productive life from the storehouses where he had placed them, but in reality he needed the powers that had been his in his youth to revise and set in order this over-plentiful material. Even his book, *Mekor Chayim*, that had been ready for the press some twenty years ago, had become so disarranged and in want of revision, owing to the notes which he had been obliged to add to it after the appearance of the commentaries of R. Abraham Gumbinner and R. David Halevi to the ritual Code of Joseph Karo, that he was compelled to forego all hope of publishing it in his present condition, when, to think out again all the material he had collected, and to re-write the whole work was an impossible task for him.[1]

Owing to the remarkable accident that, while depriving us of the writings of the man, has yet preserved to us the catalogue of them, we are enabled to obtain so perfect an idea of the method of his work that we can see that this scholar, who was always investigating and writing, in spite of all his productions, could scarcely ever lay his hands directly upon anything that he might show as the result of his labour, even when the harvest-time of his life had been reached. Just as the fruits of his all-embracing industry, that occupied itself with equal diligence with all kinds of learning, were stocked together

[1] According to the Preface to חוות יאיר.

in his brain, so his papers bore the evidences of his many-sided labours, which, to himself appeared clear and connected, but in reality carried the distinct signs of his activity as a thinker and a collector in their inextricable and variegated confusion. Filled with the earnestness of the inquirer who takes equal interest in all matters, nothing being disregarded, he considered everything that engaged his thoughts and came under his observation as worthy of being commented upon; certainly none of his contemporaries was so careful in "making notes" as he was. Whether it was the explanation of some obscure passage, the solution of some Talmudical difficulty, the application of some Agadic remark, the answering of some legal point that was either submitted to him or raised by himself, the treatment of some ethical problem, the development of some philosophical thought, the proof of some article of belief, the astonishing revelation of the equality in numerical value of two words or groups of words, the clearing up of some cabbalistic mystery, the discussion of some custom or superstition, or some phase of Jewish life, or of an historical memorial, or of a curiosity, the commenting upon some grammatical, scientific, or mathematical question, the copying of an old poem, or of a letter or opinion of whatsoever kind, making extracts from a rare book or from a manuscript, something he had himself experienced or that was brought under his notice, a tradition or the result of his own reflections—all these numerous things were carefully rescued from oblivion in absolutely unsystematic succession, just as they presented themselves to him, and were safely secured by his ever active pen. It is principally in seven volumes of his manuscripts that all this immediate outcome of his own personal work was contained. The number of manuscript volumes in which, so to speak, the intellectual family hoard heaped together by the labours of a large circle of relatives and friends was preserved, and which R. Jair's activity as a collector brought together, must have amounted to nearly

fifty; but in these seven volumes was to be found the greater part of his own work—the diary of his genius—although they by no means exhausted the full quantity of his own productions. But they remained a worthless treasure, an unused harvest as long as the dense mass of these notes could not be revised and sorted, and, therefore, Bacharach resolved to cut a path through the thicket, and, under the name of *Jair Nathib*[1] (the Illuminator of the Path), which title Isaac Nathan had also given to his *Concordance to the Bible*, to compile an index to these volumes, in which a general reference to the matter contained in each, and to the page on which it was to be found should be given. If, owing to the preservation of this work, we are led to a full consciousness of the irreparable loss literature has suffered in the destruction of these collections, on the other hand the knowledge of the subjects on which this richly endowed intellect dwelt upon with such eager interest, in addition to the numerous topics to which allusion is merely made in the midst of the vast quantity of the material treated of by him, allows us to take the desired glance over the fields of learning through which he walked gathering the fruits, and, moreover, to obtain an unexpected insight into the history of his inner life. From this point of view the publication of this work, which affords an adequate idea of his intellectual activity, becomes an absolute duty demanded by science. How important this book had been to him is best shown by the fact that he had provided it with an introduction,[2] which serves as a testimony to his brilliant power of thought and true scientific spirit. Whatever entered his mind during sleepless nights, which undermined his already delicate health, during lonely walks, during the hour of leisure at twilight, at

[1] The property of the Beth Ha-midrash in Vienna. In the "Beth Ha-midrash" of J. H. Weiss, Jellinek has given extracts from this MS. I have to express my indebtedness to my respected friend J. H. Weiss, in Vienna, who many years ago studied this treasure, for being enabled to obtain a thorough acquaintance with this MS. [2] *V.* Appendix.

public lectures, or during silent research, all was here to be found written down as a help to his own memory, entirely for his own use. Now that he was examining this intellectual store from the standpoint of a strange reader, it must have seemed necessary to him to explain, and as it were to excuse, these notes, that might seem incomprehensible to his contemporaries, especially in the case of such apparently trifling or even useless things as special customs or superstitious notions. But the large space that he had devoted to the playing with numbers and curious comparisons of words according to the spirit of the age, also seemed to him to require some word of explanation; they were only to be regarded as the children of his enforced leisure, which he had never allowed to grow in size at the expense of his own serious studies.

The merest glance at the extent of this collection gives some idea of its richness; a thorough examination of the multiplicity and scientific tone of its contents changes our wonder to admiration.

Thus the first volume consisted of 237 leaves, the table of contents of which occupies twenty-four closely written folio pages of the index. The headings that succeed each other in miscellaneous order are somewhat as follows:— Talmud, Agada, Legalism, Ritual, Bible, Homiletics, Ethics, Philosophy, Cabbala, History, and general Criticism. The variety of the contents, and the rays of light that break through the mental darkness of the period may be illustrated by a few examples from this work. Thus in one passage he asserts that even ethical writings in German are of more value than the greatest and most ingenious Talmudical works that are not based upon truth.[1] Elsewhere he excuses the Polish Talmudists for their deficient knowledge of the Bible.[2] The story of two women who agreed

[1] חסידות דל״ט ע״ב · שבח ספרי מוסר אפילו בלשון אשכנז יותר מחיבורי גדולי החריפי׳ ופלפולי׳ של שקר

[2] ד״ת דף קמ״ד ע״א · התנצלות על גדולי פולין שאינם בקיאין במקרא ע׳ כרך ג׳ דף מ״ב ע״א ודף ע״ט ע״א

that the one who died first should relate to the survivor her experiences after death,[1] seems to him to be as well worth noting down as the impressive rebuke he administered to his co-religionists for certain defects (and their causes) that had crept into divine service.[2] At one time he inveighs against the misunderstanding of Christian commentators of the Talmudical saying, "Keep back your children from reading," as well as against the reproaches levelled against the Jews for their ignorance of the interpretation of Holy Writ,[3] and then his philosophical reflections cause him to soar aloft to a height whence he recognises how the Biblical verse (Ps. civ. 31) has this profound meaning, that God will only rejoice in the future, for at the present time each day reveals some new imperfection in the world.[4]

The exhaustive description of the second volume with its 204 leaves extends from page 24*a* to page 40*b* of the Index, and shows a still more versatile aspect of his learning. Here we have the pious customs of the community of Worms copied out from an old parchment prayer-book.[5] The sufferings at the destruction of Worms,[6] the persecutions at Nordhausen,[7] here find their faithful chronicler. Now we behold him dealing with the problem, how the

---

[1] חדושים דף קמ״ה ע״א • מעשה נפלא שתי נשים שת״כ יחד איזה שתמות תחילה תגיד לחברתה מה אירע לה :

[2] חסידו׳ דף קע״ט ע״ב : תוכחה נמרצה על קלות ראש ומיעט אימה בבה״כ וכמה דברים מקולקלי׳ שבנו והסיבה :

[3] אגדה דף ק״ץ ע״א • פי׳ מנעו בניכם מן הגיון ומה שחכמי א״ה מליזין עלינו מזה ותוכחה על סכלותינו בביאור תנ״ך : ע׳ כרך ג׳ דף ע״ט ע״א :

[4] ד״ת דף ר״ך ע״ב • ישמח ה׳ במעשיו אבל לא שמח כי כל מעשה יום יום יש בו פגם :

[5] מנהג דף ד׳ ע״א • הועתק קצת מנהגי ק״ק ווירמיישא מתפילה ישנה על הקלף :

[6] חידושי׳ דף פ״ב ע״ב • מ״ש בנחמיה אשר העיר קברות אבותי הריבה • ומספר מה שאירע לו בחרבן ק״ק וירמישא תוב״ב :

[7] חידושי׳ דף קל״ו ע״א • מאורע רעה גזירו׳ נורטהויזין :

numbering of the twenty-four books of the Scripture[1] originated, and then reproducing the list of books named in the *Kneseth Hagedola* of Benveniste.[2] In one place he decides the question whether it is permitted to skate on Sabbath,[3] whilst in another the discussion touches upon what it is that decides the fate of books and the acceptance and circulation of synagogal poems.[4] The enumeration of the verses of the Bible that have been misunderstood in a Christological sense[5] interests him no less than the solution of the question whether R. Asher of Lunel or R. Asher of Toledo lived earlier,[6] or who was the Greek Rabbi whom R. Abraham b. David of Posquières mentions.[7] Why the number of ten adults that is required for public worship is simply called "the number" (Minyan),[8] is a point of no less importance for him than the striking incident that R. Gershon, the Light of the Diaspora, kept fourteen days of mourning for his apostate son.[9] He enumerates the notes of the melody to the prayer, Baruch Sheamar, verse by verse,[10] as carefully as he states his approval of the custom of applying the benedictory formula, apparently intended only for the dead, to the living as well.[11]

---

1 תורה דף ל' ע"א • מה הם עשרים וארבע ספרים הקדושי' ע' כרך נ' ד"נ ע"ב וכרך ה' דר"ל ע"ב וכרך א' דצ"א :

2 דברי תורה דף ל"ח ע"ב • רשימת ספרים הנזכרים בספר כנסת הגדולה :

3 ג"ז [= גם זו, sc. דיני] א"ח של"ז דף ע' ע"ב • לעבור על הגליד בל"א שלייפין בשבת :

4 ספרי' דף נ"ז ע"א • בדבר חיבורי' ופיוטי' יש זוכים שיתפשטו ויקובלו ויש לא :

5 ד"ת דף קי"ד ע"אב • רשימת פסוקי אנ"ך שפקרו המיני' • בדפין גדולים :

6 ד"ת דף קס"ט ע"א • הרא"ש מטלוטלא מביא להרא"ש מלוניל וגם במסעו' רבי בנימין הביאו וגם התו' זכרוהו בב"ק [f. 64*b*]; *V.* Zunz, *Zur Gesch.*, p. 48.

7 ד"ת דף קצ"ד ע"ב • צ"ע הרב היוני שדבר הראב"ד מי הוא :

8 ד"ת דף ק"ט ע"ב • למה נקרא אסיפת עשרה לדבר קדושה מנין

9 ד"ת דף קנ"ג ע"א • מה שצ"ע על רגמ"ה שישב אבלות על בנו י"ד ימים כהשמיר • י"ד שמ"ה :

10 מנהגי' דף ק"ה ע"א • סדר נגינות ברוך שאמר חרוזה אחר חרוזה

11 ד"ת דף קס"ט ע"א • נכון לומר זצ"ל ולכתוב כך גם על אדם חי שכ"כ

The third volume contains 191 leaves, which are described in the Index from page 41*a* to page 48*b*. Here we have Talmudical questions that were put to him, for instance, by the Talmudist of Worms, Moses Oettingen,[1] by R. Joseph Drescher,[2] and R. David Oppenheim,[3] as well as the penitential hymn that his grandfather, R. Samuel, had composed for the congregation of Worms.[4] Here, too, he enters into the question whether it is more meritorious to spend one's time in study or in teaching one's own son,[5] and, also, whether it is lawful to whitewash a synagogue a second time—an act that the Jews of Worms had always been averse to doing, but which they were compelled to do ten years after the catastrophe of 1689.[6] His critical talents are displayed here in collecting and grouping together the liturgical poetry composed by Eleazar Kalir and Simon the Great for the second days of the holidays,[7] as well as in his endeavours to make clear to

---

[חות יאיר, *Resp.*, 71=] במסעו' ר"ב בכה"ג ' ע' דפוס ע"א ; Cp., for a similar custom in Yemen, אבן ספיר, I., 56*b*.

[1] תורה דף ע"ח ' קושיא ממהר"מ מלמד בווירמיישא בתו' דב"מ ד"ד ד"ה אין נשבעין ותשובתי בצדו ' נקרא ר' משה עטינגין. A daughter of Moses Oettingen, the widow of Isaac Blin, died in Worms, 1705 ; *v.* קבץ על יד, III. 22.

[2] ג"ז [תורה] דף פ' ' ממהרר יוסף דרעשיר ' בגמ' דר"ה ביום נקנור וטוריינום :

[3] דיני' דף ק"ב ' שאלה מה"ה מהרר דוד אשר נתקבל לאב"ד בק"ק נ"ש והמדינה לפני היותו בן שלשים ' בדפין גדולים :

[4] תפילה דף ב"ג ע"א ' סליחה שיסד אא"ז הגאון זצ"ל לאומרה בקק"ו לפני הגירוש שהיה שע"ה ' והיא שלישיה :

[5] חסידו' דף ה' ע"א ' איזה עדיף אם להתמיד בלימודו או לבלות זמנו בלימוד בנו :

[6] דיני' א"ח קכ"א ' דף כף ע"ב ' מותר לסיד בה"כ ישנה בלי חשש רק בקק"ו נמנעו : [Later the following words were added by Bacharach, though they are now half obliterated:—ונם פה ק"ק ווירמיש אחר שנחרבה מעם צרפת שנת תמ"ט ונחזרה ונתישבה שנת תנ"ט וסדוה מבפנים יפה בלי חשש :]

[7] תפילה דף ל"ד ע"ב ' בענין פיוטי ר"א הקליר ור"ש הגדול בש ' ימים די"ט : Cp. P. F. Frankel in *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, p. 162, and חות יאיר, p. 222*a*.

himself the meaning of the observation by which, according to Abraham Ibn Daud's account, Moses b. Chanoch was said to have first directed the attention of the modest Nathan to his Talmudic erudition.[1] He investigates the reason why Jesus, contrary to the Jewish law, has been crucified alive, and ascribes it to a Roman custom.[2] If the Talmud praises acuteness of thought, this praise certainly cannot justify the Polish degeneracy into the Pilpul.[3] His historical instincts are not appeased until he has placed all the heroes of Talmudical literature in their proper historical order. Thus he tries to fix exactly the position in time of R. Jonathan Hacohen, the commentator to Alfâsi upon Erubin.[4]

Volume IV., with its manifold contents, is treated of in the index from p. 49*a* to 56*a*. It includes 236 leaves. Here we read the opinions to which he gave utterance on the 17th of Tebeth, 1668,[5] in his effort to quell the violent dispute that raged at Trier, and also the narrative of the ravages committed by the French in Worms that he had sent to his son Samson.[6] The curious species of lizard, to which the attention of R. Liepman Heller was first drawn,[7] calls for a remark from him as well as the dictum of his

---

1 ספרי׳ דף מ׳ ע״ב • מ״ש בעלי ספרי ד״ה שאמר ר״מ האורח לר״נ דכי פשו להו טבילות • שאין לו מובן • ומקומו איה :

2 חקירה דף קל״ב ע״ב • טעם שנתלה א״א חי׳ שכך המלכו׳ עושה בימיהם כבגמ׳ ע׳ כרך א׳ ד״נ ע״ב ובכה״ג תלוה וזבין :

3 תוכחה דף קל״ה ע״א • חריף ומקשי אין פירושו פלפול של הבל וחילוקי פולין ח״ו :

4 ד״ת דף קנ״ג ע״א • מי הוא ר׳ יהונתן הכהן המפרש לרי״ף במס׳ עירובין :

5 ג״ז ג״ז [דיני׳ ח״מ] דף קלאבג״ד • תשובה על מחלוקו׳ גדול ודברי בזיונו׳ שאירעו בק״ק טריר • ג״ז ד״ג נדפס ס״ה [חות יאיר, *Resp.* 65] :

6 ד״ה דף קס״ו ע״ב • מה שכתבתי לבני שמשון במצוק ק״ו מצרפתי׳ בחרוזים מהשעוריה :

7 ד״ת דף נ״ו ע״ב • מ״ש ספר אוצר חיים בדג פאסטינאקה מורינא • ומ״ש בו בס׳ לחם חמודות ע׳ כרך ג׳ דק״ל ע״א וכרך ב׳ דכ״ו ע״ב : Cp. Kaufmann, *Die letzte V.*, p. 16 n. 3. The medicinal remedy, called *stincus marinus*, by Heller, is still used and popular for aphrodisia in Lower Austria ; cf. *Wiener medicinische Wochenschrift*, 1889.

great-great-grandfather, the tall R. Löw, that the peacock belonged to the clean birds, *i.e.*, those that are lawful for food.[1] At one time he is defending Abraham Ibn Ezra against the imputation that in his exegesis he disregarded Rabbinical tradition,[2] and at another he traces the development of the system of hospitality among the ancients, and the origin of the so-called Pletten,[3] *i.e.*, the bills for the payment of the expenses of poor students and travellers to whom hospitality was shown. In one passage he seeks reasons for declaring the drawing and hanging up of one's own portrait, and that of one's relatives to be perfectly allowable;[4] in another he puzzles himself about the phenomenon that in a mirror the human face does not seem to turn from right to left.[5] He is as anxious to settle the question whether Maimuni possessed a knowledge of Hebrew grammar, poetry and metre,[6] as whether the Joseph Hacohen mentioned in the Mishna may not be the author of *Josippon*.[7]

The 272 leaves of Vol. V. have their various contents detailed in p. 57*a* to p. 83*b* in the index. In this part he is engaged in questions of natural science, as, *e.g.*, about objects that are visible and yet cannot be perceived by the sense of touch, and *vice versâ*,[8] or about the query, why

---

[1] ג"ז ג' [דיני' י"ד] ק"א ע"ב • מ"ש זקיני הגאון מוהרל"פ שטוום עוף טהור הוא :

[2] אמונה דף ר"ו • התנצלות בעד הראב"ע ממה שחשבוהו כאינו הושש לקבלה • ושבדרוש אפשר לדרוש נגד דרז"ל יע"ש :

[3] חסידו' דף רי"א ע"א • ענין הכנסת אורחים איך היה בימי הקדמוני' ואיך נתפשטו הפליטין • וכמה דברים בעניניה' :

[4] חסידו' י"ד קמ"א דף רי"ג ע"ב • אין איסור לצייר צורת עצמו וצורת אביו ולתלותם בחדרו • עע"ש : Cf. Schudt, *Jud. Merckw.* IV, 173.

[5] חקירה דף רכ"ב ע"א • ענין דבר פלא שתמונת אדם במראה שכנגדו לא יתהפך מימין לשמאל :

[6] ג"ז [חכמה] דף רכ"ד ע"א • אם ידע הרמב"ם בדקדוק ובשיר ובמשקל

[7] ג"ז [ד"ת] דף רכ"ו ע"א • יוסף הכהן הנזכר במשנה ובבריית' יכול להיות שהוא היוסיפון :

[8] חקירה דף י"ג ע"א • קצת פלאות טבעיים דברים מורגשים ואינם נראים וההיפך ; *v.* the explanation in חות יאיר, *Resp.*, 233.

drunken men often have thoughts or presentiments that are more correct than those of other men.[1] He further speaks of the superstitious notions about hobgoblins, elves, and little fairies, as he had read of them in the popular literature of his time.[2] As regards the productions of members of his family, we have copies of the marginal notes of his grandfather, R. Samuel, and his learned wife Eve, to the liturgical poems of the Machzor,[3] the account of a conversation he held in a dream with his father about a Hebrew begging-letter,[4] a poem that was written on the occasion of his appointment as preacher at Prague,[5] and a catalogue of all the writings of the tall R. Löw, of which only a very insignificant portion had appeared in print.[6] He makes observations upon the

---

חקירה דף ט"ו ע"ב • חקירה מה שבראה שדעתו של אדם נכונה יותר בהיותו שכור מבהיותו זולת זה : In the XIth vol. of his MS., *Collectanea* (p. 132*a*), he makes this remark, מה שנראה לי כי דעתו של אדם בהיותו שתוי קרובה אל הנכון בענין הדאגה :

[1] ג"ז [דיני'] י"ד קע"ט דף ק' ע"ב ענין בן תמליון • ושאין חטא על מי שמגדלו בביתו ודברים רבים ראיתי בספרי א"ה וקוראים לו קָאבָאלד ובכנוי פאלדר נייסטר והם דמות ילדים קטניט בלבוש יפה רואים ואינם נראים וכל משרתי הבית משימי' להם בזמן קבוע בקערה תבשיל לאכול • הוא עושה להם כל עבודת הבית ובפרט לנקו' הרפת ושאר עבודו' הבהמות ובלבד שלא ילעיגו עליו או ידברו עליו דבר בזיון ושאר פרטי ענייניו ומעשי' שהיו ומהותו לדעתם לא רציתי להאריך : Cp. about the בן תמליון, *Révue des Études Juives*, pp. 10, 66, and about Jewish superstition, Güdemann, *Geschichte...der Cultur der Juden in...Deutschland*, p. 199 sq. ; see also, for a description of the "mannikins," Witekind, in Janssen's *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, vi., 484.

[2] תפילה דף ק"כ עא"ב • מ"ש זקיני וזקינתי זלה"ה בגליון פיוטי' במחזור בפי' הדברים :

[3] ג"ז [דיני'] א"ח תקמ"ה דף ק"ג ע"ב • חלום שראיתי א"א הגז"ל ודברתי עמו בפירוש אגרת מזון שהוא קיבוץ של עני :

[4] פרפראו' דף ק"כ ע"ב • מ"ש א"א הגד"ל בחרוזי על חומש קטן כשנת קבל לדרשן בקק"פ :

[5] דף קפ"ה ע"א • ספרים שנדפסו שחיבר א"אז הגז"ל מוהרל"פ הם בפסולת מן האוכל שנתבזבז :

ritual as contained in certain old parchment-scrolls,[1] collects details respecting the communal customs of Hamburg and its environs,[2] and passes judgment upon practices that had crept in, such as the so-called "Spinnholz-Sabbath," [3] and the error that had spread of arbitrarily applying the formula used in the case of martyrs to persons killed in any manner.[4] He is no less deeply interested in strange identifications of different words and ideas according to their equal numerical value,[5] than in questions upon literary history, such as, Who was the author of the *Maggid Mishna*?[6] or, Why does Abraham Ibn Daud mention R. Jacob Tam in his *Chronicle*, but neither Rashi nor Maimuni,[7] or in making extracts from a parchment copy of R. Chayim's Or Sarua.[8]

The sixth volume, whose 111 leaves are indexed from page 84*a* to page 89*a*, contributed in a great measure to his collection of *Responsa*, including also the mathematical problem of No. 172.[9] But, in addition to various important expressions of opinion and Talmudical discussions,

---

[1] תפילה דף קע״ח ע״ב • נוסח שפוך חמתך בלילי פסח על קלף ישן נושן

[2] מנהגי׳ דף מ״ב עא״ב • חידושי מנהגים המבורג ואותן גלילות

[3] מנהגי׳ דף קל״ט ע״א • מנהג שפינהולץ • ושאינה מנהג חסידו׳ ובכה״ג בעת ב״ה של סעודת חתונה : ; cf. Loeb, *Annuaire de la Société des Études Juives*, I., p. 89 n. 1.

[4] ד״ת י״ד רמ״א דף ק״נ ע״ב • חתימת אדם בן הקדוש דווקא בידי מלכות ע״י עלילה או בשעת הגזירה • ואימתי יכתוב הי״ד ע״ד קפ״א ע״א :

[5] פרפראו׳ דף קצ״ב ע״ב • עמ״י עש״ו רגילי׳ לכתוב על הכתב גי׳ מלכות [= 496] ; ג״ז פרפר׳ דף קצ״ו ע״ב : שנה מעוברת שלימה ימיה גי׳ שבינה [= 385].

[6] חקירה דף מ״א ע״א • מה שמו של המחבר מגיד משנה :

[7] חקירות דף רנ״ג ע״ב • תמה על שזכר הראב״ד בספר קבלתו לר״ת ולא לרש״י ולרמ״בם :

[8] ספרים דף ל״ז עא״ב • ליקוטים יפים מספר קלף שו״ת מהר״ר חיים בן ר׳ יצחק בעל א״ז :

[9] חקירה וחכמה [דף כ״ג] ע״ב ודף כ״ד • חקירות נפלאות ושאלות עמוקו׳ ברבוע יתר העגולה שהוכיחו התו׳ על חוטים כרוכות בשטח עיגול טפח • נדפס קע״ב :

there are also researches upon literary matters. Thus he deals with the corrupt and highly-misleading state of the text of our *Tosefta*,[1] and with the proof that Zerachia of Gerona could only have been nineteen years of age when he began his *Maor*, and not when he finished it.[2] He records with precision the fact that his father had been wont to fast regularly on the anniversary of the death of his uncle, R. Chayim Cohen, who had also been his teacher,[3] as well as the curious coincidences of equality in value of various words,[4] and he carefully notes the explanation of some obscure proverbs.[5]

Especially rich in material was Vol. VII., that contained 282 leaves, and is described in the index from p. 89*a*—104*a*. Here he had written out his father's commentary to the tractate of the Mishna, called Kinnim,[6] with his own criticisms and the replies thereto of the author. Natural science, history, and literature were here gathered together pell-mell. The pigmies (Alräunchen)[7] are as much a point of interest to him as the query whether the human race has really deteriorated in stature, strength, and longevity.[8]

---

[1] ד״ת דף ב׳ ע״ב • שהתוספתות שבידינו משובשים ומוטעים מאד מאד

[2] ד״ת דף ע״ו ע״ב • הוכיח שא״א לומר בשום פנים שהיה הרז״ה רק בן י״ט בגמר חיבורו ספר המאור רק בהתחלתו :

[3] חסידו׳ דף ס״ז ע״א • א״א הגז״ל היה מתענה ביום פטירת רבו המובהק הגאון דודו מוהר״רח כ״ץ :

[4] פרפראות דף ס״ב ע״א • שדי גי׳ דין עד דיין [=314] וכה״ג מלאת״י משפט גי׳ ב׳ עדים ב׳ בעלי דינים בעלי דינים ג׳ דיינים [=481] :

[5] ד״ה דף ס״א ע״א • הא דמרגלא בפומייהו דאינשא חזור חזור ואל תצטרך לבלזו״ר מהו : cf. Dukes, in *Ozar Nechmad*, II., 113.

[6] מדף ל״ט עד דף ע׳ למד דפין ביאורי משניות מסכת קינן מא״א הגז״ל ומה שהשגתי עליהן ומה שהשיב בקצתן דחה וקצתן הודה על הגליון כלם הועתקו מר״הה [מר׳ הירש הענא] [*i.e.*, :

[7] ד״ה דף פ״ז ע״א • מענין בריה דמות אדם קורין אלריינכין • ויש ג״ב שורש עשב בדמות זה : ; cp. Janssen, *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes*, VI. 460, No. 1, and Hermann Peters, *Aus pharmaceutischer Vorzeit*, N. T.

[8] חקירה דף צ׳ ע״א צ״ע במ״ש שנשתנו בני אדם מדורו׳ הראשוני בקומה בגבורה בזמן תולדה בחכמה מקראי : ; about this assertion, which

The enumeration of the Messianic movements in Jewish history,[1] is as important an object of solicitude as the fixing the date of the composition of the legal code of Joseph Karo,[2] at the years 1522-1542. He makes a note of the supposed introduction of Hebrew words into other languages, such as the word "baar"[3] into German, or the word "null,"[4] into Latin, and, like a harbinger of the study of folk-lore, he comments upon the appearance of Talmudical tales in other literatures.[5] Like the Christian theologians, he raises the question, how America was peopled after the flood,[6] and makes use of an opinion of Philo to help him to disprove that Cain married his sister.[7] He holds in pious respect every Jewish custom,[8] but nevertheless reads polemical writings against Judaism, and adduces remarks collected from Wagenseil's works.[9] He

---

is controverted by Oersted, compare an old opinion given in *Révue des Études Juives*, IX., 58.

[1] חקירו' דף צ"ז ע"ב • מענין כמה זמני קצים ומשיחים שעברו ועשו פלאות ע' כרך ב' דקצ"ט ע"ב וכרך א' דף כ"ב ע"א : ; cf. Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III., 224.

[2] ספרים דף קי"ז ע"א • הב"י התחיל לחבר חיבורו שנת רפ"ב והשלימו שנת ש"ב :

[3] ד"ה דף ע"א ע"א • בכל הלשונו' נתערב לשון הקודש • ומלת ב"ר בל"א בר געלט כמו לויטר געלט • ע' כרך א' דפ"ד ע"א :

[4] ד"ה דרכ"א ע"א • פי' מלת נו"ל שהוא בלטיין מלשון כתוב נולי יתעבד בעזרא ו' [11] :

[5] ספרי' דף צ"ח ע"א • מה שהעתיקו חכמי א"ה בספריהם קניא דרבא ומעשה דרבי בנאה חבוטי קברא דאבוכן בשינוי קצת :.

[6] ג"ז [חקירה] דף פ"ז ע"ב • שאלת חכמיהם עולם החדש שנמצאו בה רבבות בני אדם ובעלי חיים איך באו לשם אחר המבול :

[7] ג"ז [חידושי'] דף צ"ח ע"א • מ"ש פילא היהודי שאדה"ר הוליד עוד י"ב בנים וט' בנות ולפי זה אינו מוכרח שקין נשא אחותו :

[8] מנהגי' דף ק"ז ע"ב • אין להלעיג על שום מנהג אף שאין לו טעם כגון נר י"צ ; פרפרא' דף קכ"ג ע"ב • ר"ת שבכותלי בה"כ • סמו"ט דמש"ק אט"לים שמלי"ד"ר :; cp. Schudt, *Jüdische Merckwürdigkeiten*, III.

[9] ספרי' דר"ח קונטריסי' ויכוחים ודברי ניצוח והעתקות מספר מלומד וגי זליר • מ"ש באלה ע' כרך ה' דס"א וס"ב [ספרים דף ס"א וס"ב • לקוטמי מספרי ניצחון וסכר חכם מחכמיהם בינויו וואגי זאל • נצרכים לוכוח ע'

is as much interested in the personal individuality of Bachya b. Joseph,[1] as he is eager to defend Maimuni against the suspicions of Abravanel.[2]

But even if originally Bacharach intended to make an index only to seven volumes of his *Collectanea*, he, nevertheless, soon began to do the same to other volumes, which were all duly numbered, and the valuable contents of which were as deserving of an exhaustive description as the others. By these means we obtain a still deeper insight into his earnest mind that was so deeply attached to every written memorial of the past and so careful in preserving every literary tradition. We see how his example stirred up his younger friend R. David Oppenheim, who, unlike himself, was favoured by opportunity and unlimited wealth, to carry out on a large scale the scheme that had been to R. Jair only a longed-for and unattainable ideal, viz., the foundation of a collection of every work both in print and in MS. that was connected with Jewish literature.

An eighth volume, brimful of rich material, was not yet ready for indexing when he was busy describing in detail the others, owing to the additions that it received every day.[3]

He thought that Vol. IX. fully deserved and required an exact description. Besides Talmudical treatises, it contained the discourses he delivered on the occasion of the conclusion of his lectures upon the single tractates of the

---

: [כרך ז׳]. In חות יאיר, p. 5*b*, he attacks the remarks of Wagenseil, in his *Tela Ignea Satanæ*, p. 121, where he also calls him המלומד הגדול וואגי זאליר

[1] חכמות ק״נ ע״א • מי היה המחבר ספר חובות הלבבות ומ״ש בהקדמה תוכחה על הלומדי׳ דיני גירושין ולא ידעו עניני מצות :

[2] ספרי׳ דף ק״כ ע״ב • תלונה רבה על הרי״א בכמה דברים ובפרט שחשד להרמב״ם שהכחיש ששת ימי המעשה :

[3] P. 114*a* of the Index contains this one remark, כרך ח׳ עוד יש בידי כרך ח׳ המתרבה בע״ה יום יום ורשום בראשי דפין רק עדיין לא נרמשו הדבורים בסימנים כז׳ כרכים האחרים • כי לרשמם בכרך הזה אין מקום

Mishna and the Talmud, the Masoretic explanations of his father, and important funeral orations.[1] Here we find reference to the funeral orations delivered by R. Samson Bacharach upon his father, upon R. Samuel Edels (died 1632), upon R. David, Rabbi of Dresdnitz in Moravia (died 1639), upon the preacher, R. Loeb, of Mayence (1644), and upon R. Jonah Teomim, of Metz (died 1669),[2] as well as to memorial addresses by R. Jair himself upon R. Jonah Teomim, R. Jerucham, R. Isaac, of Mannheim, who was his brother-in-law, upon another brother-in-law, R. Moses Brilin, upon a relative named R. Nathan b. Jechiel, upon the warden, Baruch, upon the pious R. Sussmann, and R. Gershon Ashkenazi.[3]

---

[1] The Index, p. 114*a*, thus describes it:—כרך ט׳ סיומי משניות • וסיומי מסכתות • מסורות • והספדות • וחידושי הרא״ש על איזה מסכתות וחידושי ברכות ועוד איזה הלכות: In pp. 114*a*-115*a*, 48 leaves of the MS., which must have had four kinds of pagination, are described; in p. 116*a*, 19 leaves which were especially numbered, are described, and they contain the discourses upon the Talmud: p. 116*b*, deals with the Masoretic notes; p. 117*a* with the comments to Asheri, and Talmudical discussions in which both he and his father were engaged; and p. 117*b* enumerates the funeral orations that took up thirty-nine leaves that were especially numbered.

[2] דף אבנ״ד • דרוש הספד מא״א הגז״ל על קבר אביו זקיני מוהר״ש זצ״ל
דף ה״ו • דרוש הספד מא״א הגז״ל • שצ״ב על הגאון מהרר״ש אדילש:
דף ז״ח • עוד ממנו על הגאוני׳ מהר״ד אב״ד מדרעזניץ ומהרר״ל דרשן: [*v.* Zunz, *Litg.*, 432].
דף ט״י ר״א • עוד הספד סתם:
דף י״ג • עוד הספר על הגאון מהרר יונה אב״ד ממיץ:

[3] דף י״ט • דרוש על ר׳ ירוחם ז״ל • ממני:
דף כ׳ וכא׳ • הספד על הגאון מהרר יונה הנ״ל ממני באריכו׳ וביאור כמה מאמרי׳ על שאול ועל בית הדמים: גמ׳ הנעלבים [*Gittin*, 36*b*] סוף פ׳ שירת דבורה ואוהביו כצאת שמש:
דף כ״ב • הספד על גיס״ הרב ממנהיי׳ כמוהרר איצק זצ״ל • מזמור מי יגור באהליך:
דף כ״ג • פשט ערום יצאתי על מחותני ר׳ נתן בן ר׳ יחיאל • גם גמ׳ כל הקובע מקום וכו׳ [*Ber.* 6*b*]:
דף כ״ד כ״ה • דרוש על פ״ו ר׳ ברוך ז״ל:
דף כ׳׳ו׳׳ח׳ • על גיסי החסיד מהרר משה ז״ל גמ׳ דהו׳ בכי דבמס׳ מ״ק:

In Vol. XI. he had gathered together the fruits of his reading, the account[1] of which gives us an insight into the extent and variety of his general studies. Grammarians and exegetes, philosophers and historians, preachers and books of *Responsa*—all had been equally the objects of his attention. He also gives excerpts from manuscripts[2] that were only temporarily in his possession. As it was his habit to introduce everywhere some remarks of his own, he frequently intermingled independent observations with his *Collectanea*, and when he did so he noted down in the Index the sources of his information.[3] This list of extracts from the books of others he completes by a *résumé* of the excerpts scattered throughout the seven chief volumes.[4]

In Vol. XVI. we are informed of the existence of a MS. which contained, in addition to notes by his father and grandfather, also portions from the pens of other authorities, such as R. Moses Cohen Narol, whose writings came into the possession of the family of Bacharach through his

---

ע״ד ל׳א על איש צדיק ר׳ זוסמז ״ל :
דף ל״ט · על הגאון מוהר״ג מ״ה אב״ד ממיץ זצ״ל :

[1] P. 108*a* of the Index is thus headed: ליקוטים יפים מספרים הרשומים ודברים תורניי׳ וחידושים שחדשתי והשגתי לפעמים עליהם. This description of the works he read occupies 209 leaves: p. 108*b* concludes this retrospect.

[2] Thus, *e.g.*, דף מ׳ג עד נ״א, ספר פרחן דקדק, that is, the grammatical portion of the *Machbereth* of Ibn Parchon, דף נ״א ; דף ל׳ פ׳ מחזור קלף דף קצ״ז · ספר כתוב and ; ע״ב · גמטריאו׳ מתוקים על ספר קלף ישן מר׳ ייזלין הזקן מאורעות, in which I recognise the *Memories of Joselmann von Rosheim;* v. *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XVI. 85, *sqq.*

[3] Pp. 106*a*-107*a* has the heading: דברים תורניי׳ שאינם נוגעים לספרים הרש[ו]מים בדף ק׳ח ע״א רק לפי שעה כתבתי אותם אצלם בכרך י״א · ורשמתי אותם פה בכרך י״א ע׳ רשימה סוף ספר זה ולקמן דק״ח ע״א. This index at the end of the volume, to which he often alludes, is missing in the MS.; perhaps it was also only intended to be drawn up, but was never done.

[4] P. 108*b* has this heading: רשימת ליקוטי קצת ספרי׳ זולתי ספרים מע״ל הנזכרים והמה נפוצים ונמצאים בכרכים [*i.e.*, p. 108*a*], *i.e.*, in the *seven* volumes to which he exclusively refers in these remarks.

widow; R. David Blum, Rabbi of Sulzburg in Baden; and R. Elijah Loans, of Worms.[1]

A detailed index was also wanted for Vol: XVII., which originally comprised 117 pages.[2] Having been begun when he was a youth, its contents had been partly passed over and partly transferred to other volumes. Thus afterwards whole pages of it were thrown into the fire, and others struck out. But what remained was of sufficient value as to merit a minute description. In addition to remarks upon his nightly dreams, in which he continued his studies [3] and speculations upon the form of the shield of David,[4] we also find here the reflection that the learned students of the Law, who apparently were maintained by the working classes, really were the supports of the latter.[5] Already there reveals itself in his youthful mind that many-sidedness and interest in all kinds of knowledge that afterwards so characterised him when in maturer years. In the midst of Talmudical studies there

---

[1] P. 123*b* of the Index contains the distinct note, כרך ט״ז • לבני ר״ש Among others, the following are enumerated :—

ביאורי חלק א״ח מזקיני הגאון כמוהרא״ש :
הגה׳ על הרא״ש על כמה מסכתות • מא״א הגז״ל :
הגה׳ על המרדכי מא״אז הגז״ל הג״ל :
קונטרס פרפראות נפלאות מהגאון מוהרר״מ נהראל :
קונטרסים ממהר דוד בלומא מזולצבורג :
ב׳ קונטרסים כ״י הגאון מוהרר אלי׳ בעל שם על הזוהר מספרו מדות אלי׳ והקדמתו • ולפי הנשמע כל הספר ביד יוצאי חלצין והיה בנו ר׳ ייזלין במענץ :

[2] The description of it in the Index extends from p. 109*a*-112*a*, and bears the following heading : כרך י״ז אשר כתבתי בימי חורפי מן הבא ברעיוני ק״ב דפין רק מפני שרובא דרובא כבר נעתקו בברכים אחרים ומקצתם לא ישרו בעיני לכן שרפתי מהם כמה דפין ומהנשארי׳ העברתי קולמס על אותן שכבר הועתקו או דחזינא בהו תיוהא ומעוטים הנשארים שרירים וקיימים מפוזרים אנה ואנה וחפצתי להעתיק פה סמנים מהם [sc. ע׳ רשימה סוף ספר זה] וראשי פרקים.

[3] ד״ת דף ט״ז • נראה לי בחלום קושיא ותירץ על אין מקיפין בחילול השם :

[4] פרפראו׳ דף ט״ו • סוד צורת מגן דוד :

[5] ד״ת דף ל״ה • מה שבמורגש ת״ח נידוני׳ מע״ה • ובמושכל להיפך :

appear notices upon the ritual at Metz,[1] and critical glosses to the editions of Jewish chronicles.[2]

In Vol. XVIII. three collections were combined, viz., his own decisions when a Rabbi, and forms of documents, such as bills of divorce and of chaliza; secondly, items from the official actions of his father concerning the same subjects, and, finally, the opinions of older authorities upon similar questions.[3]

Vol. XIX., according to its description, contained a large and elaborate work of his father upon the 613 commandments, a Will of R. Samson Bacharach, that is full of testimony to his profound piety, and an ethical letter of admonition to his children.[4]

In Vol. XX. he had collected his marginal notes upon certain well-known works, such as the *Two Tables of the Covenant*, of R. Isaiah Hurwitz, and the famous book of

---

1 מנהגי' דף ט' · מנהגים דק"ק מיץ :

2 ספרי' דף פ"ח ע"א · השגה על היוסחין בשני דורות ר"ת והראב"ן :
ספרי' דף ק"י ע"א · חשגות על בעל שה"ק בשני דורות :

3 On p. 112*a*, at the end of the Index to vol. XVII., appears the remark :
אחר כרך י"ז הנ"ל הנחתי כרך רשום י"ח והוא מה שאירע לי בגיטין שסדרתי ובהם כמה חדושים דינים הלכה למעשה והם קבוצי דפין רבים ומקראיהם וזמניהם גם סדר גט וחליצה בקצרה וקלפי גיטין עצמן אבל דפין קטנים מאד כ"י א"א הגז"ל בגיטין שסידר הוא עם כרך גדול של הגיטין עצמן הוא בכרך אחר מלבד כרך סידורי גיטין וחליצות על דפין גדולים כמלא ספר גדול מגדולי הקדמונים והוא בכרך רושם ומ"מ שייך לרושם י"ח הזה :

4 On p. 113*a* of the Index are the following words : כרך י"ט כרך גדול
מאד כ"י א"א גז"ל במנין תרי"ג מצות והנוהגי' בכל יום ומה שנכשלין בהם ותוכחה :
כרך גדול יותר מאד ממני ומה שנחלקו גדולי הקדמוני' במנין קצת מ"ע ומל"ת ומה שנלע"ד · גם מה יאמר לפני עשיית כמה וכמה מ"ע אשר לא יסדו הז"ל לברך עליהם והשגות על ספר מגלות אסתר :
כרך צוואת א"א הגז"ל בכתב ידו ובו יראה גודל חסידתו ע' כרך ל"ט · עוד צוואת מוסר ליוצאי חלציו כלליים וקצת דברים פרטים שמזהיר ומצוה לבניו וי"ח · קצתם הנחת[י]ם אצל צוואה שלי :
קונטרס גדול בענין רל"א שערים פנים ואחור ונפלאות במספר צירופי המלות מקטן ועד גדול :

R. Joshua Falk Cohen, and explanatory remarks upon the Midrashim.[1]

In another section of this miscellany, to which R. Jair was especially attached, we become acquainted, thanks to the minute catalogue of the contents of Vol. XXII., with the poems and prayers of his father,[2] which he inserted in the index, after the pattern of the author. Is it owing to its stout binding, or to any other external circumstance, that this book alone, among all the huge collection that was brought together with so much love by their owner,[3] has come down to posterity? From this favourite volume of Bacharach are taken the poems that he could not omit to reproduce[4] in memory of their composer.

In Vol. XXIII. there were a number of manuscripts, some his own work, such as the plan of the introduction to his *Mekor Chayim*, and of the *Ez Chayim*, and others written by his father.[5]

---

[1] On p. 122*a* of the Index we read: כרך כף : כרך גדול חדשים עין יעקב וחידושי מהרש"א הגה' וחידושי מדרש רבה וילקוט : כרך גדול העתקות מ"ש בגליון ספר של"ה : כרך גדול מ"ש בגליוני סט"ע וקצת חידושים : כרך גדול על חדושי פי' רשי וצדה לדרך בתורה : Originally the words in חות יאיר, No. 1., were also included here: נדפם בח"י (קונטריסים רבים השגת על בעל מהדורי שניה דנ"ש במה שהשיג עלי · הועתק מר' הירש הענא) נדפם בג"ה. He also observes here on the margin: ע' רשימה סוף ספר זה.

[2] P. 125*a* of the Index has the heading: כרך כ"ב · כרך קטן מאד מאד מכורך בדפי עין ומסגרת יפה יפה כ"י א"א הגז"ל הם שירות והודאו' וסליחות ותחינות וידויים ובסופו מראה מקום לפי הדפין והעתקתי פה המראה מקום לשונו מלה המלה :

[3] The MS. was in the possession of Jacob Koppel, Rabbi of Worms, who, in 1848, published some of the poems of R. Samson Bacharach, in the journal שומר ציון הנאמן, pp. 108*b*, 110*b*, 118*b*, 120*a*, 132*b*, 138*b*, 148*b*, 152*b*, 156*a*.

[4] חות יאיר, pp. 223*a*-229*a*, 274*b*-275*a*.

[5] In the Index, p. 121*a*, under the heading כרך כ"ג · ע' רשימה סוף ספר זה, we have enumerated, קונטרס ק' גלגולים מהאר"י ז"ל כ"י א"א הגז"ל · קונטרסים מגדולי הקדמוני' נחשים על הוצאת לעז על המשפחות, clearly

One of the pearls of the collection is Vol. XXIV., which is mainly devoted to historical notes, and to original, contemporary, and ancient poems, many by men who were altogether unknown as poets. Here, too, we find the memoirs of R. Moses Cohen Narol, which R. Jair's stepmother had brought from Metz, and which consist of penitential prayers and accounts of the persecutions of 1648 and 1656, as well as of events occurring in Metz.[1] A special value is attached to this volume from its dealing with family matters. It contains the genealogical tree of his father and mother, the memoirs of the unhappy year (1666) of the plague in Worms, the account of the invitation of the tall R. Löw to appear before the Emperor Rudolf II., and the text of the amulets that he prepared for that monarch. At the end of this volume were also the letters from relatives and friends that Bacharach deemed worthy of special description.[2]

Memorials of inestimable historical value were gathered together in Vol. XXXV. Although many of these documents had been burnt and lost, yet the remnant of

---

as a reference to the *Responsa* upon the so-called "Pin-maker's" question; cp. S. Hock, in *Gal-Ed*, p. 16, note 18,—

איזה פשטים נפרדים מא"א הג"זל קצתם נזכרו בספרו שמן המאור
פתקים קטנים נפרדים מא"א הג"זל שייכי' לט"ז וש"כ לחלק י"ד
כרך גדול קבלה מעשיות · נתתי במתנה לה"ה אב"ד ראש ישיבה קלויז
מהרר שטואל שאטי בהיותי שם ורנקוורט קיץ תנ"ט :

This volume also contained the introduction of the *Mekor Chayim*, part of the letters of approval of the same, and the plan of the *Ez Chayim;* thus Bacharach describes it: כרך הסכמות גדולי הדור רבני אשכנז על ספרי נדפם בספר ח"י ; מ"ח בכרך יפה אצל ספר מ"ח (all this is struck out); further we read, הקדמה שייכה לספרי מ"ח ועניני וכל השייך לחיבור כל הכרכים · נכתב כ"י ר' הירש הענא אצל שו"ת שהעתיק ק' בינין ונדפסה בשו"ת ח"י. By the aid of this quotation, we can now understand the words in חות יאיר, p. 230*b*, ובכרך כ"ג ביארתי.

[1] Among these, I include the documents about the dispute between R. Meir Lublin and R. Joseph Ashkenas, of Metz; cp. Kaufmann, *Révue des Études Juives*, XXII.

[2] P. 119*a*. *b*, and p. 126*a* contain the Index of this volume.

them contained such important fragments that a detailed description of them seemed fully justified.[1] The records of the Sabbatian agitation of the year 1666, and the correspondence that both he and his father carried on during this exciting time, had an especially personal interest for Bacharach. In this volume were also carefully collected historical notes of apparently slight importance, such as the affair of the confiscation of books in Frankfurt-on-the-Maine[2] in 1509-10, a proof of the enlightened historical tendencies of the collector's mind.

Vol. XXXVII. contained a special work of his grandfather upon the Talmudic tractate Baba Mezia.[3]

In Vol. XLVI. of this collection were included the poems of his father, the majority of which were taken from Vol. XXII., besides other poems and imperfect fragments of his own composition, and poems of an historical and religious purport of other authorities. This section Bacharach has furnished with a special table of contents.[4] Testimony to his historical bent of mind, which despised no source of historical information, and also extended to the examination of tombstones, is afforded here by his remarks upon the inscriptions upon the graves of R. Meir, of Rothenburg, and his noble benefactor, Alexander, which were in the cemetery at Worms.[5] We have also here the family-tree that R. Jair drew up, making important additions to the statements imparted to him by his father. In this part he also wrote out[6] an historical work of his, in

---

[1] According to p. 113*a* of the Index.

[2] Cp. the description of the MS. No. 7 of the *Rosenthaliana*, in the Catalogue of M. Roest, p. 1170, and Kracauer, in *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, I. 160 *sq.*

[3] Mentioned by the way in the Index to vol. xxxv.

[4] According to p. 125*a* of the Index.

[5] Cf. Lewysohn, Nos. 21 and 22.

[6] At the end of the description of vol. xxxv. are the words, קונטרים משלשלת נדולי חכמי צרפת וספרד ופוסקי שאחריהם עד היום · מהגאונים ואילך. All this is crossed out and replaced by the words, הוא בכרך מ״ו על״ק [=עיין לקטן] דקכ״ה ע״ב.

which he tried to establish a continuous chain of students of the Talmud from father to son, from teacher to pupil, from the time of the Gaonim down to almost his own time.

This commencement of a catalogue to his collection of MSS. continued by Bacharach, after he had left Worms, in his exile at Frankfurt,[1] proves to us most distinctly that in spite of his life-long habit of constantly taking notes, in spite of a superabundance of productions of all kinds, in spite of systematic and extensive diligence in collecting—by which labour he might have been able to publish something—in spite of all this, he never had anything ready to hand that need only have been shown in order to be printed at once. Stimulated by a sort of hunger for fresh knowledge, always engaged in collecting and writing down scientific facts and discoveries, restless in his gathering together notes like a student, and like a busy bee searching through all fields of learning, he may have almost felt that the honey was in his possession, when the bitter experience was brought home to him that he no longer had the power of extracting it.

The most striking example of this torment of Tantalus, to die of thirst in sight of flowing water, is offered by the work that has come down to us bodily, and not as a mere bibliographical shadow, viz., the manuscript of Mar Keshisha,[2] which is a dictionary of the terminology and

[1] This follows from what is said in preface to the *Jair Nathib*, which towards the end, describes his work as a lecturer at Worms.

[2] Which is preserved in the Beth-Hamidrash at Vienna. It is evident that this was only afterwards bound at the end of the volume containing the work written against R. Aaron Teomim, that originally had a special pagination. From the 201 leaves that (with the exception of the Preface to the *Jair Nathib*) are numbered on the lower left margin with Arabic numerals, 126*b*-201*b*, belong to the Mar Keshisha's work. In the middle of the top of the page next to the title, Bacharach wrote the numbers in the current Hebrew alphabet, and as he begins with p. 4, and leaves off with the page before the last, he only counts 150 sides (מר קששא קנ). Till p. 177, where the additions begin, on the left-hand corner of the upper margin of the right side of the page, the

methodology of the Talmud, in the widest sense of the words. It can be boldly averred that seldom has a collection of material for any branch of knowledge been attempted in such magnitude, and with such comprehensive observation of all facts connected therewith as in this one.

Whatever his deep research in the oft-repeated journey over the sea that was called the Talmud, had brought to the surface, was here collected. Every letter, every word, every formula, every rule that was in any way connected with the terminology and methods of the Talmud, was here dwelt upon, and elucidated with the most extensive reference to the large body of literature belonging thereto. Only a personal examination of this[1] material can give any idea of the richness of it. Seventy-six quarto leaves are covered with his delicate and well-formed handwriting, that looks at first as if it were hopelessly confused, but in reality is wonderfully clear, and reveals to us the fact that the writer was shortsighted. In the history of the study of the Talmud, this work ought to have made an epoch by its truthfulness and simplicity, its acquaintance with scientific methods, and its merciless severity against all useless ingenuity and Pilpulistic disputations.[2] But this treasury with its almost immeasur-

---

Hebrew letter, with which each article begins, is always given. Three full octavo leaves with notices upon the work are in sheets in the book.

[1] J. H. Weiss was engaged with the plan of an edition of it; *v.*, Kochbe Jizchak, 36, 85, *sqq.*, and Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, VIII., 222 *sqq.*

[2] As an example, I quote an article from p. 135*a* :—

לא מצא ידיו ורגליו בבה"מ · יבמות ע"ז ע"ב · כתובו' דמ"ח ע"א · גיטין ספ"ד · ג"ל שיחת ת"ח אף כי מורגל בפי כל צריך לימוד כי מ"ש ידיו הוא כענין מ"ש רז"ל בסוטה [f. 7*b*] דלא הוי ידע יהודה למישקיל ימטרה בשמעתת' עד שאמר מר"עה ידיו רב לו מפני שכל דבר טורח ייחם לידים בדרך השאלה מפני שע"י היד של אדם פועל הכל יהי נודע כחו וכמ"ש היד ה' תקצר · ולאפוקי מפי' בעל זיקוקין דנורא דכ"ז שעינינו פלפול הנעשה ע"י סיפוק ידים כי לדעתי אותה הנהגה משובשת וכל המרבה בה הרי זה משוגע והארכנו בזה בסוף הקדמתינו לספר

able wealth was scarcely a useful possession even for its owner; it was quite impossible for him to make it accessible to others. His eye hardly retained the power to penetrate this forest that had grown round the text in the course of years in the form of glosses; he was too weak and infirm to enter once again upon the researches, the results of which were here hinted at with extreme brevity rather than fully described, and to re-tread the path which he had traversed long ago. As the ominous title foreboded, he had become "the old man" who no longer had the strength to lift up the treasures that a life of unceasing industry and self-denial had accumulated.

Whilst in this condition, the only evidences of any healthy interruption in the progress of his activity in constantly acquiring new knowledge, were the public decisions, now the sole memorials of his productive labour, that were evoked from him by numerous questions from all sides. Through this channel he had an opportunity of displaying his rich store, which, thanks to the clearness of his index, he was easily able to extract from his *Collectanea*.

מטה אהרן בי רבי תגא ירושלמי הוא מקל נועם ואפילו ת"ח שבבבל לא נקרא חובלי' ע"י הידים חלילה רק ע"י סתירת כל א' את דבר חברו ע"י כח גדול ויד חזקה בפלפול · ומ"ש רגליו הוא אסוקי שמעתת' אליבי' דהלכתא שאחר שקלא וטריא שעליו אמר מר"עה ועזר מצריו והוא לשון קיום ועמידת הדבר ג"כ לשון מושאל ובמ"ש אמת יש לו רגלים ובמשנה שרגלים לדבר בבתרא דנזיר · עמ"ש תי"ט סוף משנה ראשונה דאבות על והעמידו תלמידי' אף דשם לפענ"ד א"צ לפנים כי הוא לשון חז"ל בפרט בדבר חשוב ומסוים כבפ"ב דסוכה העמיד מלכים העמיד שופטי' והוא לשון השיבו' כט"ש ויקם מלך חדש וכפי' רשי על ויקם שדה עפרון עמ"ש ערך עמידה. He also attacks Heida, *e.g.*, in the article גמיר לא ג"ש, p. 133*b*: והטיב חרה לי על רוב דבריו בזה ובכאלה בכמה מקומות ומפני כי איש חסיד היה חלילה לי לפגוע [p. 25] בכבודו ולנגוע בקציהו · עמ"ש סוף הקדמת ספרי מטה אהרן. Throughout the whole work Bacharach displays his thorough acquaintance with the Commentary to the Mishna of R. Lipman Heller, whom he calls (in חוט השני, p. 110*a*), הרב אוצר בלום ההוא בעל תי"ט.

In innumerable discussions, *pro* and *con*, he had at hand, in his seven principal volumes that were fully indexed, the familiar materials for his work, that were like a favourite garden through which he was never too tired to walk. With these excellent aids, it was not difficult to indicate to Hirsch Fränkel[1] and other copyists and amanuenses, among whom we are informed of a R. Elisha[2] and R. Samuel,[3] the passages from his *Collectanea* that were to be embodied in his miscellaneous *Responsa*.

This collection was to comprise 635 *Responsa*, the title of which, *Chavoth Jair*, was to equal that number in the numerical value of its letters, and was to have the further advantage of combining within itself other noteworthy plays upon words.[4] Thus, in contrast to the old works of *Responsa* that were like fortified cities, his modest expressions of opinion were only to be "the villages of Jair," and besides alluding to his name Chayim, were to preserve the memory of the learned grand-daughter of the tall R. Löw, the female founder of his house, by denoting the author as "the Jair of Eve (Chava)." But when only a third part of his *Responsa* had been printed, and he saw that they already formed a goodly volume, he resolved, in consequence of some deep-meaning allusions,[5] to issue in the first volume only 238, the numerical value of his family name (though on closer inspection, it really amounted to 242), to which, at the last moment, he added some especially important newly-received *Responsa* of his friend, R. David Oppenheim.[6] The inclusion of the prefaces to his original

---

[1] The first note in he *Jair Nathib* observes: כל מקום שנכתב אצלו בד"ג ור"ל בדפין גדולים הועתק מכ"י ר' הירש הענא על דפי קוואַרט.

[2] In the beginning of the *Jair Nathib*, Bacharach says: "Three short perpendicular lines at the side of any headline in the Index, denotes that this piece was copied by R. Elisha"; רושם ג' קווים קטני' בסופו ' סימן שהועתק בכ"י ר' אלישע.

[3] In the same way four dots show the work of R. Samuel:—:: רושם הועתק ע"י ר' שמואל. [4] *V.* the Preface.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 229*a*: 4 + טוב + יאיר = 4 + ויהי אור = בכרך = 242.

[6] *Ib.*, p. 239*a*-p. 250*a*.

larger works, as well as of the letters of approbat on to the *Mekor Chayim*, and of several references to his *Collectanea*,[1] and to the *Mar Keshisha*,[2] was to furnish some idea of the sum total of his life's work, even though he was prevented from making public the whole of it.

But it did not require this external indication to enable every clear-sighted person to see that with this work a scholar had come forward who was thoroughly conversant with every possible branch of learning, and every page of whose book bristled with proofs of the fulness of knowledge that was at the disposal of the author. What now appeared was something quite new and original, a collection of opinions that struck out a line for itself, that was independent and exhaustive in the solution of questions, highly suggestive in its manner of propounding problems, possessed of a thorough mastery over the sources of information, and supported by a remarkable knowledge of general literature. A series of auxiliary sciences had here been pressed into the service of the study of the Talmud: the spirit of R. Lipman Heller was now resuscitated. The general tendency of the whole was no longer a display of quibbling ingenuity, but a dignified erudition, that drew its origin from the most hidden sources. Emulating the example of Estori Parchi in his knowledge of the historical sciences, he again discussed the coins and weights and measures of the Talmud;[3] following Joseph del Medigo[4] he treated of mathematics and astro-

---

[1] *V.*, in the Preface: וזה הוא הטעם בעינו מ"ש באיזה מקומו' עיין בסמ"ק והוא ספרי מר קשישא או בקונטרסי' כרך פלוני דף פלוני; and further (p. 2*a*, line 5 from the bottom), ואיזה דברים מהם כתבתי בכרכים; compare also p. 165*a*, p. 185*b*, ע"כל בקונטרסי', and p. 230*b*, ובכרך כ'ג.

[2] סמ"ק = ספרי מר קשישא, he also reckons among the abbreviations on p. 276*b*. At the end of No. 152 occur the words, יש עוד בכה"ג לשונו' קשות ביארנוה בג"ה בספרי מ"ק.

[3] Compare חות יאיר, *Resp.* 1.; *v.* Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, p. 536.

[4] The idea of the publication of a special work by Bacharach upon Joseph del Medigo, mentioned in Zunz's *Monatstage*, p. 1, rests upon the passage in חוט השני, p. 112*a*. He had seen Joseph, when a boy, in

nomy[1] with the acumen of the specialist, and through the thoroughness and richness of his observations[2] he started a new school in the study of the Talmud. In the midst of these Talmudic *Responsa*, he revealed a mind that was equally at home in problems of religious philosophy[3] as in the mysteries of the Cabbala,[4] and that had passed the school of secular culture[5] in general and the study of natural science in particular.[6] An implacable enemy to

---

Prague, and also when he visited Worms, in 1652, as he himself states in כי ריש"ר בימי היה והכרתיו בהיותו בפראג ובבואו, חות יאיר, p. 270*b*; compare Horovitz, *Jüdische Aerzte*, p. 25, note 2.

[1] Compare, *e.g.*, *Resp.*, 155, 172, and p. 266-67*a*, 219, where his numerous astronomical labours are mentioned.

[2] In חות יאיר, No. 94, p. 91*a*, a friend there named had already remarked the incomparable character of the methodological writings of Bacharach. A careful comparison of this *Responsum*, as well as of the famous No. 192 with the text in the MS. of the מר קשישא, convinces me that the printed portion represents a revision and expansion of the rough materials here collected.

[3] From p. 198*b*, we learn that Bacharach has also written a work upon the *More* of Maimuni, והארכנו בג"ה בחידושי מ"נ.

[4] Compare *Resp.* 210.

[5] Compare *Resp.* 206. On f. 104*b* he also mentions a polyglot Bible of the New Testament, in sixteen languages, that he had seen. Compare his remarks upon the antiquity of printing, and how books used to be printed, in *Resp.* 185; he speaks of the German translation of the Bible, p. 206*b*, last line.

[6] In the remarkable *Resp.* 233, he reckons up the miracles and incomprehensible phenomena in Nature, that distinctly support the idea of transcendental mysteries, compare 234. The self-contradictions of the statements of scientists, especially among astronomers, that he mentions in the learned *Resp.* 219, has induced him (as we see on f. 204*a*) to throw into the fire with his own hand his researches in this abtruse subject: אף כי קמתי בשחר ושרפתי בחמתי ומר נפשי כמה גווילין וניירות חבלתי מעשי ידי אשר טרחו בו זמן רב. His ardent longing for knowledge that is manifested in this *Responsum*, which altogether breathes a modern spirit, leads us to wish we might see a translation of, and scientific investigation into it. Thus, on f. 206*b*, he also speaks of how he refuted the argument of a Christian scholar who defended the alteration of the Sabbath to Sunday on the plea that one day had been lost when, in the time of Joshua, the sun stood still, by showing to him that in that case the Mohammedan were right in observing Friday as the day of rest.

Pilpul,[1] he disarmed all opposition by his profound knowledge of the sources of his statements, a knowledge that enabled him to point out, even to great scholars, what they had overlooked or said incorrectly.[2]

A glance through his volumes of *Collectanea* suggested all sorts of important additions, some of which he determined to subjoin to his first volume, but of which he decided to reserve the greater part for the second, that was to include the remainder of his *Responsa*, but which never appeared. The house of Oppenheim in Vienna, Samuel Oppenheim and his sons Emanuel and Wolf, in conjunction with Samson Wertheimer, defrayed the expenses of printing[3] ; and in the spring of 1699 the work issued from the press of the Frankfurt printer Johannes Wust.

Owing to his feeble health and consequent need of rest Bacharach had not troubled to obtain testimonials from strangers, though he could readily have procured them from all sides. He limited himself to his friends in Frankfurt. R. Gabriel Eskeles, of Metz, who, as a descendant of the tall R. Löw, was his kinsman, and who was just then staying in Frankfurt (1698) whilst on a journey ; R. David Oppenheim, in Nicolburg, and R Samson Wertheimer, in Vienna, both of whom had heard of his work of *Responsa* from Worms[4]—these were the only strangers whose

---

[1] Compare the end of the pedagogic *Responsum*, No. 123, and the observations of R. Samson in Nos. 124 and 152 ; for the high esteem in which he held Hebrew grammar, see f. 206*a*, *b*.

[2] The extreme independence of Bacharach is shown, for instance, in *Resp.* 20, that is so replete with proofs of the extensive range of his reading, and that had already been published in חוט השני. In this, he points out from Rashi, Maimuni, Elijah Misrachi, and R. Isachar Bär Eulenburg, whom he esteemed so highly, how even the greatest authorities can err. By comparing p. 24*b* with p. 108*b*, it will be further seen that Bacharach had this sheet reprinted after the whole collection of *Responsa* had been already printed.

[3] Kaufmann, *Samson Wertheimer*, p. 57, note 2.

[4] Bacharach's words at the end of the testimonials: כי שני המאורות הגדולים הרחוקים המה ראו בביתי ובגבולי בק״ק ווירמיישא רובא דמינכר מן התשובות בהיותם אתי עמי במחיצתי.

warm expressions of approval he prefixed to his book. Joseph Samuel b. Zebi,[1] the Rabbi in Frankfurt, led the way, and R. Samuel Cohen Schotten and Naphtali Herz Gans ended the list of friends who signified their esteem for Bacharach by giving their letters of approbation to his work.

It was characteristic of the fate of this man, hardened in misfortunes, that the sun just began to rise in the heaven of his life when evening was drawing nigh. Now, when his renown was being spread abroad on the wings of his book, he had become a prematurely aged man, who had surrendered all his once fondly cherished hopes, and had learned that resignation[2] which is too often the only guerdon of conscientious toil. Had he been still young and strong, he would not have had to wait long for a summons from some important community, a realisation of his hopes, for which he had hitherto been fruitlessly longing. For we need not seek the causes of his isolation and ill-success in any traits in his character, which the all-effacing hand of time might have obliterated. It is at once obvious that this man, whom unknown circumstances had condemned to the obscurity of private life, after a too brief period of public activity, has been unable to rise again, in spite of the appreciation of the best of his contemporaries, without the support afforded him by literary fame. His distinguished descent and personal talents had not been sufficient to procure for the obscure German a post worthy of his merits, at a time when the most eminent Jewish communities chose for their Rabbis none but Polish scholars, whose studies began

---

[1] *V.* Horovitz, *Frankfurter Rab.*, II. 56, note 2; the words in his testimonial אשר היה ר"מ ואב"ד בילדותו, בק"ק ווירמישא, which Lewysohn p. 74, has only made worse by attempting to correct them by an impossible conjecture—probably contains a blunder instead of מענץ or מגנצא.

[2] In the Preface, p. 1*b*, he remarks: כי כבר הגעתי ת"ל למדת הנשתווין, which words have been thought worthy of being reproduced in Asulai's שם הגדולים, ed. Benjacob, I. 458.

and ended with the Talmud. But he had already become reconciled to his fate, and had humbly and quietly given up all expectations for the future. If there was anything that disturbed him, it was the thought that the continuance of learned tradition, the chain of the study of the Law, which had descended in his family from father to son, would cease with him, and his intellectual heritage would be wasted, and have nobody to accept it.[1] It was for this reason alone, and not with any desire for fame, that he rejoiced in the thought that the publication of the first volume of his *Responsa* had secured the safety of at least a part of his life's work.

But his day was not yet destined to draw to a close before he had scattered the seeds of his genius in the same furrows in which his father and grandfather had laboured. The belief in the re-establishment of the community at Worms, that he had foretold and continually nourished, did not prove an idle one; he was to be rewarded for the force of his faithful confidence. The Peace of Ryswick had been concluded, and the dispersed citizens and the Council that had been deliberating in exile now hurried together to reconstitute a new community from the ruins and desolation of the city.[2] In vain had the Lord Palatine and ruling chief justice, Johann Friedrich Seidenbender, attempted to keep out all who were not Lutherans from the new town, and in the thirty-nine articles of his memorial-letter had especially devised plans against the Jews, "how they should be allowed to die out quietly."[3] On the 13th of June, 1699, the treaty that sealed the admission of the Reformers

---

[1] Compare p. 1*b* of the Preface to חוות יאיר and to the Index, יאיר נתיב.

[2] F. Soldau, *Die Zerstörung der Stadt Worms im Jahre* 1689, p. 47.

[3] Lewysohn has published the remarks of Seidenbender—not Seidenbrenner—taken from his memorial-letter, that concerns the Jews, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, VII., 363-7: "If we read what his opinions were," says Soldau, p. 49, "it will be evident why, during the time Worms was in the hands of the French, the Jews kept friendly with the enemy an bore so little love to their own governors."

was concluded. Nor could this permission be withheld from the Jews, who, thanks to the energetic and influential support they received from Samuel Oppenheimer, the Imperial Chief Court-Agent at Vienna, were moreover confirmed in all their privileges.[1] With revived courage and warm zeal the Jewish community accordingly set about re-establishing themselves. The old Synagogue, that had become a stable for the horses of the brutal soldiery who had burnt the town, and afterwards a granary for the provisions of the populace who had taken refuge therein,[2] had first to be attended to, and it was even white-washed inside—an act that their pious scruples had prevented them from performing at any other time.[3] The selection of a Rabbi for the new community, which was their foremost care, could scarcely have caused any serious doubt, or have been open to dispute. They might well consider themselves fortunate in having a shepherd close at hand who would take charge of the once more assembled flock, and to whom an old debt was still owing. With what feelings must Bacharach have accepted the post to which a generation before he had been dedicated by the blessing of his dying father, towards which he had in vain brought forward his highest aspirations and fullest strength, and which was now bestowed upon him when a mere shadow, a wreck of his former self! Certainly he must have recognised the hand of Providence in all this, that allowed him, though late in the day, yet with his own eyes to behold the chair of authority that had been sanctified for him by the legacy of his father.

Thus, he had the satisfaction of knowing that not in vain had he dreamed of the re-consolidation of the revered and

---

[1] *V.* Seidenbender, quoted by Lewysohn, *ib.*, 363; G. Wolf, *Geschichte der Juden in Worms.*

[2] Schudt, I., 411; Lewysohn, *ib.*, 362.

[3] See *supra*, note 74, and Schudt, *ib.*, "After the peace of Ryswick had been concluded, the Jews forthwith renovated their Synagogue and erected a roof of slate over the vault, in order to make it look very pretty."

ancient congregation of Worms, and of being a witness of its vigorous resurrection, thanks to the resolute guidance of its leaders. The spirit of intolerance that was breathed forth, both from the council-chamber and the pulpit, against the Jews, could not check the process of their re-settlement in the town; the wardens of the synagogue had even the courage in the year 1700 to lodge a complaint with the magistrates against the inflammatory sermons of the parish priest, Johann Heinrich Mehl, and thus to preserve at least the appearance of justice, though so far from obtaining the reality, they were compelled by the Government to apologise to the clergyman in question.[1]

But it was to be sufficient for Bacharach to have passed the borders of his promised land, and to see only the beginning of the realisation of that which he had so earnestly longed for. After a short period of activity, on the 1st of January, 1702, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, death withdrew him from his congregation. Enfeebled by illness from his childhood, his strength consumed by grief, having been almost compelled to still his biting sorrow by incessant and exhausting mental labour, he had grown aged, before he had reached advanced years, and had spent all his powers by the time he had begun to require them for prosperous activity. True it is that both his epitaph,[2] and the "memorial for his soul"[3] that was set up for him in Worms, prove that people began, after his death, to recognise what they had lost in him, though they had not known how to keep possession of him, but the ill-fated star that had shed such a gloomy light over his whole life pursued him even beyond the grave. The distressing anxiety about the writings he would leave behind him, that had disturbed his last years, has proved itself to be well founded, for the

---

[1] Schudt, *ib.*, 421 *sqq.*

[2] The first words of the epitaph (Lewysohn, No. 38), before the word שִׁמְעוֹן, form the acrostic הגאון מהורר"ח.

[3] קבץ על יד, III. 22.

rich intellectual treasures that all his life long he had accumulated and guarded with so much affection, have been scattered to the four winds, and become a prey to the destructive elements.[1] But even if he has not come down to posterity with all the ripe produce of his life's work, nevertheless he has become so deeply impressed upon their memory as to have his name preserved as one of the most prominent men of genius, one of the most important phenomena among the German Jews of the seventeenth century, who, though having his nature deeply rooted in the past was still in advance of his time, and who will always be regarded as the forerunner of the study of Judaism in a historical and scientific spirit.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

---

[1] Even the necessary instructions about how his MSS. should be divided into parts, which seem to have been written upon the covers of the Index, have disappeared, perhaps through careless binding. One passage has however been preserved, which M. Friedmann has already transcribed for Dr. Berliner, it runs as follows :—

ישאר ביד האפטרופסים כרך ח׳
כרך שטרות וקניינים · יותן לבני כהר״ר זנוויל ·
כתבי רבנות וצוואת וככה״ג יותן לבני ר״ש ·
כרך כתבתי עליו שאין בהם צורך יותן לבני כהר״ג :

The Preface to חות יאיר also promises to give testamentary instructions about his works.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

A Translation of the Treatise Chagigah.

A Translation of the Treatise Chagigah. From the Babylonian Talmud. With Introduction, Notes, etc. By the Rev. A. W. STREANE, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1891.

MR. STREANE'S volume deserves, and will receive, the cordial welcome of all English students of the Talmud. It is a useful and meritorious effort to place at least one of the smallest tractates of the Babylonian Talmud within the intellectual reach of those to whom the original presents insuperable difficulties. But Mr. Streane's attempt cannot fail to re-open the whole controversy on the possibility of translating the Talmud at all.

No literature can ever be the possession of the multitude unless it can dispense with a guide. A country is not opened up to civilisation when a few adventurous spirits have found their way to its heart. Until its highways have become the ways of common tread, which he who will can traverse, it remains in the control of the professional explorer. In this sense we fear the Talmud can never become a popular book ; the "general reader" can never hope to see more of the country than the guide chooses to show him. For, though it has been committed to writing, the Talmud remains an oral tradition, which a living expounder alone can adequately convey to another. We do not mean to imply that translation is quite impossible, and that efforts towards that object should be deprecated. But Mr. Streane himself would be the first to admit that his version is by no means easy reading. If a translation is to be of real service, the text of the Talmud cannot be rendered exactly as it stands. Mr. Streane's version is in places quite bewildering, and this is no fault of the translator. Yet it is not the fault of the original either, for whatever the Rabbis were not, they were close reasoners. The difficulty is one arising from the method in which the Talmud is written, and that it is not quite impossible to cope with it has been shown clearly enough by that renowned Talmudist, Friedmann of Vienna.[1] Not to trans-

[1] דבר על אודות התלמוד. (Pressburg : 1885.)

form this review into an essay, we must briefly state the conclusion at which this authority arrived. The translator must not take the Talmud as he finds it, and translate it word by word, for thereby confusion becomes worse confounded. He must first separate the main line of argument from the accessories, added sometimes in most intricate ramifications to the main line, and he must show, by printing in varying types, the points at which the main line of thought is interrupted and resumed. Technical terms must be altogether left untranslated, for they have no strictly accurate equivalents in other languages. Friedmann prints some representative extracts to show how the Talmud would look thus arranged, and at the invitation of the Oriental Congress, held in Vienna in 1888, edited tractate *Makkoth* in accordance with his plan. May it be hoped that one of the Congresses to be held shortly in London will take the matter in hand, and will entrust to Mr. Streane, or to other available scholars, the task of attempting, on lines similar to those suggested by Friedmann, the translation of some representative passages from one of the Talmudic tractates ?

The preceding remarks deal with fundamental principles; it remains to speak of Mr. Streane's performance on its own merits. It bears the mark of patience and care, as well as of a no mean acquaintance with the language and style of the Talmud. The translation of technical phrases, however, occasionally leads to a misinterpretation. Thus, on p. 3 of the translation, " there is a Baraitha, A deaf man is like a fool and a child," does not convey the true sense, for קתני merely refers to the preceding Mishnah, which is about to be explained. A similar remark applies, *e.g.*, to the opening words of the second paragraph of p. 122, where the Mishnah and not a Baraitha is cited. In the same paragraph (on p. 3) the words שדיברו חכמים בכל מקום mean less "as wise men have everywhere said," than " wherever the sages employ the term." Mr. Streane's notes are usually very full, and the historical help they supply is most useful. Yet the addition of a brief explanation of the context, of the interpolation of apparently irrelevant passages, might often have greatly facilitated the student's labour of following the argument. Talking of the notes, it is somewhat strange to find such frequent references to Wolf, Bartolocci, and Etheridge, to the utter exclusion of the important works of modern scholars. Equally strange is the omission to mention the *Variæ Lectiones* of Rabbinovicz, which would have supplemented some of Mr. Streane's notes. Thus, on p. 117, note 5, a reference to the Munich MS. would have shown that the reading is לא, and not ולא. Bacher's *Agada der Babyl. Amoraer*, p. 148, might have been quoted on p. 119, note 1, and 137, note 2, for it is the most

important contribution to the subject. But we have no space to enter into a minute criticism of the notes; the following points must suffice: תנו רבנן (p. 11, note 2) so far from always introducing something pre-Christian, mostly does the reverse; nor is the distinction drawn (p. 13, note 4) between בשלמא and הניח, a tenable one. On page 19, for "weighs out for us both light and heavy" the translation should be "has made the light as important as the heavy" (ששקל עלינו הכתוב קלות כחמורת). In p. 55, note 4, the explanation offered of the absence of a commentary on Genesis corresponding to those on the other books (*e.g.*, Mechilta on Exodus), though very ingenious, can scarcely be accepted. The *Bereshith Rabba*, which is one of the oldest of the Midrashim, filled the gap which Mr. Streane finds, but which, in fact, has no existence. No commentary of authority supports Mr. Streane's note 9, or p. 65; nor is there, as far as we know, any Talmudical or Midrashic passage that justifies the statement (p. 71, note 1) that "*Tradition* said that there were 250 points of difference between the Law and Ezekiel." The note (p. 81, 4) to "wrapped himself up" omits to allude to the fact that a Talmid Chacham was very particular to appear in a dignified costume, and thus the phrase acquired quite a conventional signification. On page 117 the omission to refer to Rabbinovicz has produced an unintelligible rendering, for the reading should be משום דאיכא כבידו של כלי, which gives very good sense, "for the weight of the vessel must be taken into account." Sometimes one might feel inclined to divide the paragraphs differently. Thus, on p. 121, the new paragraph should not begin at the words "Rab Papa," but with "But let us consider." Several other notes might be questioned, and some uncritical explanations are propounded, which are obviously inadmissible. But we have no further space to deal with details, however important they may be.

Though it will be seen from what precedes that Mr. Streane's work is marked by some defects, it will, we are certain, have a stimulative effect on the study of the Talmud, and the learned translator has earned our thanks for a very conscientious attempt to supply a real need.

I. Abrahams.

Massoretic Investigations.

Masoretische Untersuchungen. By Dr. LUDWIG BLAU, Professor at the Rabbinical School of Budapest. (Strassburg: 1891.)

MUCH has been done lately for the advancement of the study of the Massorah, by Dr. Ginsburg in this country and Dr. S. Baer in Germany. The JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW published in its first year an able essay by the Rev. Isidore Harris, but no one has as yet found out that the authorised Massorah, if we may employ this expression, is not reliable at all, a subject which Professor Blau lays before us in his monograph. He tries to prove that the Massorites did not understand the earliest tradition for the Biblical text which is contained in the Siphre and the Talmud. If Professor Blau is right, and we believe he is, the authority of the Massorah recepta is broken. In the first instance, our author treats of the points above words, which indicate an elimination. Thus in Numbers iii. 39 the ואהרן has no right to be there, according to the Siphre. The Massorah puts, by misunderstanding the Siphre, a point only on the ו of ואהרן, which gives no sense in the text. More striking is the nonsense the Massorah makes of the passage Gen. xviii. 9. The Siphre says that the word איה is provided with points of elimination, since the angels knew where Sarah was. Some texts make the elimination in the word אליו, some for the whole word, and some others keep the ל only. The words in the Siphre and other sources, viz., "For they know where Sarah was," can only mean the elimination of איה, "where." Professor Blau proposes to make sense in the Biblical passage after the elimination of the word "where," which we cannot consider satisfactory. According to our opinion, the passage would read as follows: —"And they said unto him, Behold, Sarah thy wife is in the tent. And he said, I will certainly return," etc. The same is the case with the word רחקה (Numbers ix. 10; JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I., p. 133), where the old tradition eliminates the entire word, and not the ה only, which gives no sense.

Of course we cannot reproduce all the passages quoted by the Professor. We shall only mention the gem of the monograph, viz., his discussion of the reversed נ in Numbers x. 35, 36, which means nothing else but the abridged form of נקוד "pointed." The points having been too many for two verses, the two נ at beginning and end took their place. This is the true explanation, which no one noticed before our author, although it is as simple as the egg of Columbus. In fact, the expression reversed *nun* is a late one; the earlier tradition has נקוד, as Professor Blau shows. The author of the tractate *Soferim* had probably a MS. before him in which spaces were marked before

35 and after 36 ; therefore he recommends a שיעור, "space." (That is the right reading in a Bodleian MS., instead of the incomprehensible שיפור in our text, which Dr. Joel Müller, in his excellent edition of this treatise, ingeniously proposed.)

The next part in Professor Blau's monograph has for object the pendent letters (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I., p. 137), which is followed by a chapter on the *Tikkune Soferim*, of which the earlier documents count eleven, while later on we find mentioned eighteen. Raym. Martini, for instance (*Pugio Fidei*, p. 277, ed. Carpzov), mentions an unknown *Tikkun* for Ps. xxii. 17, which was used as an argument to brand him as a forger (*The Expositor*, 1888, Third Series, Vol. VII., p. 183) ; but from the variations found in different documents on this subject it is highly probable that Martini copied from a genuine text. In the sixth part our author treats of the words written otherwise than read, and in the last he gives explanations of Massoretic notes quoted in the Midrashim.

We hope that Professor Blau will continue his ingenious Massoretic investigations, for if he has succeeded in shaking the foundation of the Massorah, he ought to try to repair the breach by a new construction.

A. NEUBAUER.

Eldad the Danite.

Eldad ha-Dani seine Berichte über die zehn Stämme und deren Ritus in verschiedenen Versionen nach Handschriften und alten Drucken mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen nebst einem Excurse über die Falascha und deren Gebräuche von ABRAHAM EPSTEIN. Pressburg : 1891 (in Hebrew, and with a Hebrew title also), published by Herr Lippe, Wien.

THE author of this interesting and learned monograph is not a stranger in the field of Rabbinical literature. Besides his essays on the *Midrash Rabbathi* and the *Pugio Fidei*, on the *Book of the Jubilees* (of which the first part appeared in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, t. xxi., p. 80, *sqq.*), and many others of minor importance, Herr Epstein is the author of a remarkable book on Jewish antiquities, entitled, *Beiträge zur Jüdischen Alterthumskunde I.* (Wien : 1887), of which we regard his present book as a second instalment ; indeed, we are astonished that the learned author has not described it as such on the title-page. The present work is composed of three essays. The first treats of the diary of the famous Eldad the Danite, which Herr

Epstein thinks genuine. The native country of Eldad, our author concludes, was either Yemen, or a province of South-east Africa, where the Jews knew Hebrew without having any knowledge of the Talmud, whilst in Palestine, Babylonia, Persia, Egypt, Spain and the Magreb, the decisions of the Geonim were already well known towards the end of the ninth century, the date at which Eldad appeared, bringing with him strange *Halachoth* concerning the *Shehitah* and *Bedikah*, which agree neither with the views of Rabbanites nor Karaites. Eldad, Herr Epstein maintains, could not be a native of Abyssinia, the country of the Falashas, since they speak only the Geez dialect, and know no Hebrew, whilst there is no trace of this dialect in Eldad's Hebrew, but there are some traces of Arabic, which Eldad must have known, although he pretended the contrary. Traces of Arabic in Eldad's Hebrew were already recognised by others before our author (*Jour. Asiatique*, 1861, II., p. 206), although Herr Epstein supplies a larger number of instances; but to affirm that the Yemen Jews, although knowing and writing Hebrew, were completely ignorant of the Talmud and the works of the Geonim, is a premature conclusion, for the early history of the Jews in this country is not so well known as to permit such a definite conclusion. And were this even proved, we could not admit that the Yemen Jews knew nothing of the oral law, as is the case with the Falashas, who indeed are scarcely of the Jewish race at all. Why should the Babylonian and Palestinian Rabbis have communicated Halachas to Africa, Spain, France, Italy, and Germany, and not to Yemen? Surely, the Geonim would have been as anxious for the religious observances of the Yemen Jews as of those in other countries. It is therefore probable that Eldad invented his strange Halakhoth as he did his impossible visit to the Ten Tribes and the children of Moses. Why the Geonim in Babylonia and in Africa believed in them, and why the grammarian, Judah ben Qoreish, quoted the explanation of שגה according to the dialect of the Danites (not of Eldad; see *Journal As.*, 1861, *loc. cit.*), can be answered by another question: Why did they believe in so many Agadic books, issued in their own time, as ancient, for instance, the *Pirke de R. Eliezer*, and others? The connection of the Ten Tribes with the rise of pseudo-messiahs is well known, and therefore any information about them was not only welcome, but was eagerly believed, and hence no scepticism was roused as regards Eldad's reports.

But apart from the question of the genuineness of Eldad's diary, we consider Herr Epstein's geographical notes, as well as the comparison of Eldad's Halakhoth with the Rabbanitic ones, as a boon to Rabbinical literature. His publication of the different texts of Eldad's diary from old editions, and from MSS. is also an important contribution,

and this remark applies more especially to the copious and learned notes. It seems, however, that our author was not aware that the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. I., pp. 95 to 114, has an article on the same subject, where in a supplementary note (p. 423) another text is pointed out in which the diary in a concise form is ascribed to a merchant Elhanan.

The Halakhoth are also given as found in four different texts, of which the most authentic seem to be those reported by Samuel Jama ben Jacob of Cabes in Tunisia. Here in the neighbourhood of Kairowân the tradition was better kept up. That the Arabic book entitled *Risaleh al-Burhân fi Tadzkiyat al-Haiwan*, without the name of the author, in the unique Bodleian MS. is indeed, according to Herr Halberstam's ingenious deduction, the work of our Samuel, results from passages in Yemen MS. which we shall mention in another number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW. Why Herr Epstein doubts the existence of this MS. (p. 105, ℵ) we do not know.

The third part treats of the Falashas, which has become now a subject *à la mode*. Of course Herr Epstein, as well as others who have busied themselves with this strange tribe, have to rely chiefly upon the report made by the celebrated M. Joseph Halévy, and the accounts published by Flad and others. The name of *Falasha* is derived from the root *falash* to emigrate ; they indeed call themselves "the exiled" in their prayer-book. Is the name of *Pelishtim*, "the Philistines," derived from the same word ? It is possible, for they came from Caphtor (Amos ix. 7).

After a brief description of the dwelling-places and the language of the Falashas, Herr Epstein gives an account of their literature. To this ought to be added some apocrypha which M. Halévy brought from Abyssinia, and which are still in his possession. Our author continues then with a chapter on the creed of the Falashas, and with the enunciation of their feasts and fasts with the calculation necessary for fixing them. In mentioning that the Falashas rely in these respects on the book of the Jubilee, our author speaks of the similar calculation of the Samaritans according to a late source. Why not rather quote the introduction to a Samaritan chronicle which appeared in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1869, II., p. 422 ? After having spoken about the priests, the Nazirites, the house of prayer, the sacrifices, the prayers, the ritual rules and the costumes of the Falashas, Herr Epstein concludes with a chapter on the origin of this curious tribe, for which they have themselves three traditions, and after having mentioned and discussed the opinions on the subject by Filoxene Luzzatto, the late Marcus and M. Halévy, our author comes to the conclusion that the Falashas for the greater part came from Egypt, whence they brought their strange ritual, which is neither Samaritan

nor Judaic, but a mixture of both made by Onias when he built the temple of Heliopolis, and tried to satisfy the different sects by accepting something from each of them. That is also the reason suggested for the strange literature the Falashas possess, and perhaps also of their ignorance of Hebrew. We, for our part, believe that the Falashas are converted slaves, made by the Jews of Abyssinia at an early epoch.

From this short summary it can be seen how much of proved theory as well as of conjecture are to be found in our author's book, the reading of which we can recommend to those who are interested in the fictions found in Rabbinical literature. We only regret that Herr Epstein uses German words written in Hebrew characters, which are unintelligible for all Jewish students, except perhaps in German-speaking countries. טעקסט (Text) could have been given by נוסחא. What a barbarism the word להליטעראטור represents! A Hebrew particle and a Hebrew article appended to the German word "Literatur"! Why not rather employ the word כתבים?

A. NEUBAUER.

Geography of Palestine.

Bibliotheca Geographica Palæstinæ. Chronologisches Verzeichniss der auf die Geographie des Heiligen Landes bezüglichen Literatur, von 333 *bis* 1878, *und Versuch einer Cartographie. Herausgegeben.* By REINHOLD RÖHRICHT. Berlin, 1890. (Reuther.)

As the comparatively small volume of the Bible has produced, and still continues to produce, an immense literature, so also Palestine, which was one of the least extensive countries of the ancient world, has been the subject of an immense literature of travels and pilgrimages, which is of the highest importance for the geography of the Bible. Of course, the greatest number of pilgrims were Christians of all denominations, and thus from them proceeded the greater bulk of this literature. A smaller amount was written by Jews, and a still smaller portion by Mahomedans. But the last have composed special works of geography, of which Palestine, of course, forms a part, and they wrote histories of Jerusalem and Hebron, which they also regard as holy places. It was high time for compiling a bibliography of the works concerning Palestine, which are written in so many languages. This task the Nestor of Palestine studies, the late Dr. Titus Tobler, undertook, and issued a bibliography in 1868. Before his book appeared, and soon after, societies for Palestine

exploration sprang up in most countries of Europe and in America. Their transactions, as well as the periodicals of Eastern bibliography, mention usually books, essays, and articles written on the geography and topography of Palestine. In rewriting and completing Tobler, it was necessary either to come down to the year 1890, or take another limit. Dr. Röhricht has chosen the latter method—viz., to complete the bibliography till 1878, the point at which the Journal of the German Palestine Exploration Society begins, where every item relating to Palestine is recorded, as far as modern times are concerned, whilst the lamented Count Riant, in Paris, issued two volumes, with the title of *Archives de l'Orient Latin* (1878-1883), which continues an almost exhaustive bibliography of records concerning Palestine. There is no need of praising Dr. Röhricht's industry, for which he is so well known, and which has already produced such excellent results. Let us only say that he has spared no trouble to obtain the fullest information possible as to the various libraries in the world as regards their MSS. and printed books relating to Palestine. The names of those who assisted him so much are mentioned in the preface. They belong to various countries, and made researches as to works written in various languages. We shall only mention here the help of our great bibliographer, Dr. Steinschneider, concerning Jewish travellers. Of course, in spite of all assistance, the literature is not exhausted yet. There will surely be found in the libraries some MSS. which are not given in Dr. Röhricht's volume. But, as it is, there are no less than 3,515 items of books, pamphlets, and articles collected in the present work. A great boon for Palestine students is the cartography which follows the bibliography, and which consists of 747 numbers of maps existing in various libraries of Europe, and beginning, from 360 A.D., with the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, whilst the diaries begin with the year 300 A.D., with the *Itinerarium Antonii Augusti*. The bibliography of each item is given, as well as a summary of the contents. The volume concludes, after the unavoidable addenda, with three indexes—viz.:—1. Of authors; of the anonymous authors, with the beginning of their treatises, and of the maps. 2. Of the localities mentioned in the works. 3. Of the archives, libraries, and MSS. made use of. At the beginning our author gives the bibliography of the chief works which he consulted for his book. Let us hope that our author will now continue with his bibliography every ten or twelve years, for it is impossible for ordinary students to procure all the periodicals relating to Palestine, not to speak of the irksomeness of consulting many indexes for those who have access to great libraries.

A. NEUBAUER.

TALMUDICAL MISCELLANIES.

I.

Sifre Homeros, Books of Entertainment.

There are mentioned in the Talmud and Midrash about half-a-dozen times certain books, under the heading Sifre Homeros, or Sifre Mirom, Miron, Miros, Hamiros, Humiros. R. Nathan ben Jechiel[1] offers three explanations, viz., (*a*) heretical books; (*b*) books of a certain heretic, by the name of Mirom; (*c*) books of Greek wisdom, called in Greek (Hamirom) Homiros.

The first explanation is based on the Hebrew root *mûr*, Hiphil *hemîr*, which means change, hence Sifre Hemirom signifies books of apostates, who changed their faith, becoming untrue to Judaism.[2]

The second theory starts from the same root, with the additional remark, however, that the title of these books is taken from the proper name of a heretical author. This is the opinion of R. Gershom, whom R. Nathan follows, without mentioning the source.[3]

In the third explanation R. Nathan follows—likewise without giving credit to his authority—the interpretation of R. Hai Gaon,[4] who refers perhaps to Homeros, the well-known Greek poet, the supposed author of the renowned Greek epic which bears his name.

This latter is, indeed, the clearly defined opinion of David de Lara,[5] Benjamin Mussafia,[6] David Luria,[7] and David Cassel.[8] Azaria De Rossi,[9] while he knows of this explanation, rejects it, and prefers to derive the word from the Greek adjective *moros*, so that Sifre Homoros means books of nonsense, stupid books.

Grätz[10] finally—whom J. Lewy[11] seems to follow—thinks of ἡμερησία βιβλία chronicles (of Jewish kings or heroes).

---

[1] In article מרום, see our *Aruch Completum*, v. 252.

[2] Thus also in the *Commentary of R. Obadia Bartinora to Jadaim*, iv. 6.

[3] To be found in his *Commentary to Chulin*, 60ᵇ. *MS. Vaticana* (*Angelica*, p. 316), the copy of which is in my possession, and from it reprinted in the Wilna edition of the Talmud.

[4] *Commentary to Jadaim*, l.c. [5] *Kether Kehuna*, l.c.

[6] Article מרום. [7] *Commentary to end of Koheleth Raba.*

[8] In his edition of *Meor Enajim*, ch. iv., p. 84, note 4.

[9] *Meor Enajim*, l.c., and ch. lvii., p. 462.

[10] *Monatsschrift*, xix., p. 138. [11] *Dictionary* I., p. 476.

Looking closely into the matter we shall soon become convinced that all these suggestions are untenable. From the Mishnah, quoted in the footnote 2, we learn that these kinds of books were of no value, and according to the Babylonian Talmud,[1] were deserving of being burned. The Jerusalem Talmud[2] pronounces, however, in regard to these books, a much milder judgment. This important account reads as follows: "R. Akiba says,[3] 'He also (has no share in the future life) who reads exoteric books,' for instance, the books of Ben Sirah, Ben Lana. But he who reads books of Hamirom, or any books composed from this time (when the canon of the twenty-four books of the Bible was closed), is considered as having read a letter. What is the reason thereof? Because it is written,[4] 'And furthermore, my son, be admonished: of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh.' They are given for the musing mind, but not for weary study."

The same is to be found in the Midrash,[5] with some variations.

There can be no question that the Jerusalem Talmud did not refer to the books of Homer, for if such an excellent book as that of Ben Sirah (Jesua Sirah),[6] of whose gnomes about forty are quoted in Talmud and Midrash, and which obviously was not prohibited from public use, is, in the above account, nevertheless declared to be discarded from study under the penalty of losing the future life, how much the more would this verdict be applicable to Homer, whose books contain narrations of fictitious events, fabulous personages and legends of such strange diction and polytheistic colouring that they must needs have been considered from the point of view of Judaism as so many types of idolatry. On the other hand, we cannot maintain Grätz's suggestion, for if the Sifre Homeros chronicles related to Jewish heroes, why should they be so severely judged as to be declared worthy of being burnt, and in case they contained some scandalous accounts or records, why, on the other hand, should their perusal be regarded as harmless as reading a letter?

---

[1] *Chul.* 60[b], where the words, "Like the books of Homeros" are omitted in our editions, but they are preserved for us by R. Gersom, R. Nathan and Azaria De Rossi.

[2] *Ab. Zara*, x., 28[a], mis-quoted by Mussafia and Grätz (*Commentary to Koheleth*, p. 166).

[3] *Synh.* x. i.

[4] Ecclesiastes xii. 12.

[5] *Koheleth Rabba* to xii. 12. Instead of Ben Lana we find there Ben Tagla. See our opinion about them in our *Aruch Completum*, v. 49. "The books of Homeros" are omitted in the Midrash.

[6] Flourished in the first half of the second century. See Grätz, *History* II.[2], p. 281, and *Aruch Completum*, ii. 119.

We cannot help abandoning, therefore, all these attempts to explain the meaning of Sifre Homeros.

In my opinion this word is the Greek ἵμερος (Himeros), meaning pleasure, entertainment, delight. Such books of entertainment and pleasure were, it goes without saying, in existence in great abundance,[1] besides the so-called books of Apocrypha. They were read as a relaxation, to divert the mind, and for the sake of exhilaration. The Babylonian sages condemned them, but the Palestinian scholars looked upon them in a much more favourable light, and although they did not attach to them any importance whatever, they did not exactly forbid them ; on the contrary they permitted them as a diversion for the mind ; they declared them, however, as not being a praiseworthy subject for earnest study, which latter could be only claimed for the Holy Writ.

From this point of view we have to consider the Books of Himeros (this is the only true reading), and we are supported in our opinion by the following illustration of the Midrash.[2] The question, namely : "What did David refer to when saying,[3] 'Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in thy sight,' is answered thus : David was anxious to have his words and meditations written down, preserved and engraved for future generations, in order not to be read only like books of Himeros, but that they should be studied as earnestly as the important laws, the study of which is followed by a reward in the future life."

It seems hard to resist the conclusion that the books here referred to are books for leisure and entertainment, which, although considered as profitless in themselves, were none the less tolerated as reading matter[4] and mind-refreshing diversions, but which were well discriminated from the earnest, absorbing and sanctifying studies of the Sacred Books.

---

[1] Fox-tales, Washers' gossips were, for instance, wide-spread collections according to Talmudical records. See our *Aruch Completum*, article "Mimshal," v. 166. Acher (Elisa b. Abujah) is said (Chag. 15[b]) to have indulged in Greek songs, and exoteric books to have fallen from his lap when he stood up.

[2] *Midrash Shocher Tob*, beginning of the first chapter ; *Jalkut*, Psalm, §§ 613 and 678.

[3] Psalm xix. 14.

[4] Cf. *Azariah De Rossi Imre Binah*, ch. II., p. 83 (ed. Cassel), with reference to *Numbers Rabba*, ch. xiv.

II.

Crœsus.

Crœsus, King of Lydia, was well-known to the Talmud and Midrash, and was quoted on account of his riches, for which he was celebrated in ancient history, and the name is used to designate a very rich Jew in the time of Trajan and Hadrian. This word occurs in several places[1] under the corrupt readings Chrosum, Chrosun, Chrosna, Chrosuth. Perles already called attention to the proper reading, חרסום, as being identical with Crœsus, but as to the contents of the passages where *Chrœsus* is alluded to, we have arrived at different results. Having found the word spelled חרסום[2] or חרסות,[3] we may assume the identity with Crœsus.

When did this rich Jew, called from his wealth *Crœsus*, live, and who was his son Eleazar or Elazar? We are told by the Talmud and Tossephta[4] that Eleazar (Elazar) the son of Crœsus was high-priest in the time of the Second Commonwealth. He followed Ishmael the son of Phabi[5] in the high-priesthood, which is to be concluded from the fact that he is mentioned after Ishmael ben Phabi. This is also affirmed by Josephus[6]:—"He (Tiberius) sent Valerius Gratus to be procurator of Judæa. This man deprived Ananus of the high-priesthood, and appointed Ishmael the son of Phabi to be high-priest. He also deposed him soon afterwards, and ordained Eleazar the son of Ananus, who had been high-priest before, to be high-priest, of which office, when he had held it for a year, Gratus deprived him," etc. The Talmud[7] contradicts this statement by assigning Eleazar the son of Crœsus eleven years to officiate. The fact itself, however, that Eleazar the son of Ananus is identical with Eleazar the son of Crœsus, or in other words with Eleazar the very rich, seems to be unquestionable, only that while Josephus called him by his true name, the Talmud cited him by the surname derived from his riches, an account of which is given in another place,[8] informing us that "he inherited from his father a thousand cities on the continent, and also a thousand ships on the sea." It is, therefore, obvious that "Eleazar son of Crœsus"

---

[1] *Joma* 9[a], 35[b]; *Jerus. Joma* iii. 40[d]; *Tossephta Joma*, end of ch. i.; *Tract. Semachoth*, ch. ix.; *Echa Rabb.* to בלע; *Kohel. Rabba* to יש אחד.

[2] See *Rabbinowitz Dikduke Soferim to Joma*, p. 44[b], and *Jalkut* i. § 145, Ed. Salonich.

[3] MS. Erfurt.

[4] As quoted in foot-note 1.

[5] פאבי or פיאבי.

[6] *Antiquities* XVIII. ii. 2.

[7] *Joma* 9[a].

[8] *Joma* 35[b]; *Echa Rabbathi* to בלע.

is not a patronymic but an appellative name, called after his fabulous fortunes, which made him proverbial.[1]

If Eleazar the rich high-priest lived in the age of Tiberius, we understand very well why the time of the rich Jew called Crœsus is called the time of persecution,[2] for Tiberius hated the Jews and persecuted them severely.[3]

There is, however, also mentioned[4] a certain Gebine son of Crœsus, of whom it is said, that when his father died he asked his mother to show him his heritage. She consequently showed him a heap of gold, so big that while he stood on one side of it and the mother on the opposite side, they did not see each other, the heap of gold being between them. This narration serves us as an illustration of the verse,[5] "There is one that is alone, and he has not a second, neither *are his eyes satisfied with riches.*"

From this last sentence is the information derived that this rich man was blind, and thus he could not enjoy his marvellous wealth. The word "Gebine," signifying "deficiency of the eyesight,"[6] is, therefore, well chosen as a *nomen appellativum*. To identify, however, this rich Gebine with our rich high-priest is impossible, for being afflicted with defective sight, he would not have been eligible for the high-priesthood according to Jewish Law. But he may have been a descendant of the Crœsus family, and possibly a grandson of our rich high-priest Eleazar.

This can be proved by the following.

In connection with this Gebine the rich, is related[7] a strange statement to the effect that when Gebine the son of Crœsus died, Beltshazzar the Governor of Babylon was born.

Unquestionably Beltshazzar is here used as a disguised name for one of the Roman Emperors, as the author of the statement, R. Levi, did not wish to mention the real name of the Emperor.

Now in the apocryphal book of Judith, Trajan is called by the disguised name Beltshazzar.[8] The same is the case when R. Joshua mentions[9] certain Jewish martyrs executed by Nebuchadnezzar, which is likewise a disguised name for Trajan or Hadrian. And so we must undoubtedly understand by Beltshazzar of the Midrash either Trajan or Hadrian, who were both persecutors of the Jews. And thus the Midrash, desiring to point out the era of this event, that is,

---

[1] *Kiddushin* 49[b]. See also *Tossephta Kidd.*, ch. iii.

[2] *Semachoth*, ch. ix. [3] Grätz, *History*, iii., 211ff.

[4] *Koheleth Rabba* to יש אחד. [5] Ecclesiastes iv. 8.

[6] See our *Aruch Completum* II., 497.

[7] *Koheleth Rabba*, l.c. [8] Grätz, *History*, iv[2]. 132.

[9] *Tossephta Edioth*, ch. iii, cf. Zebachim, 113a.

the time of the commencement of the persecution of the Jews, tells us that with the death of the rich Gebine, coincides the government of Beltshazzar, that means to say, began the persecution of the Jews by Trajan and Hadrian.

As the final result of our investigation we may take the fact that Crœsus was an appellative name for a very rich Jew, as we would call a very rich man in our time Vanderbilt or Rothschild. One word more: "Bonus the son of Bonus" is mentioned in the Talmud[1] as a man possessing great wealth, and living in great luxury. I have shown elsewhere[2] that it is also an appellative name, taken from the Latin *bonus*, which means rich, and perhaps the owner of this appellative name belonged also to the same wealthy family of the Crœsuses.

---

[1] *Gittin*, 59a. [2] *Aruch Completum*, vi. 10.

III.

Zeus in Mishnah, Talmud and Midrash.

We read in the Mishnah[1]: "The blasphemer is not guilty unless he pronounces the name of God. R. Joshua, son of Korcha, said: 'The whole day (as long as the examination of the witnesses lasts) we deal with the witnesses by using the expression יכה יוסה את יוסה', "Jose smote Jose." When judgment is promulgated, we do not sentence by using a surname, but we dismiss every one (of the audience that they should not hear the blasphemy) and say to the first witness: "Tell exactly what did you hear," and he says it,' &c."

In explaining this Mishnah, the Talmud[2] says: "We have learned in the *Boraitha*, he who did not pronounce God's name is not guilty till he pronounces God's *proper* name. Where is this proved? Samuel says, "For it is written[3]: 'And the son of the Israelitish woman blasphemed the Name and cursed,' and the verb *nakeb* means to pronounce God's proper name." In accordance with this explanation, no death penalty can be executed upon any blasphemer but in the case of his pronouncing God's proper name, the Tetragrammaton. Now, in order to avoid the useless repetition of the blasphemy during the examination of the witnesses, the tribunal introduced a circumlocution, serving as a substitute for the unutterable Name of God. R. Joshua, son of Korcha, thus transmits the formula of this substitute, being the following words: יכה יוסה את יוסה. The reading יוסה is maintained by some sources[4] while others[5] have יוסי. As to the expression itself, it is a *crux interpretum*. Rashi[6] thinks the word has no meaning and was chosen only on account of its having just four letters, and thus recalling the four letters in God's proper name. There is still another reason, namely, that the value of these four letters יוסי expressed in an equivalent of numbers, amounts to 86, the number equivalent of the word אלהים. The latter reason, however, is of no great import, as the blasphemer was not considered to be guilty until God's proper name (יהוה) was pronounced by him. R. Nathan ben Jechiel differs from Rashi, inasmuch as the former suits his explanation to the reading of either

---

[1] *Synh. Mishnah* V., ch. vii.

[2] *Synh.* 56[a].

[3] Levit. xxiv. 11.

[4] Munich MS., Jerus. Talmud, *Sifra*, ch. xviii. of Emor.

[5] Our editions. R. Nathan has both readings of our *Aruch Completum*, iv. 219, and cf. p. 119.

[6] *S nh.* 56[a].

יוסה or יוסי. In the first case, the four letters remind us of God's proper name, consisting likewise of four letters, three of which (יוה) being common. In the second case, three letters of the word יוסי, viz.: יוי amount to the number 26, which is at the same time the numerical value of the Tetragrammaton יהוה.

Now it seems improbable to assume that the Mishnah, in choosing the formula above quoted, did so by counting the value of the letters. Moreover, this play with the so-called Geomatria belongs to a later period of Hagadic exegesis.

Another question is, why should just the verb יכה convey the idea of a blasphemy?

J. Levy[1] offers another explanation. He takes יוסי in the double meaning of a Greek and a Hebrew word. The first he thinks *υἱὸς* = son, the second is יוסי = יוסף, *i.e.*, Joseph, the father of Jesus, so that "Jose smote Jose" imparts the idea: The son smote the father, implying that the son is mightier than the father.

There have been still other attempts to set aright the difficulties, but with the same unsatisfactory results.[2]

In my opinion יוסה is certainly a foreign god, used as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton. The choice is suggestive, as the four letters recall the mystic number, *four*, of יהוה, three of which being identical, as R. Nathan explains. The choice was furthermore a happy one, as Zeus (יוסה), the chief deity of the Greeks, was well-known all over Asia, and the witnesses, in order not to repeat the blasphemy, could with impunity cast their contempt at him. The verb יכה, conveying the idea of blasphemy, is also appropriate and in accordance with the Biblical expression,[3] "And he smites the earth with the rod of his mouth."

The meaning of "Jose smote Jose"—that is, Zeus smote Zeus—is therefore that he blasphemed the highest deity with[4] the highest deity, whereby the highest Jewish deity being expressed by the highest Greek deity, and יהוה substituted by Jose (Zeus), the blasphemy was made a fitting subject of discussion during the examination of the witnesses. That יוכה is not chosen by a mere chance, but for a substitute of יהוה, is expressly remarked by R. Acha b. Jacob in the Talmud,[5] and that blasphemy was only punishable when יהוה by

---

[1] In *Koback's Jeshurun* iv., 4.

[2] See Rahmer's *Literaturblatt*, vol. viii.

[3] Isaiah xl. 4.

[4] The particle את in the sentence, יכה יוסה את יוסה, is therefore to be translated "with." See Gen. xv. 18; Exod. i. 1; Judges i. 16; 2 Kings vi. 16.

[5] *Synh.* 60ª.

יהוה was blasphemed, or, speaking in our formula, Zeus with Zeus (Jose with Jose), has been already mentioned.

A strong confirmation of the view that יוסה alludes to Zeus we find in another passage of the Talmud.[1] Quoting the expression of the Mishnah,[2] "He who curses with a curse," R. Josef says :—"This means יכה קוסם את קוסו, 'he who blasphemed with an oath his Kos,'[3] where Kos, equal to Zeus, is again substituted for יהוה. Kos comes nearer to the word Zeus, besides being a surname of the same, who was called Ζεὺς Κάσιος, and known by the Romans as Jupiter Casius.[4] This name occurs also in a Nabatean inscription as קציו.[5] The Midrash[6] mentions בתי קוצין, houses devoted to the worship of Zeus Kasios, after whom, or in whose honour, the city En Kos was called En Koz.[7] This deity was worshipped also in Idumea. Josephus[8] writes as follows :—"Costobarus was an Idumean by birth, and one of their principal dignitaries, and one whose ancestors had been priests to the Kose,[9] whom the Idumeans had esteemed as a god."

Benjamin Mussafia[10] goes so far as to maintain that the name of the small coin זוז was called thus for bearing the profile of Zeus, and therefore R. Menachem bar Simai never looked at this coin.[11] Zeus' name being so widely spread, we can easily understand why it served as a typical substitute in the case we have been considering.

A. Kohut.

---

[1] *Synh.* 81ᵇ, 82ᵇ. [2] *Synh.* 81ᵇ.

[3] This is the proper reading, to be found also in the Munich MS. ; our editions have wrongly קסמו.

[4] *Plinius* v. 14. [5] *Zeitschrift der D. M. G.* xix. 639.

[6] *Midr. Samuel*, ch. xiv.

[7] *Jerus. Abod. Zara* iii. 43ᵃ ; *Tossephta Ab. Zara*, ch. vii. See, too, *Aruch Compl.*, Article עין כל.

[8] *Antiquities* xv. 7, 9. [9] Κοζέ. See, too, *Brüll Jahrbücher* i. 140.

[10] Article זוז. A similar view is held by Mussafia with regard to Pallas. See Art. פלס 2.

[11] *Aboda Zara* 50ᵃ.

ANGLO-JUDAICA

Three Centuries of the Genealogy of the Most Eminent Anglo-Jewish Family before 1290.

THE library at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, left by the late Seligman Goldschmidt, contains a parchment MS., brown with age, numbered lxxxvii., and consisting of 286 small folio leaves, unpaginated. Apart from its main contents, the notes with which its various owners have enriched it give it a special interest. But it is especially on account of one particular notice that I must here record my thanks to the courtesy of Herr Mayer S. Goldschmidt, who, as a special favour, entrusted me with the MS. The history of the Jews in England before the Expulsion, so very poor in dates—in the Jewish authorities, at least—is here unexpectedly enriched and elucidated. This alone justifies us in giving a detailed account of this source, which has, so far as I know, hitherto remained unnoticed. Judging by its family records, the Codex seems to have been for a long time preserved in what is now Bavaria, probably as an heirloom in one and the same family as far back as 1438. Jehuda b. Abraham of Abensberg notes the anniversary of the death of his father, Abraham ben Schlemuiel Abensberg. The latter's remains were interred at Landeshuth. Jehuda died, like his father, at an advanced age, and was buried at Bamberg in 1476. Jehuda's mother was buried at Nuremberg in 1461. We also read of burials of other members of the family at Regensburg 1466, and at Bamberg 1473. The notices which Jehudah b. Abraham inserted of his marriage in 1429, and of the births of his nine children and five grandchildren, extend from 1429 to 1456.

Jekuthiel Salman ben Samuel, who was buried in 1493 at Schwabisch-Wörth, and his son Joseph, born shortly before his father's death, appear as the next possessors of the MS., and their family history furnishes the material for the remaining records. Notices of interments at Landau in 1531 and 1537, and of a journey to Schwabach in 1454, show that we are still on Bavarian soil. The last recorded owner is Seligman ben Samuel Jacob of Wallenstein (1698). He bought the MS. of his teacher, Wälsch-Isaac, at Noerdlingen. These places are also in Bavaria. The MS., judging by its contents, seems to be a compilation of synagogal hymns, collected for

their literary interest rather than for ritual purposes. The collocation of piyutim in classes, the admission of several evening poems for the same festival, the inclusion of various German poets' compositions for the Sabbath before a marriage, and the order of the poems, which does not follow the calendar, but appears to have been governed by chance—the writer copying his material as he obtained it—are all indications pointing to this conclusion. I cannot tacitly pass over the astonishment caused me by the supposed discovery of a correspondence between the variations in the New Year's Liturgy, especially in the first part of אבינו מלכנו, with the ritual of an English Machzor before 1290. But the perusal of the Amidah for the Day of Atonement soon made it clear that the variations exhibit a greater affinity to the French ritual—as in זכרנו לחיים טובים, for instance, where the word טובים has in several places been erased by a German. (Compare Ibn Yarchi's *Hammanhig*, 52a.) The evening hymns for the New Year also point to France. Still it cannot be asserted that the MS. shows full and unqualified agreement with the French ritual.

In order to place the reader in a position to estimate the contents of this MS. for himself, and further to determine its age from the fact that it does not contain a Piyut that belongs to a period as late as the fourteenth century, I propose to give here a full *resumé* of all the Piyutim and Selichot in this Codex, giving a reference, in each case, to the place where Zunz has discussed these compositions. Here and there Zunz's account is supplemented by the MS., which apparently was unknown to that writer when his *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie* was in preparation.

The MS. is defective at the beginning, and commences with the Hallel of the Passover Haggadah, which ends with the sentence לך ה' הממלכה : לשנה הבאה בירושלים. Next come the "Six Chapters of the Ethics," the Amidahs for the New Year and Day of Atonement, the Liturgies for Hoshanah Rabbah and the Feast of the Rejoicing of the Law. Then begin the group of *Maaravot*, or Evening Poems for the Festivals, in the following order:—

For the first day of Passover, ליל שמורים (73); for the second evening, Meier b. Isaac's hymn (149); for the seventh evening of Passover, אורי וישעי (295); for the first evening of Pentecost, וירד אביר (134); for the second evening of Pentecost, אלהים ביתה (152), אל אלהים ה' דבר (an alternative composition); for the first evening of New Year, אמוני נבונים; for the second evening of New Year, מלך אמיץ (136); for the first evening of Tabernacles, אוחזי בידם (137); for the second evening of Tabernacles, אימתך סודרת; for the eighth evening of Tabernacles, את יום השמיני (554); for the ninth evening of Tabernacles, שמיני אותותיו (271).

A special *Maariv* by Joseph ben Nathan, the conclusion adapted for the eighth evening of Tabernacles. A *Maariv* for Tabernacles by Elieser ben Simson (see Zunz, *Litt. Gesch. d. Syn. Poesie*, 27 and 176). A *Maariv* for New Year's Eve, by Hillel ben Jacob (293), and a Bikkur, by Joseph ben Jacob (173, No. 8).

Next follow a group of poems for Sabbaths: [1]—

For Sabbath Bereshith the Yozer אל נשא (103); for Sabbath Bereshith the Ophan לבעל התפארת (122,) by Benjamin b. Zerach; for Sabbath Bereshith, Solomon Hababli's Zulath, אחשבה לדעת (104.)

For Sabbath and New Moon, Benjamin b. Zerach's Yozer as an Ophan, לך אלים אלפי אלפים (121); for Sabbath and New Moon, Meir b. Isaac's Ophan משרתיו עומדים (118); for Sabbath and New Moon, Meir b. Isaac's Zulath, אמונתך אמתי.

For the Sabbath of Repentance, Elieser b. Nathan's Yozer, אור עולם קראו (260); for the Sabbath of Repentance, Ophan (8); for the Sabbath of Repentance, Zulath (11), *ib.*

For the Intermediate Sabbath of Tabernacles, Meir b. Isaac's Yozer, את השם (147), and Zulath, אזכרה מקדם (552).

For the Sabbath Hafsakah, Yozer, אור זרוע זרוח כבודו.

For the Sabbath Nachmu, Meir b. Isaac's Yozer, ארוממך אל; for the Sabbath Nachmu, Menachem b. Machir's Ophan, שאו מנחה (159); for the Sabbath, Nachmu Meir b. Isaac's Zulath, אמת משל היה (148).

The Sabbath before a marriage is well provided with numerous compositions of German poets, following each other in succession. Simon ben Jacob b. Abun opens the list with a Yozer, אייחד שם שוכן תרשישים, an Ophan, a Zulath and four divisions of a Reshuth, arranged in order (114). Then follows אתנו שבחיה (80), with the verses and the ordinary section. Another group of these poems is next given, they are by Isaac Halevi. First comes his Yozer, אחר שלישים; then his Ophan and Zulath—in these the initial words אחד and תחת, which the scribe probably wished to illuminate—are missing; and last, his Reshuth, ending לילות וימים (156*f*). The third group of the same class is by Kalonymos ben Jehudah of Mainz. They commence with the Yozer לך ה' הגדולה אורות מאופל followed by two Ophans (Nos. 5 and 3), a Zulath (No. 9), and a Reshuth, beginning ומרשות קדומת אמן למפעל (165).

The double event of a circumcision taking place on the Sabbath before a marriage, is not neglected. For such an occasion the MS. has Menachem ben Jacob's Yozer, אלה תולדות (295), Jehudah b. Kalonymos ישראל חביבים (281), Baruch b. Samuel of Mainz' בנים לאביהם, with his Zulath and Reshuth (306), preceded by the Zulath אומן דתותי (129).

Next follow for Sabbath Hafsakah an Ophan by Meir ben Isaac, מלאכי צבאות בעלבון (148), and a Zulath אערוך לך ואצפה.

[1] The greater part of the original numbering of the poems has been destroyed by the binder.

For Chanuka, during which two Sabbaths occur, a Yozer אודך כי עניתני חייתני ולא כליתני.

The following introductions come next :—

יחדיו בשיר (469, No. 4), יחדו לב נשלם (589, No. 5), המלך שיר נדבות מעלות (572, No. 85). At this place some minor pieces for the Sabbath before a marriage are inserted :—

אל אדון (87) ; Ibn Gabirol's Reshuth for Kaddish (188) ; the Ahabah לחוצה באורך גלות (217); Samuel Dewlin's Nishmath שבח מי יאמר (465); Abraham Ibn Ezra's אל ישראל (213) ; Jehosfiah's יפרח לנוחי (469) ; David's דמי הבן (470) ; Jehosfiah's יה בישר (469) ; Dunash's דבוק חתן (484).

The Kedushas for the Sabbath Additional Service are well represented by fourteen poems, to follow one after another :—

Samuel's אלהיכם שכנו שם (593); Eleasar of Worms' יוסיף כם יה (319); Baruch b. Samuel's ברוך סודו (307) ; Samuel, שמש ומגן (593). (This is headed אחר של הרב ר' שמואל בנו. *i.e.*, by Samuel b. Baruch, which supplements Zunz's list.) Samuel b. Menachem, שליט בעולמו (330) ; Menachem of Worms' משרתיו שואלים (296); Eleasar of Worms' תפארתו ממעל (319) ; Jehudah, יחזיר שכינתו (563), ישכיל עבדו (472), יביא משיחו (563) ; Judah Halevi, יוסיף ידו (472) ; Jehudah, יזריח (563), ישיב (563), שרפים מרננים (563).

Then come the following Meoroth :—

Simson's שלח אמתך (301) ; Jehudah Halevi's אמרות האל (205) ; Ibn Gabirol's שלשים ושתים נתיבות (189).

Poems introductory to ארוממך כי נשגב, נשמת and יגוני ומרחבי (560) Jehudah Halevi's Ahavah יודעי יגוני (205) ; also שבח נותנים, כהמול and for Pentecost נגוהות אות קרן, בהמוליו אב המון.

Five Kedushas for the Sabbath Additional Service follow, אלהיכם יופיע (acrostically signed יצחק ב[ר]ב[י] מאי[ר] חזק) ; Nathaniel's נכתב לעולם (685) ; Samuel's שמים שת רכובו (593) ; Joseph's יחיד בעולמו קולך צהלי ואילי וחילי [1] (569).

For the Sabbath before a marriage the Reshuth אמוני שלומי ומרשות ישראל, and Jehudah b. Kalonymos's Ophan, ידודון ותרשישים (281.) Then comes a hymn to be recited on calling up the "best man" to the Law מתחיל זה אור נגה על דרכיך. Its superscription gives the author's name, הפיוט אור נגה בניגון יה בישר שר צבאך ממורינו הרב ר' אליקים בר יצחק זי"ל מִשְׁטַרְבָּוְרְק.

This name, R. Eliakim b. Isaak of Strasburg (cp. *Ritus*, 218), is unknown to Zunz (549).

---

[1] A few pages are here miss'ng, probably two, judging by the divisions of the parchment which form eight pages each.

For the last day of Passover the MS. gives the following hymns :—

המלך שוכן דומה ; the Barchu יאתה שדי לך מלוכה ; Jehudah Halevi's Ophan יה אנא אמצאך (207),[1] and Menachem's Zulath אסירי התקוה (671).

For Sabbath Chanuka, Joseph b. Salomon's Yozer, אודך כי אנפת (123); two Ophans, כבודו אור יזריח (71), and שני זתים נכרתים ; Solomon ha-Babli's Zulath, אין עור חלף (104).

For the Sabbath before a circumcision, Kalonymos ben Jehudah's Yozer אור תורה הבהיקה (164) ; the same poet's Ophan דממה, his Zulath אז כעברת ; Elieser ben Nathan's אפוני אימיו (260), and his Ophan (No. 9) ; then follow several Yozers in one group :—

For Sabbath Rosh Chodesh, Meir ben Isaac's אילת השחר (148); Solomon ha-Babli's אומץ דר חזקים (103) ; Amitai's אשיחה בדברי (166) ; Joseph Tob-Elem's, ארנן חסדך לבקר (133) ; then a Zulath (already given) אומץ דתותי.

For a Pre-nuptial Sabbath, Baruch ben Samuel's Yozer, אומן באומן ימן מעשיו (306) ; Amitai's Ophan, אראלים ומלאכים (167).

For Sabbath Chanuca, Meir ben Isaac's Zulath, אהבות עלמות מוגרות לאנשים (148) ; Moses ben Samuel ben Absalom's Zulath, אז בקשוב עניו (see *Jewish Chronicle*, 1877, August 19th, p. 11). Here the poem is definitively appointed לפטירת משה רבנו.

For the morning of a circumcision, Jehudah b. Kalonymos' Ophan, יקר גדלו (281).

For the Intermediate Sabbath, Amitai's Ophan, here ascribed to R. Meir, אשנבי שחקים (167) ; the Zulath אשישת שלוחתו (86).

Then in one group, Solomon b. Abun's Barchu, שיר ושבח (311); Ephraim of Bonn's אמונים באורו לכו (290); Moses b. Isaac's מעלות בשיר יה שמך ארוממך ; Jehudah ha-Levi's לאל אשר שבת חיילים אם צבאו ; נועם (413), and יקירים אדירים (566), here expressly ascribed to him, אופן מר' ; Ephraim of Bonn's Ophan איומתו קדושתו (290) ; Joseph יהודה קַשְׁטָלִין ben Nathan's Reshuth for "calling up" the "Bridegroom of the Law," מרשות אומר עצתו and מרשית יסד ארץ, (חתן בראשית).

For the Sabbath before a marriage, Amitai's Yozer, אדון מגיד מראשית (167), and Kalonymos ben Jehudah's Ophan, קרוב מצדיקי (165).

Next comes a group of "Magen" for nearly every Sabbath in the year in the following order :—

Sabbath	Bereshith,	טיפח שמים ויסד ארץ
„	Rosh Chodesh,	מדי חדש בחדשו
„	Chanuka	כנר התורה אור
„	Shekalim,	כסף ישקול עמי
„	Zachor,	זכור וזכור נתאמו
„	Para,	אחד קדוש נתן
„	Hachodesh,	כימי צאת עמי

[1] At this part a whole sheet perhaps is missing.

Sabbath Hagadol,	בשבת הגדול
Pesach (680),	חג המצות שמרו
Shebuoth (680),	כל שומרי אש דת
Sabbath Nachmu,	עמי וציון נחמו
New Year,	בכסא יום חגינו
Sabbath Shuba,	שובב וחרד על דברי
Eighth day Succoth,	יום שמיני עצרת

For Pre-nuptial Sabbath, כלה כנגה תצמיח; Festival Sabbath, Joseph Kimchi's יום שבת זכור (460); a Kaddish by Isaac Semiri, האל העירה (473), and אבי ראה אורך (679) is followed by three Aramaic Reshuth for Maftir, viz.: Isaac b. Samuel's אלימו כען דמינכון (283); Samuel b. Reuben's אתא ודונמא (464); R. Tam's יציב פתגם (266).

Then come two sets of poems for the pre-marriage Sabbath :—

Menachem b. Jacob's (*a*) Yozer, מי ימלל, with his (*b*) Ophan, No. 7; (*c*) Zulath, No. 12; (*d*) Reshuth, No. 151 (*c* ends לשבת מבטחים; *d* ends מאור זיום וחילם); Meir b. Isaac's Yozer אומנות הדורה, with his Ophan No. 8 (148), and Elieser ben Nathan's Zulath אות ברית שילשתי (260); Menachem ben Jacob's Yozer, אלהי ישענו (295) for the Sabbath of Repentance forms the conclusion of the Piyutim. Yet the last word of the page, תשובה, and the catch-word מקרבת, show that the Codex is here defective.

Then follows the Penitential Liturgy, beginning לך ה' הצדקה and containing the ordinary hymns; thirty-five other numbered Penitential hymns follow with an index of them :—

אתאנו לך יוצר רוחות	אנשי אמנה אבדו
אדאג מחטאתי	אזון תחן
אפפוני מצוקות	ישראל נושע
אריות הדיחו	יושב בגבהי מרומים (repeated)
ישראל נושע	ישראל עמך
אל נא רפא נא	תבא לפניך
אדברה וירוח לי	אם עונינו רבו
אבן הראשה	אין מי יקרא בצדק
אום קרואה	יי יי אל רחום
בתולת בת יהודה	אדון בינה הגיגינו
אבותינו כי בטחו	אזרחי מעבר
יושב בגובהי מרומים	אני יום אירא
אדם בקום עלינו	אם אמרי אשכח
אתה האל עושה פלא	רועה ישראל
אתה האל עושה פלאות	תשוב תרחמינו
במתי מספר חלינו	אך בך לדל
גדול עווני	אמנם הרענו
אין כמידת בשר	

On the reverse side a calendar of the lunar cycles for the years [2]75—[2¹]87 is commenced in another hand. A list is also given of the beginnings of the weekly portions for fourteen years, with a calculation of the *Tekufoth* and the יום השאלה for the years מ׳—עד׳ =1279—1313. This takes up eight pages.

The calendar is followed by short notices concerning Synagogue Ritual and Liturgy for the whole year, with special reference to the rubrics of Mainz, Speyer, and Worms ; and lists of the portions from Pentateuch and Prophets for the Festivals, of the divisions of the weekly portions for the ז׳ קרואים, and of the minor portions read on Mondays and Thursdays.

Then comes another calendar for the years ע״ד—צ״ח=1313-1337, the concluding portion of which is obliterated. The reverse is covered with family notices. The following passage (p. 14), which needs elucidation, appears in another handwriting on the front page of the last leaf :—

אשור זו סליק הרי זה קצבת עיבור וכל הצורך עד סוף מאה באלף ששי והבריות עול[ם עד] זה יום עמדי בו חמשת אלפים וחמשים וחמשה ועד סוף עיבור זה חמשת אלפים ומאה מיחורבן בית שיני אלף ומאתים ושבעים ושמונה ומעת הוסר התמיד ׳ אלף מאתים ושבעים ושנים ׳ הוסיף עליהם י״ב שנים להבא ותגיע לימים אלף מאתים ותשעים והוא קץ ראשון האמור בדניאל למעת הוסר התמיד להגלות משיח בו והוא מכוון עם מספר ע׳ צ׳ ק׳ ואלפים ושלש מאות מיום רדת ישר׳ מצרימה ׳ ואז ונצדק קודש ׳ אשרי המחכה ויגיע ׳ [׳׳] אלף שלש מאות שלשים וחמשה ׳ זה הקץ השני הנוסף על הראשון ׳ ארבעים וחמשה שבהם יתכסה משיח ויחזור ויתגלה ׳ ומה שנ׳ בתשובת המלאך לדניאל שבועים שבעים נחתך על עמך וגו׳ אין זה שום קץ אלא סך גלות בבל וימי בית שיני והכל מבואר לקמן

זה העבור קצב משה בן הנדי׳ הר׳ יעקב בן רבנו משה מלונדרש בן הרב רבנו יט׳ שחבר ספר התנאים בנו של הנדי׳ הרב ר׳ משה (sic) מברישטו בנו של הרר יצחק בן הר״ר שמעון אחיו של הר״ר אברהם בר׳ שמעון בן אחותו של רבנא שמעון והוא היה בנו של הר׳ יוסף בנו של רבנו שמעון הגדול השוכב בבירת עלמין ממגנצא יבא שלו׳ ינוח[ו] על משכבותם ולנו ולכל ישר׳ יעמד זכותם ׳ אמן אמן אמן סלה :

Under it in still another hand, in which I can discern traces of French caligraphy, there is the notice that bears on the history of the Jews in England before 1290. A photograph of this page would certainly have graced the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition had the contents of the MS. been known at the time it was held.

Does this important notice form an integral portion of the MS. in which it is found ? Has the Codex crossed the Channel twice, having

first been brought to England from France or Germany, and then brought back at the Expulsion in 1290? Does the reference to a completed calendar refer to the almanac in the MS. beginning with the year 1279? Or should we regard this family notice as entirely independent of the Codex, and bound up with it by accident?

Rather than waste time in the futile discussion of these questions, which, to me at least, appear insoluble, I proceed to give the authentic historic substance of this notice, which throws light on so many points.

This document is of especial interest, because, by its aid, we can trace back for three centuries before 1290 the genealogy of an eminent Anglo-Jewish family. The English writer proudly points to R. Simeon the Great, his maternal ancestor, nine generations back, as the founder of his house. It is no less important a family than that of Magister Mosseus, the Rabbi of London, named in English documents, whose ancestry is here given.

It is this Rabbi, Moses' grandson and namesake, Moses son of Jacob, whose noted wealth and benevolence had earned him the title of Nadib, in whom we recognise an Anglo-Jewish author of calendars.

The inference might be drawn that the Jacob just referred to is identical with Jacob le Evesk of the Rolls, who is styled in his genealogical tree son of Magister Mosseus. (See Jacobs' Papers, Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, p. 45; Adler, ib., p. 271.)

But I do not wish to mix up conjecture with authentic tradition, and will rather assume that the title, Nadib, which the Jacob of our document bears, shows that he is not identical with Jacob le Evesk, and that the latter, consequently, was not the son of R. Moses of London.

Our notice, however, throws a clearer and steadier light on R. Moses himself, and on his father, R. Jom Tob.

This Rabbi seems to have been distinguished not only for profound learning and personal weight, but also for illustrious ancestry. The notices about him, that have come down to us, show him to have been a Talmudical writer, and, like the French Talmudists of his time, a grammarian and an exegetist also. This is independent of the question whether he was Moses b. Isaac's teacher or not (Neubauer, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, II., 324). For he is designated Rabbenu Moses b/ his grandson; and his son, Jacob, in the Oxford Hebrew Shtar (*Hebrew Deeds*, M. D. Davis, 206), calls him רב משה דלונדרש.

Perhaps R. Moses combined with his ecclesiastic duties the practice of a physician, like his son, Elias le Evesk Pontifex Judæorum, the Rabbi of the English Jewry, who, besides exercising the Rabbinic office, was also distinguished for his medical skill. This was indeed

the fashion in the Middle Ages, and later too (Jacob's *Revue des Etudes Juives*, xviii., 261).

Besides this most distinguished of his sons, who is one of the most important figures in Anglo-Jewish History before 1290, we get acquainted also with R. Jacob, the learned and wealthy father of our Almanac Maker, Moses, with Cresse, and with Hagin. Following the old identification of Hebrew and foreign names which goes back to Isaac of Corbeil, I recognise in the last name Isaac b. Moses and not Chajim b. Moses (Adler, *ib.*, 268). We shall also not be far wrong if we assume that Benedict gen. Mag. Mosseus, named among the London Jews, was a son-in-law of our R. Moses (Jacobs, *Jewish Chronicle*, January 25th, 1889).

The central point of interest in our notice lies, however, in its information concerning R. Jom Tob, the father of R. Moses. The profound respect with which the great-grandson refers to his ancestor shows the latter to have been a distinguished Rabbinical authority. He was the author of a work which we may add to the very meagre list of notable Anglo-Jewish books before the expulsion. Although, for the present, only its name, התנאים, is known, the distinguished title its author, R. Jom Tob, bears in connection with it, proves that it must have had considerable repute—at least among English Jews. I refrain from attempting to infer the contents of the book from the mere title, and shall pass on to give some further information about R. Jom Tob, which I find in his great grandson's notice. R. Jom Tob need no longer be confounded with the Tosafist R. Jom Tob, the martyr of York Castle in 1190. The latter was a Frenchman, of Joigny, whose father was called Isaac. Our Jom Tob was an Englishman, and the son of an Englishman. His father was Moses of Bristol, wealthy and well versed in Rabbinic literature.[1] If the name of R. Jom Tob of Joigny must be erased from Mag. Mosseus' genealogical tree (Jacobs, *ib.*, 45; Adler, *ib.*, 266 f.), Anglo-Jewish history before the expulsion is the richer by the addition of another hero. Instead of a mere hypothesis, we have the historic figure of a celebrated Rabbi and author—R. Jom Tob.

Though, for the present, there is no other record of Moses of Bristol, the correctness of the reading need not be doubted. I had a difficulty in making out the word *Bristol*. Herr Ch. M. Horowitz, through whose MS. catalogue of Goldschmidt's library I became acquainted with the Codex, read מבאשטן, adding, however, a query (?) after his reading. But a careful examination made it clear to me that not

---

[1] About Bristol Jews, see Seyer's *Memorials of Bristol*, pp. 527-529. This book I only know from *Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica*, p. 30.

a letter of the name was at all doubtful. According to the usual custom of indicating the omission of a final letter, this word had an arc over the last letter but one. The terminal points of the stroke are still distinguishable. I will not here discuss the possibility that the old tombstone of Isaac b. Moses, which Jost already notices (*Geschichte der Israeliten*, VII. 405), and which has recently been claimed for the author of the Sefer ha-Shoam (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II. 325), may really cover the remains of Moses of Bristol, whose father our record expressly styles Rabbi. The historical certainties our MS. affords ought not to be swamped by hypotheses.

The higher we ascend the branches of the genealogical tree given in the MS., the thicker grows the darkness in which the names are enveloped. Still, we have a particle of historical knowledge which, on one point at least, appears to confirm the truth of its notices. The MS. tells us for the first time of a certain Joseph, son of R. Simeon b. Isaac b. Abun, the great legalist and hymnologist of Mainz, who bears the titles *Rabbana* and *Hagadol*. Now, the historical fragment, which we owe to Solomon Luria's historical sense (*Responsa*, No. IX.), also shows that R. Simeon traced his descent to R. Joseph, the aged—זקן (Zunz, *Littgeschichte*, III.). The Joseph of our document, his namesake, was the son of R. Simeon the Great, who lies at Mainz. R. Joseph's daughter was the mother of R. Simeon, to whom our Magister Mosseus refers as his great grandfather. Our genealogical notice bears internal evidence of its authenticity in the accuracy with which, counting by generations, it places R. Simeon the Great, three centuries before the writer, *i.e.*, just at the turn of the year 1000 (See Zunz, *ib.* 112, No. 1). Thus the fame of R. Simeon the Great perpetuated by the German Jews, was also preserved, generation after generation, among the English Jews. Their noblest family traced back its descent, as we here see, on the mother's side, to Germany. May new discoveries illuminate the darkness which envelopes Anglo-Jewish history before 1290! The path to truth must at all times be marked by the sacrifice of hypotheses. For at the smallest gleam of the light of history the torch of hypothesis is extinguished.

APPENDIX.

Over the index of the Penitential Prayers and to the left of the page—

פטירת אבי הישיש הנהור אברהם בן הנהור שלומיאל ז״ל מאבנשפערק כ״ח טבת יו׳ ה׳ קצ״ח לאלף הששי ונקבר בלנצהוט תנצ״ב

פטירת אמי מורתי החסידה מ׳ בילא בת ר׳ יהודה ז״ל ד׳ אדר ונקברה יו׳ א׳ בנורנבערק שנת רכ״א לפרט תנצב״ה א״בכי״ר

פטירת אמי מורתי ה[חסידה] והתמימה מ׳ ורוידא בת הר״ר שמעון פראג ז״ל י״[ב] אייר זך בעומיר ליל ראשון] ונקברת יום ב׳ בבאבנבע[רג] שנת רלג לפרט תנצבה אבכי״ר

פטירת אבי הישיש הנהר יהודה בר רבי אברהם ז״ל מאבנשבערק כ״ח ש[בט] בליל שבת ונקבר בבאבנבערק ביום ב׳ רלו לאלף הששי תנצב״ה אבכי״ר

פטירת אמי מורתי החסידה מר׳ ווילק בת ר׳ משה זולער ז״ל י״ג ניסן יום ו׳ רכו לפרט ונקברה ברעגנשפורק

פטירת אבי הישיש הנ״ר שמואל בר זכריהו הכהן ז״ל כ״ג אדר יום ג׳ רלו לפרט ונקברה ברעגנשפורק

At the end of the Calendar :—

ד׳ כסליו קפט לפרט נישואין שלי
קצט לפרט כה שנים יח אייר קעה
יהודה ברבי אברהם זצל
חיים זוסא שליט נולד ליל ה כג אלול קפט לפרט זוסא חיים
חיים שעריל שליט ליל ראשון של חנוכה קצד לפרט שעריל חיים
חיים רחל שליט טו אלול יום ו קצד לפרט רחל חיים
חיים אברהם שליט ב שבט יום א פרוארא קצט לפרט אברהם חיים
חיים נואט שליט י״ז אדר יום ו׳ רא לפרט נואט ח[יים]
חיים בילין ל״ג בעומר רגל בילין חיים נולד לילה
שמעון נולד כ״ד טבת שנת קצב לפרט ליל רישון
האנקינא נולד כ״ג אדר יום א׳ קצו לפרט
חיים הינדיל שליט ר״ח אלול יום ג׳ רול לפרט חיים
חיים לידת ניני שפרינצא שת׳ יב מרחשון ליל ג רול חיים
חיים שמואל ניני שי׳ כח תמוז יום רזל ופרטו בהר חיים
חיים אברהם ניני שי׳ ד׳ אייר יו׳ א׳ רטל ופרטו אחר חיים
חיים כיליין ניני שת׳ ה׳ תשרי יו׳ ה׳ ריב ליפרט חיים
חיים שמעון ניני שיח׳ שמעון הכהן יו תשרי ריו ופטרו ברך הש׳ חילו ופעל ידיו תרצ׳ וגומ׳

On the inside of the last page but one :—

ווען ח' טבת אם יום ב' נוילטא זוא זולמן כלל וכלל קיין געניזא ולייש אודיער שמליץ עשין ווען דיא רבני' בון נורבירק הון נזייט דש גרוש סכנה נפש זייא אין כד שעאות

On the front of the last page but one :—

אני יוסף ב"ר יקותיאל
זצ"ל
ניני יוסף יצ"ו נולד ביום א' כ"א אלול רצז"ל לפק
יגדל בתורה ובמעשים טובים
פטירת של אמי מורתי הניכבודה מ' מרים ז"ל בת ר' מאיר ז"ל יום אלול
ופטירת אבי מודי הניכבד ר' זלמן זל לעולם בערב ראש השנה
פטירת זוגתי ז"ל הצדקת התמימ' והישר' שינלן ז"ל בת ר' יודיל ז"ל יו'
ו' כ"ז תמוז רצז לפ"ק ונקברת פה בק"ק לנדא תנצבה
פטירת בני יוסף ז"ל ה"ה היה ביום ג' ד' אדר ונקבר ביום ד' בק"ק לנדא
שנת רצא תנצבה
בתענית אסתר רנ"א לפ"ק היה ברית מילה של ר' ליווא יצו בנו של
זלמן ז"ל
בר"ח אדר רנ"ג לפ"ק היה ברית מילה של ר' יוסף יצו בנו של זלמן ז"ל
פטירת מ' מרים ז"ל אמם של הנערי' דלעי' הייתה י"ט אלול ביום ה'
ובו ביום נקברה בק"ק שוועבישן ווירדא שנת רנד לפ"ק תנצבה
פטירת ר' יקותיאל ב"ר שמואל ז"ל אביהם של הנערים דלעי' הייתה
בערב ראש השנה ביום א' ובו ביום נקבר בק"ק שוועבישן ווירדא שנת רנד
לפ"ק תנצבה

At the end of the Penitential Prayers :—

בא לידי זאת התפלה בשנת תנ"ח לפק בעיר נערלינגן ממלומד אחד נקרא
בשם חניכו וועלש יצחק זעליגמן בן לא"א הר"ר שמואל יעקב זצלה"ה לע"ע
פה ק"ק ווירשטיין

On the eighth page from the end at foot :—

טפישה מי' לנדישהוט
כט תשרי יום ב' ריאל

איך קאם גין ווישינפורק י"ז תמוז ריאל פון ווישינפורק גין שוובאך רח
אדר רידל

DAVID KAUFMANN.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

JULY, 1891.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND PART OF ISAIAH.[1]

I.

THERE is, perhaps, no better way of illustrating the progress of Old Testament criticism than to compare the forms assumed by the great critical problems in the past and in the present, not, of course, in the spirit of self-exaltation, but simply to clear up our own position, and to show ourselves not unworthy of those eminent predecessors to whom we owe so much. It may be that the critical problems of the Hexateuch call much more loudly for the application of this method than those of Isaiah. But if I may be permitted a brief reference to personal circumstances, I believe that the reader will justify me for selecting the second part of Isaiah as the subject of this survey. It so happens that at the close of each previous decade of my student-life my attention has been irresistibly drawn to the greatest of the prophetic books. In 1870 I put together such critical and exegetical results as I had been able to reach in a volume called *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged.* At that time the book stood alone; it is now, naturally enough, superseded by Professor Driver's scholarly handbook, which in its main features corresponds very nearly to my own work, and has the advantage of being written eighteen years

[1] This article originally formed two public lectures, delivered by the author in the university of Oxford, May, 1891.

665

later. One of these features is the adoption of the view that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. forms a single prophetic work, with a unity of its own.

It was about ten years later, in 1880 and 1881, that the present writer brought out two fresh works on Isaiah, one in two large volumes, the other in but fourteen columns of an encyclopædia. In the former (experience having proved the unpreparedness of the public), scrupulous regard was paid to the delicate susceptibilities of the orthodox, and though the data of criticism were presented to view, and the then state of the controversy was objectively sketched, the reader was left to form his own critical theories for himself. To save his conscience, however, and to help more advanced students, the writer set forth his own matured results in the *Encyclopædia Britannica.* And now the year 1891 has come, which means the end of another ten years of study. Is it not natural for me to ask myself whether I was nearer the truth, as regards the second part of Isaiah, in 1880 or in 1870, and if in 1880, whether I have improved at all upon the imperfect results then attained? Let me try to answer these questions.—In my first attempt in the criticism of Isaiah, by the side of some critical discrepancies from Ewald, which are not strikingly either progressive or retrogressive, there is this one retrograde step to be noticed, that I treat Isaiah xl.-lxvi. as forming an artistic whole, divided by the two-fold occurrence of a refrain (Isaiah xlix. 22, lvii. 21) into three books of equal length. In the Encyclopædia article, on the other hand, I maintain that the appearance of unity is as fallacious as in the case of some other books, and that the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah contain no less than nine inserted or appended passages belonging to different periods. The main position of my article (*i.e.*, the denial of the unity of II. Isaiah) has since 1881 been taken up independently by several other writers, to whom in due time I shall refer, but it has yet to fight its way to general acceptance. I feel it my duty, in the altered circumstances

of Bible study, to give greater publicity than heretofore to views which are of considerable importance, if correct, for the study of Isaiah.

But before proceeding further, I should like to justify the statement that these views, if correct, are of considerable importance. I will not now urge purely critical considerations, but will simply point out that one reason why the theory of the non-Isaianic origin of Is. xl.-lxvi. has made its way so slowly among English students is the fact that this theory, in the form in which it has been usually presented, does not fully satisfy the conditions of the problem. Nor is it only intelligent orthodox laymen (laymen, I mean, from a scholar's point of view) who find a difficulty in the new theory as commonly set forth. Klostermann and Bredenkamp are not merely orthodox theologians, but able scholars, and both of them repudiate the delightfully simple theory that Is. xl.-lxvi. was written at the close of the Exile by a Jew in Babylon. Their own theory, anticipated in a vague sort of way in 1853 by Sir Edward Strachey, is that fragments of Isaiah's writings were worked up and completed by a much later hand. Nägelsbach, too, is not merely an orthodox, but a sound, though somewhat narrow, scholar; and he, though he speaks, like Delitzsch, of the three Enneads of Is. xl.-lxvi., admits that the third Ennead does not deserve the name, as it contains only five discourses. Isaiah, he thinks, may have been overtaken by death before he could properly arrange and develop his materials, and the consequence was that this part of the book fell into the hands of an interpolator during the Exile. This theory is even more crude, arbitrary, and unsatisfactory than that of Klostermann and Bredenkamp; but one or another of their theories may still, perhaps, be a convenient resting-place for some slowly-moving minds.

Let me add that in conducting my argument I wish to preserve the most friendly courtesy towards those who may at present differ from me. I make but one easy and

perhaps unnecessary stipulation, viz., that they would from time to time re-peruse the second part of Isaiah, putting preconceived theories aside, and seek at each fresh perusal for a clearer view of the facts of exegesis. These facts are very delicate, and without constant practice it is only too easy even for good Hebrew scholars to overlook them. It is not well to be too hasty in deciding, nor to rely too exclusively on one's own vision. If, however, a number of trained students agree in constantly recognising certain exegetical phenomena which conflict with what has become the tradition of modern criticism, it is very improbable that they are altogether wrong. It is not their interest to subvert the decisions of the past, nor can it be in itself pleasant to any lover of the Bible (and who should love the Bible more than the critic ?) to disintegrate a fine Hebrew work with a superficial appearance of unity. It may, indeed, be a fact of experience that a thoroughly justified and careful disintegration is rewarded by deepened insight into Israelitish history; but, though well assured of this, few critics enter on the work of analysis without some reluctance. If, therefore, for more than a hundred years past, voices have been raised at intervals in favour of the disintegration of II. Isaiah, and if to-day the old theory is being revived in more elaborate and defensible forms, it becomes honest students of Isaiah not to shut themselves up in the comfortable house of tradition, but to open their eyes to facts, and reconstruct some part of their old habitation. I ask, then, for a careful consideration of the exegetical facts which are adduced by the new school. My own explanation of the facts, published in 1881, was, of course, an imperfect one. Further study has, I trust, enabled me to improve it. But I will most gladly exchange it, either in part or altogether, for any theory which corresponds better to the facts, and fits better into an intelligible historical sketch of Hebrew literature.

But perhaps some one may say, Why put forward a fresh theory at all? Why not rest content with one which

satisfied two such scholars as Gesenius and Hitzig? I might say, in reply, that though Gesenius was admirably equipped on the linguistic side, he had not that power of putting himself into close relation with his author which any truly great exegete possesses, and that Hitzig was obstinate and paradoxical to a degree, which greatly impaired his influence as an Old Testament scholar. But the real answer is that criticism cannot stand still. As long as even probable solutions of complicated problems can be obtained, we are bound to seek them, and more especially when the problems are connected with a book the most interesting and fascinating in the world—I mean the "Divine Library," the Bible. And if you want a proof that disintegration can be combined with an ardent love of the Scriptures, take the case of the first disintegrator of the Second Isaiah, Don Isaac Abarbanel, who proved both by word and by deed, his enthusiasm for the treasure of the Torah. Long before Koppe and Eichhorn, he wrote down this observation, in his commentary on Isaiah (finished A.D. 1498), *à propos* of Isaiah liii.: "Nor is there anything remarkable in this prophecy coming in the midst of a series of promises of the future redemption; for the prophecies in this book are not all of them connected or related to one another, but each separate prophecy and each separate promise uttered by the prophet stands by itself, as may be seen by the contents."[1]

Let us pass on now to the history of the analysis of II. Isaiah. The hint thrown out by Abarbanel had no critical consequences. The modern school of fragmentists dates back to Koppe, the author of the notes to the German edition of Bishop Lowth's *Isaiah* (1779-1781). This was followed by Augusti, Bertholdt, and Eichhorn, the last of whom, led astray by Koppe, too boldly separated the text of Isaiah into eighty-five pieces. Gesenius and Hitzig, however, stood firm on the side of unity, and the words in

[1] *The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters.* II. Translations, by S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer (1877), p. 188.

which the former, whose name is still so justly honoured among us, expressed himself, deserve quotation: "The only concession," he says, "which can be made is that the prophet did not write the whole book straight on, but composed the different sections at different times, after which they were united, or rather worked up together. Thus, at any rate, lvi. 9—lviii. 14; lxiii. 1—6; and lxiii. 7—lxv. 25, can be thought of as having had a separate existence, though they were afterwards, no doubt, worked up together, on which account, too, there is often a transition between them, and a seam can seldom be discovered."[1] Precisely the same view is expressed by Hitzig, who fully admits the fragmentary origin of the book, but insists on the unity ultimately produced when the author brought the separate fragments together, and seeks to strengthen his argument for unity by adopting a bright idea of Friedrich Rückert. This idea was that the prophet's work, which we call the Second Isaiah, was divided by the author himself into three books of nine sections or chapters each, and that the two former books were marked off by the closing refrain: "No peace, saith Yahveh (or saith my God), to the wicked" (xlviii. 22; lvii. 21). There was much wise moderation in the attitude of these great scholars, the old and the young. They candidly admitted an element of truth in the theory of the fragmentists, but could not tolerate the denial of the unity of the book, and the ascription of the sections which composed it to different authors. Their position is, I think, untenable, and yet I am sure that by their policy of moderate conservatism they did good service in their day to criticism. For the analysis of ancient writings requires to be practised with circumspection, and this was a quality in which the early critics were deficient. There were two ways in which the school of Koppe might have sought to justify its procedure. It might have produced either a

[1] Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaja*, III. (1821), p. 15.

thorough commentary on Isaiah, or a sketch of Jewish literature in the framework of contemporary history, showing, if possible, that such extreme disintegration was not uncalled for on exegetical and historical grounds. Now, it is true that Eichhorn did translate and comment on the Hebrew prophets, but he aimed more than was right at popularity. He had his reward, for he won the ear of Goethe, but he did not win that of Hebrew scholars like Gesenius. The other work which might have been asked for—a history of Hebrew literature—Eichhorn wisely left unwritten. That was reserved for a younger Göttingen scholar, not a member of any of the existing schools, Heinrich Ewald.

This great critic, whose life I have sketched at considerable length elsewhere,[1] began his critical career as an independent conservative. At the age of twenty he published a work against the literary analysis of Genesis, whether into documents or into fragments. Eight years later, he set an example of honesty by retracting it; not, however because he had gone over to any one of the existing parties, but because he had learned to estimate better the complexity of the problems of the Old Testament literature. And note the caution of the man. Not till 1835 (he was then thirty-two years of age) did he bring out a second work implying a definite judgment for or against the critical analysis of Hebrew writings. This was his work on the Psalms, which, I confess, however stimulating, is by no means equal to his great work on the Prophets. The first edition of *Die Propheten* appeared in 1840 and 1841; and here, in spite of his weakness as a dialectician, Ewald has, if you will only study him well, carried the criticism of the second Isaiah to the furthest point which had as yet been reached. I will not take up my reader's time by describing his results, as he embodied them in the second

[1] "The Life and Works of Heinrich Ewald," *The Expositor*, 1886 (2), pp. 241, etc., 361, etc.

edition, published in 1867.[1] The prophecies of the Second Isaiah originated, according to him, at the close of the Exile, in "fly-sheets, which the surging stream of the time drew forth, one after another, from the prophet."[2] Hence the changes in the prophet's mood, and the references which he makes to the varying effects of his prophecies on the people. These "pamphlets or fly-leaves," however, were collected by the prophet in two books, one comprising chapters xl.-xlviii., and the other, chapters xlix.-lx., to which, as Ewald thinks, the prophet added lxi. 1—lxiii. 6, as an epilogue, and afterwards lxiii. 7—lxvi. 24, as an appendix. It should be added that Ewald peremptorily rejects the plausible threefold division suggested by Rückert, and adopted by Hitzig and Ruetschi, and afterwards by Delitzsch and myself.

This, however, is not the whole of Ewald's critical theory. He also felt compelled by exegetical phenomena to recognise in the Second Isaiah a considerable element derived from earlier books. He had already pointed out, in the masterly introduction to his book, that words and thoughts of earlier prophets were continually revived by more recent prophetic writers, including the Second Isaiah.[3] In the section on Isaiah xl.-lxvi., he showed how this theory worked. Creative as the prophetic writer is, he often does not disdain to imitate models; nor, says Ewald, "on closer consideration is it possible not to see that he also inserts whole passages of some length from older prophets with little or no alteration, which can be plainly distinguished as regards their primary meaning and the time of their origin." These passages are xl. 1, 2, lii. 13—liii. 12, lvi. 9—lvii. 11, in which Ewald finds a great similarity to Mic. vi., vii., and which, like that prophecy, or those prophecies, he ascribes to a prophet of the reign of Manasseh; and further, chapters lviii. and lix. and some

[1] Translated by Mr. J. F. Smith, in five volumes, 1875—1881. (Williams and Norgate.)

[2] *The Prophets*, E.T., iv. 254; cf. i. 90. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 82-83.

smaller passages, which are, he thinks, introduced from a writer closely allied to Ezekiel, and probably contemporary with that prophet.[1]

It will at once be noticed by the student that in this complicated theory, Ewald makes more concessions to the fragmentists than either Gesenius or Hitzig. He will only admit an imperfect unity in the book; for lxi. 1—lxiii. 6, and lxiii. 7—lxvi. 24, he views as additions representing after-thoughts of the writer, and several passages in the body of the work he regards as extracts from older prophetic writings. In this increased complication we must, I think, acknowledge a sign of progress. As I ventured to remark, ten years ago, "Complication, and not simplicity, is the note of the questions and of the answers which constitute Old Testament criticism."[2] Gesenius and Hitzig went too far in their natural rebound from the pernicious extreme of the fragmentists; the right mean was seen at a glance by Ewald. No unprejudiced reader of the Second Isaiah, if he has any literary tact, can fail to admit this. All that remains is to examine the different sections of the Second Isaiah more closely, both from the point of view of ideas and from that of style, using Ewald's suggestions as working hypotheses, and modifying them as may be found necessary, in accordance with deeper study both of Isaiah xl.—lxvi. and of other monuments of the Babylonian or Persian period.

Let us start from Ewald's hypothesis with regard to (*a*) lvi. 9—lvii. 11*a*, the longest of the three passages of earlier date, inserted, according to this critic, in the Prophecy of Restoration, and therefore presumably the most abundant in evidences of its origin. Is the date pre-Exilic, as Ewald holds, or Exilic? The Palestinian aspect of the description in lvii. 5, 6, the probable reference to persecution in lvii. 1, and the correspondence of the sins imputed to the people with those of Israel before the Exile, have been felt to give

[1] *Ibid.*, iv. 251—253. [2] Cheyne. *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 228.

a strong plausibility to Ewald's view. Indeed, almost the only recent book in which an Exilic date is defended, is the posthumous introduction to the Old Testatment by the lamented Edward Riehm.[1] Far be it from me to disparage one to whom I was myself many years ago indebted; but the truth must here be spoken, that though eminent in Biblical theology and exegesis, Riehm had not a keen eye for literary criticism, and is not the best of guides in this department. Still, we must not close our ears to reasonable objections from any trained scholar, and Riehm's objections are these: (1.) That it has not yet been satisfactorily shown that the discourse presupposes (exclusively?) pre-Exilic circumstances, and (2), that there are four points of contact n chapters lvi. and lvii. with passages in chapter liii. and Jer. ii.[2] As to the first of these, we need not deny the abstract possibility that some of the sins denounced may have continued during the Exile; but we must assert dogmatically that the description corresponds to what we know of pre-Exilic practices. As to the second, the only parallelism which has the least importance is that in lvii. 1 and liii. 8, and this is perfectly consistent with the theory here maintained respecting Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12. At the end of his paragraph, moreover, Riehm makes this valuable concession, that in describing the idolatry of the exiles (these are Riehm's words, not mine) the prophet must have taken similar descriptions by pre-Exilic prophets as his model. I now venture to refer to myself. In 1870 my opinion was that a historical retrospect like that in the disputed passage might possibly have been composed by an Exilic prophet who was familiar with the denunciations of his predecessors, and, by hearsay at any rate, with the scenery of Palestine. The evil "watchmen" and "shepherds" spoken of in lvi. 10-11, might, I thought, be the prophets and elders who continued to be the guides

[1] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1890), ii. 141.

[2] Compare lvi. 11 with liii. 6; lvii. 1 with liii. 8; lvii. 5 with Jer. ii. 20; and lvii. 10 with Jer. ii. 25.

of the Jewish community during the Exile. Nor could I satisfy myself as to the existence of a suture or join in lvii. 11. This was, I suppose, a natural position to take up in 1870. But in the course of ten years it became clear to me that the harshness of the style, contrasting as it does with the smoothness of the passages between which the piece is inserted, is not to be accounted for on my earlier theory. At the very outset of the section (v. 9) we find archaisms (חַיְתוֹ, שָׁדַי, אִתָּיו) which, though not unparalleled in the later literature, are contrary to the habit of the Second Isaiah; nor is there any at all striking point of contact with that prophet's work, except it be the reduplication of הֵם in lvii. 6, which surely belongs to the rhetoric of all times and nations. If Isa. lvi. 9—lvii. 11*a* (13*a*), came before us in a pre-Exilic work, would any one dream of referring it to the Exile? So strongly was Luzzatto (a conservative Jewish critic) impressed by its antique character, that he declared this passage, and this alone, in Isa. xl.-lxvi., to be not Isaiah's, but the work of one of his later contemporaries, and supposed lvii. 1, 2, to be a dirge written in commemoration of Isaiah's martyrdom.[1] A Jewish tradition, as we all know, placed this event in the reign of the persecutor Manasseh—the reign in which Ewald and others, for good reasons, place the whole or the greater part of the sixth and seventh chapters of Micah.[2] The only question is whether the Second Isaiah, or an editor, connected lvi. 9—lvii. 11*a* (13*a*) with the rest of the chapter. Stade is of opinion that the vigour and originality of the Second Isaiah forbid us to suppose that he adopted passages from other prophets. This is plausible. One would have expected such a great writer to alter the phraseology more, and so make the passage his own (cf. below on lii. 13—liii. 12).

---

[1] Bredenkamp's impression is somewhat similar. He agrees that the passage is not by the author of the main part of Isa. xl.-lxvi., but thinks that it is really the work of Isaiah, who, in lvii. 1, 2, expresses a presentiment of his own fate.

[2] Mic. vii. 7-20, however, are more probably Exilic.

An editor who wished to find a home for this (probably) pre-Exilic passage, may have worked it up with a fragment of the Second Isaiah's work. At any rate, lvi. 9, etc., must be regarded as parenthetical; chap. lx. is the natural sequel of chaps. liv. and lv. (cf. lx. 1, etc., with liv. 1, lv. 12).

(*b*) The next of the three alleged early passages to be examined is lii. 13—liii. 12. The argument for Ewald's theory (*i.e.*, that the passage is borrowed from an older prophet) is clearly not so strong here as in the former case. It is quite true that lii. 13, etc. (like lvi. 9, etc.), has somewhat the appearance of a parenthesis. It is not very closely connected either with the preceding or with the following section. In its style, too, it contrasts very strongly with the work in which it is imbedded, and reminds us by its harshness of lvi. 9—lvii. 11. On the other hand, it is by no means without points of contact with the admitted Deutero-Isaianic prophecies, and, putting aside the remarkably definite individualisation of the picture, both the description and the ideas seem to be not wholly incompatible with the authorship of the Second Isaiah. The question is, whether we can sufficiently account for the peculiarities of the piece by regarding it as a fly-sheet written some time after the preceding and (probably) the next following discourses, at a time when the idea of vicarious suffering, in all its consequences, had taken such a hold of the prophet's mind as even to impede his utterance. As in 1880, my own impression still is that this is not the case. If the Second Isaiah ever used older material, he did so here. But I cannot, unfortunately, endorse the opinion of Ewald, that he took over the older passage almost without any important alteration; and in this I am glad to have the support of Dillmann. It seems quite impossible even to approach the form of the older passages. We can but conjecture that it referred to a prophet-martyr —whether Jeremiah or another—and that the striking feature of his symbolic leprosy was derived from an early Book of Job, which was probably entirely narrative, and

preceded that now extant in the Canon. Isa. lvii. 1, 2; Mic. vii. 2*a*, may refer inclusively to this martyrdom.[1]

(*c*) The last of Ewald's supposed Manasseh passages, xl. 1, 2, is regarded by all critics but Ewald as the Second Isaiah's work.

We now pass on to (*d* and *e*) chaps. lviii. and lix., which Ewald makes into a single prophecy with five strophes, but which is rather a pair of prophecies, separated by only a brief interval. Let us first inquire whether Ewald is right in denying that more than one or two verses (lviii. 12, lix. 21) contain the Second Isaiah's work, or whether we may not have recourse again to the theory of fly-sheets, and account for the peculiarities of these companion addresses by a change in the circumstances and mood of the author. The second alternative must, I fear, be rejected. If no limit is to be placed to the application of the theory of fly-sheets, I know not how much may not be annexed to the domain of a single great prophet. Baron Bunsen had no scruple in asserting that not only Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but the disputed passages in the first part of our book, and the two appended discourses in Jeremiah (l. and li.), together with Lamentations, many of the Psalms, and the Book of Job, were all by the Second Isaiah, or, to give him his right name, Baruch, the secretary of Jeremiah. I do not myself think that the Second Isaiah can be safely credited with the authorship of any minor works, or fly-sheets, which are not closely related, not only in style, but in subject, to his chief work. Applying this principle, I am unable to admit that Isaiah lviii. and lix. can have been put forth for the edification of the people by the Second Isaiah. Both chapters place us in the midst of a community free from idolatry and punctual in legal observances (notice a characteristic phrase of the Levitical legislation in lviii. 3-5). This will surely not fit the Second Isaiah. In the former,

[1] Jer. xvii. 19—27, is an interpolation, though modelled on the style of Jeremiah. See my *Jeremiah*, vol. I. (1883), p. 418; Kuenen, *Onderzoek*, 2nd ed., II. (1889), p. 176.

though the Jewish people suffer much from oppression, its need is not yet so great as to affect the course of daily business; in the latter, its condition is so hopeless, and ruin seems so imminent, that a horrible dread has seized upon all men. As Bredenkamp truly observes, a corruption so deep as that described in lix. 3-8, and a condition so desperate as that in lix. 9-11, do not characterise the period of the Exile. Consider (2) this fresh point—that, though the stress laid upon fasting in chap. lviii., both by the mass of the Jews and by the prophet, and upon Sabbath-keeping, may not be inconsistent with an Exilic date (see Zech. vii. 3; Ezek. xx. 11-21; xxii. 8, 26), yet it is without a parallel in the acknowledged II. Isaiah. It is, at any rate, entirely in the spirit of post-Exilic writers (see Zech. vii. 5, viii. 19; Joel ii. 12, 13; Neh. xiii. 15-22.)[1] Notice (3) that there is no reference to Babylonia, and that lix. 20 implies that the Jews are at this time in "Zion," and especially (4) that there is no human helper, no Cyrus, on the horizon.

The difficulty of ascribing chap. lix. to II. Isaiah is greatly increased by the defects of its style. I doubt if we can even ascribe so badly composed a work to the same author as chap. lviii. The glaring picture of depravity in vv. 1—8 is unrelieved by any touch of human feeling. How unlovely, too, is the mixture of figures in v. 5*b*! The middle verses (vv. 9—15*a*) are still more awkwardly expressed, and cohere neither with the preceding nor with the following section. The Divine intervention is anticipated in lix. 15*b*-17, with the utmost confidence (note the prophetic perfects). But what does this confidence rest upon? The restoration of God's favour should be conditional on hearty repentance. But all that lix. 9—13 says is, that the people (including the prophet) is in deep misery, and fully conscious of its evil deserts. There is no vow of amendment of life; no appeal to God's covenant-love. We have to take for

[1] Klostermann and Bredenkamp, however, in accordance with their theory (see above), ascribe chap. lviii. to Isaiah.

granted that preaching like that in chap. lviii. has produced an effect, and that the prophet knows intuitively that the voice of true penitence has been "heard on high" (lviii. 4). How can we ascribe such a composition to that great master of speech, the Second Isaiah?

But is there nothing to be said on the other side? Certainly there are some exegetical data which may seem to be opposed to a post-Exilic date. In lviii. 12, the rebuilding of ancient ruins, and in lviii. 14, the triumphant occupation of the heights of Canaan, are promised as the rewards of obedience. In both cases, however, the difficulty is more in appearance than in reality. The recurrent calamities of the post-Exile period did not extinguish the Jewish craving for independence (see Hag. ii. 22), and Sanballat even accused Nehemiah of intending to set himself up as king (Neh. vi. 6). This accounts for lviii. 14. And as to lviii. 12, which undoubtedly resembles lxi. 4, it may be truly said that the language was almost as applicable after the return of the Jews as before. It was a slow process, the repairing of ruined cities, as Nehemiah's picturesque description of his own work at Jerusalem shows. I may add that the writer of lviii. 12 is not, in my opinion, the writer of the rest of the chapter. Two great awkwardnesses of expression, וּבָנוּ מִמֵּךָ and נְתִיבוֹת לָשֶׁבֶת, suggest the theory that ver. 12 was inserted by the editor of Isa. xl.-lxvi. (or, at least, of Isa. xl.-lxii.), to adapt chap. lviii. to its new position in the midst of Deutero-Isaianic works. Still less need we stumble at an exegetical fact, pointed out by Mr. G. A. Smith, that "judgment" and "righteousness," are used in chap. lix. in the same sense as in the acknowledged work of II. Isaiah. Of course, the influence of the Second Isaiah was felt by the writer of these chapters How could it be otherwise? So, also, was that of the true Isaiah (cf. perhaps lix. 3, 7 with i. 15, 21; lix. 19 with xxx 27), and that of Ezekiel (cf. lviii. with Ezek. xviii. 7, 16, and lix. 16 with Ezek. xxii. 30). And so, too, was that of the introduction to the Book of Proverbs (lix. 7*a* being

taken from Prov. i. 16), which is very possibly a work of the Persian period.

The determination of the period of chaps. lviii. and lix. has an important bearing on that of other passages. If these two documents are post-Exilic it becomes all the more probable that (*f*) lvi. 1-8, is so, too. Let us, then, study this brief but pointed prophecy. How strongly it contrasts in style with the flowing oratory of chap. lv.! The author has absorbed the ideas of the Second Isaiah, and adopts some of his phrases (see vv. 1, 5). But his circumstances are different. The situation is briefly this: The religion of Yahveh has begun to attract foreigners; proselytes have attached themselves to the regenerate people of Israel. But alas! a cloud of anxiety overspreads their minds. A new spirit of exclusivism has sprung up at Jerusalem. Those who speak in the name of Yahveh threaten to separate the proselytes from the people, contrary to the spirit of Deut. xxiii. 7. There are also Israelites who have been forced to become eunuchs at the Court of the "great king," but who are earnest adherents of the great spiritual religion of Jeremiah and the Second Isaiah. These take their exclusion from the congregation to be a matter of course, and yet they cannot help mingling their tears with those of the proselytes. For they know the great prophecy in Isa. xliv. 1-5, and cannot understand how the bountiful promise of God should be confined to a select aristocracy. Now, how can the accession of proselytes be understood while the Jews are still in exile? Especially as ver. 7, in its most natural sense, implies the existence of the Temple. These few verses do, in fact, pre-suppose a very different situation from that of Isa. xliv. 1-5.

Proselytes have begun to offer themselves, as the author of that passage and the writer of xiv. 1, 2 declared that they would do. But in Jerusalem the reforming movement of Ezra and Nehemiah has generated a new spirit of exclusivism. Against this the prophet contends. He fortifies his position by a special revelation in these words: "An

oracle of Adonai Yahveh, the gatherer of the outcasts of Israel. Yet more will I gather unto him, besides his gathered ones." Why does he employ such an unusual introductory formula? The addition of Gentile members to the true Israel was by no means a new announcement (see xliv. 5; lv. 5). Evidently, the older prophet's teaching had fallen into neglect. In one respect, however, this new prophet agrees with Nehemiah. He thinks much of the duty of Sabbath-keeping, and in this he agrees with the author of a neighbouring but independent prophecy (see lviii. 13, 14). We must refer both prophecies to the same period. It was a troublous time, as lvi. 1, not less than lviii. 2, implies. Deliverance from the oppressor is in both eagerly hoped for, and the ideal sketched in lvi. 7 (end) finely completes that of lviii. 14.

T. K. CHEYNE.

THE LITERATURE OF THE JEWS IN YEMEN.

THE existence of Jews in Yemen, although mentioned by messengers from Jerusalem (שליחים), who went there from time to time to solicit contributions for their poor brethren in the Holy Land in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, first came into prominent notice through the late Jacob Sappir and the famous traveller and distinguished Orientalist, M. Joseph Halévy. Both not only gave an account of them, but brought MSS. thence, which enable us to give a summary abstract of their literary productions. Later on these two explorers were followed by commercial travellers, who brought more MSS. from Yemen, and thus added more information about our subject. But before proceeding to speak of the literature produced by the Yemen Jews, it will be necessary to discuss their early settlement in South Arabia. According to the tradition of the Jews in San'a, as reported by J. Sappir,[1] Jewscame there forty-two years before the destruction of the first Temple. When they heard Jeremiah's prophecy (xxi. 9): "He that goes out [of this city] he shall live," 75,000 warriors of the nobles of Judah, with priests, Levites, and slaves, headed by twenty-five chiefs of families (whose names the Jews of San'a still preserve), left Jerusalem, passed the Jordan, travelled through the wilderness, and by the way of Edom, after eleven days' journey, finally reached Yemen, which is a fruitful land, like "the garden of God and the land of Israel" (San'a is, indeed, still called the garden of Eden). They took possession of it, choosing a king, who built the

[1] *Eben Sappir*, i., p. 99.

Fortress Nakus, and established a powerful kingdom. When Ezra sent letters to them, asking them to return to Palestine, together with the exiles of Babel, they did not listen to him, and continued obdurate, even when he made his personal appearance amongst them. They said that the time of the true redemption had not yet arrived. Why, then, go again to meet a second exile, which must inevitably come? Ezra grew angry, and excommunicated them; to which they retorted by a curse, to the effect that he would not be buried in the Holy Land. And both curses were confirmed. The Jews in Yemen have found no rest or repose up to the present day, and Ezra is buried in the desert of Bassora. The Jews of Yemen hated Ezra so much that his name is never given to a child, whilst the names of Zechariah (Yahya in Arabic), Saadyah, Obadiah, Joseph, Aaron, Moses, David, Solomon, etc., are very frequent. These names they pretend were borne by the chiefs who led their people to Yemen. Up to the rise of Mohammed, they say, they were happy enough, and were undisturbed in their occupations; but since he vanquished them, after severe battles, they have been oppressed up to the present day, while a great number of Jews, according to their statements, were forced to accept the Islâm.

Whether this tradition be fact or legend, certain it is that centuries before Mohammed, there were powerful Jewish communities in North Arabia as well as in South Arabia or Yemen. Whether they came there as early as they assert, or effected a settlement during the last years of the second Temple, or even after its destruction, must remain an open question; there are no documents which can assist us to decide the question. Josephus does not mention Yemen at all, although he speaks of the Arabians on the border of the Jewish Kingdom. In the Mishnah, Arabian women are mentioned, and in the Talmud, Arabic expressions are given; but these refer most probably to the inhabitants of Northern Arabia, where we find before Mohammed's time powerful warriors and distinguished poets, who wrote in

Arabic.[1] As to Yemen, we know that Jews played an important *rôle* there from the fourth to the sixth century A.D., and allied themselves with the natives (Homerites or Himyars), in opposing the Byzantine rulers. It is even reported that kings of the Himyars were converted to Judaism, and that one of them massacred the Christians who came to establish themselves in Yemen. But according to recent investigations, the power of the Jews in Yemen seems to have been exaggerated by Christian writers of that epoch, for it is evident that their letters and reports on the subject are partial as concerning the ill-treatment of the Christians by the Jews.[2] However, we cannot decide this question here ; the fact that Jews occupied a position of influence in Yemen is sufficient for our present purpose.

There is a blank as to any mention of the Jews in Yemen between the sixth century (after the defeat of the king Dhoo Nowâs), and the letter addressed by Maimonides at about the year 1160 to the chief of the congregation of Yemen, R. Jacob ben Nethaneel ibn al-Fayumi, or of Fayum, in Egypt, of which we shall have to say more later on.[3] Though we are certain of the presence of Jews in Arabia, north and south, we know little about their learning in Jewish matters. There can be no doubt that the Jews in North Arabia brought their Bible with them, and possessed a good stock of Aggadic matter, upon which Mohammed based his Koran.[4] And it is not very hazardous

[1] See Dr. Hirschfeld's *Essai sur l'Histoire de Médine* (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, T. vii., p. 167 *sqq.*)

[2] See M. Duchesne's article and M. J. Halévy's rejoinder in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, T. xx., p. 220 *sqq.*, and T. xxi., p. 73 *sqq.*

[3] In responsa of the Geonim, probably in the eleventh century, Yemen coins are mentioned. See Dr. Harkavy's edition of the *Responsen der Geonim.* Berlin : 1886, pp. 202 and 217.

[4] See A. Geiger's essay : *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen ;* Bonn, 1833 ; Dr. J. Gastfreund's essay : *Mohammed nach Talmud und Midrasch*, Wien, 1875 ; Dr. H. Hirschfeld's *Jüdische Elemente im Korân*, Berlin, 1878 ; and *Beitäge zur Erklärung des Korans*, Leipzig, 1885.

to say that what the Jews in the north knew those in the south knew also. Moreover, it is more than probable that rabbinical emissaries came to Arabia and brought the legal and ritual decisions of the Talmudical schools. Such emissaries went to Egypt, Asia Minor, Africa, and Rome; why, therefore, should they not come to Arabia? But, granted this, there is no trace of any writings left by rabbis of Arabia, and therefore the view has lately been propounded that they were ignorant as to the interpretations of the Halakhot by the Rabbinical schools, and that the Yemen Jews possessed special ritual rules of their own.[1] But this reasoning could be applied also to the Jews in Persia, in Asia Minor, in Rome and Italy, Spain, France, and Germany. The Jews of the last-named countries were much farther from Babylonia than those of Yemen, and yet we have not heard that the rules for *Shehitah* and *Bediqah* were different with the Jews in Europe from those current among the Jews in Babylonia. It may be true that the early Jews of Yemen never saw a copy of the Talmud, but they would not have stood alone in this deficiency. This bulky compilation could not be procured everywhere, and many countries were unacquainted with it until the tenth century; but that does not prove that they did not possess a kind of abstract containing the daily ritua rules. If the Jews of Yemen produced no works on Talmudic topics, Persian Jews, who were the nearest to the seats of the Babylonian schools, are in the same condition. While rich men in Africa and Europe could finally procure copies of the Talmud, this was impossible for the Jews in Yemen, who were at the time when the Talmud was finished (eighth century) in utter misery. Surely from the epitaphs found at Aden, dating from the beginning of the eighth century, we may conclude that the Yemen Jews were as well acquainted with Rabbinical lore as all other Jews who were not in the

[1] See *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. iii., p. 542.

immediate vicinity of the schools of Babylonia and Tunisia. We shall reproduce only one epitaph, which is of the earliest date.[1] It is the following: ברוך דיין האמת נאסף לבית עולמו האיש החכם . . . החסיד העניו המכובד והמאושר הטוב והישר הירא שמים אדונינו שלום ריי"ת בר הזקן הנבון החסיד העניו הירא שמים אדונינו חוטר נ"גע בחדש תמוז שנת כ' לשטרות. "Blessed be the judge of truth. Gathered to the house of his world is the man, the wise . . . . the pious, the humble, the honoured and the happy, the good and the righteous, who feared heaven; our master, Shalom, the spirit of the Lord guided him (Isaiah lxiii. 14)—son of the venerable, the wise, the pious, the humble, who feared God, our master Hoter, may he rest in Paradise, in the month of Tammuz, 20 of the era of the contracts" (*i.e.*, Seleucidæ). It is evident that the thousand is omitted, and that the full date is 1020 Sel., equal to 709 of the Christian era. Thus the epitaphs of Aden, (which is the key to San'a), of which we know a dozen, are written as early as the eighth century in the same Hebrew that we find used in the epitaphs of Italy of the same date, and do not present any admixture of strange words which Eldad is supposed to have brought from this part of the world.[2] These epitaphs, dated according to the era of the contracts, point to an acquaintance with the Babylonian schools, for the Italian early epitaphs date from the era of the destruction of the second Temple, and later on bear, in addition, the era of the creation.[3] The Jews of Yemen continue up to the present day to date from the era of the contracts, using Aramaic formulæ, which point more to Babylonia than to Palestine. Moreover, the use of superlinear vowel-points (usually called Assyrian punctuation) in the pointed Hebrew texts written in Yemen would

---

[1] See J. Sappir, *Eben Sappir*, ii., p. 10, n. 1. See also *The* [*London*] *Palæographical Society* (Oriental section), plate xxix. (Hebrew).

[2] *Jewish Quarterly Review*, iii. p. 542.

[3] See Professor G. T. Ascoli's essay: *Inscrizioni inedite o mal note, Greche, Latine, Ebraiche di antichi sepolcri giudaici del Napolitano* (*Atti del IV. Congresso*, p. 239). Firenze, 1880.

argue their connection with the Eastern Massoretic schools rather than with the Palestinian one at Tiberias. We shall see later on that Saadyah Gaon's Arabic translations of Biblical books were very popular in the Yemen congregations. These translations reached them most probably from Egypt, since Yemen Rabbis seem to have come from that land. Jacob al-Fayyumi, who corresponded with Maimonides (about 1160), was a compatriot of Saadyah, who is also called al-Fayyumi, although born at Dilaz in Egypt.[1] The late J. Sappir thought that Jacob was even of the family of Saadyah Gaon, which may be the case, but there are no proofs for it.

According to Benjamin of Tudela (about 1175), there were Jews in Yemen, and learned men amongst them, but the passage in which the Yemen Jews are mentioned[2] is in a very corrupt state, and besides, Benjamin not having visited this country himself, it would be hazardous to draw any conclusion from the information he supplies. But it is evident from the introductory words of Maimonides to his letter, addressed to Jacob al-Fayyumi, that the congregations of Yemen were not devoid of learning. Maimonides addresses his letter to Jacob, and in general to all our eminent brethren, the wise of the congregations of Yemen (ולכלל כל אחינו ואלופינו כל תלמידי הקהלות בארץ תימן); and further on he speaks of "those who meditate all day in the law of Moses, and walk in the way which R. Ashi (the supposed compiler of the Bab. Talmud) taught" (וכל היום הוגים בתורת משה · הולכים בדרך הורה רב אשי). Again, Maimonides says that these Yemen congregations observe the precepts not only strictly, but also with knowledge (מקיימים כל המצוות בדקדוקיהם ממקהלותם), and he blesses God for the mercy he had upon the distant congregations, enabling them to observe the precepts (ברוך השם אשר לא

[1] See Dr. A. Harkavy, in the *Israelitische Monatsschrift.* Berlin, 1891; No. 2.

[2] Ed. Asher, translation, p. 113, *sqq.*

השבית מקיימי התורה ושומרי הקים באיים הרחוקים.) And at the end of the letter Maimonides states "that he answers in Arabic, so that women and children should understand it, and be encouraged to stand firm by the Law," but he does not make any allusion to the weak state of learning in Yemen. Where is the proof, then, that in the eighth century they knew less about the Law than Jews in other countries? And as to the assertion that the Talmud did not reach Yemen, it seems to us a pure imagination, as we shall see further on. They themselves have a tradition, according to J. Sappir,[1] that before they received the compendium of Maimonides, they made their ritual decisions from the Talmud and other traditions. Only after Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah* reached them, together with the letter to Jacob al-Fayyumi, they sent men to Egypt to find out the truth about Maimonides, and after a favourable report concerning his wisdom, learning and piety, they received him and his works as their guide. So far indeed does their veneration for him go that they include him in the קדיש, adding ובחיי רבנא משה בן מיימון,[2] "and in the life of Moses ben Maimon." Their chief study now, Sappir adds, is the compendium of Maimonides, without taking notice of any other casuist; in general they do not care for hairsplitting discussions (פלפול); all they want is the final decision, which they find ready to hand in Maimonides' work. Later on they got hold of Joseph Caro's *Shulhan Aruch*, which they studied with the same object as they had studied Maimonides' code, viz., only for the final Halakhah. We possess numerous treatises of their schools, it is true, comparatively modern, on *Shehitah* and *Bediqah*,[3] but there is no trace of strange words, as found in Eldad's Halakhas, and surely if they had been once in use with the Jews in Yemen, with whom we may

[1] *Eben Sappir*, i., p. 53.

[2] These words are not found in the MSS. of the Yemen Siddur.

[3] See M. Halévy's account in the *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*. Paris: 1873, p. 589.

safely count those of Aden, they would not have completely disappeared; the conservatism of the Jews would not allow of such a supposition.

We come now to the chief object of our paper, viz., the literary productions of the Jews in Yemen after Maimonides' letter to Jacob al-Fayyumi.

Like the Spanish school in the tenth and the eleventh centuries, the Yemen Jews paid more attention to grammar, massorah, lexicography, exegesis, poetry and philosophy, than to casuistical discussions. The Franco-German schools, which remained in the background in these branches of studies, with few exceptions, produced, on the other hand, a huge *pilpulic* literature. Of course, all the schools east and west degenerated later on through the introduction of the Kabbalistic forgeries. Mysticism always possesses great power of attraction, and more especially in times of persecution and unhappiness.

BIBLE.—The largest number of the Yemen MSS. represent those which contain copies of the Pentateuch, with the Targum, and often with Saadyah Gaon's Arabic translation. None of these MSS., as far as they are known now, are older than the fourteenth century. For the Hebrew text the common vowel points are now employed, whilst in the Targum the superlinear system of punctuation is still in use. The Haftaroth are usually copied in a special volume; the Yemen rite does not differ much from the Ashkenazic, which came most likely from Babylonia. The five Megilloth are also copied in special volumes with an Arabic translation and an Arabic commentary, which is not by Saadyah. The one on Ecclesiastes has lately been recognised as that of Judah ibn Ghayath,[1] imported probably from Egypt. Rarer are the copies containing the Prophets and the Hagiographa with and without the Targum. The Bible is called with them *Tadj*, "crown" (כתר). The

[1] See Dr. Jacob Loewy's dissertation: *Libri Kohelet versio arabica quam composuit ibn Ghiyath*, Berlin, 1881.

Massorah, when put in the margin, is remarkably correct. The Pentateuch MSS. are sometimes preceded by a grammatical treatise originally written in Arabic with the title of *Tidjan*, which was afterwards translated with many additions into Hebrew. The latter was edited with copious notes by M. J. Derenbourg, of Paris, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1870, under the supposed title of *Manuel de Lecteur* (הוריית הקורא).[1] The Arabic text exists in several MSS., and is awaiting publication. This grammatical treatise, which is the only one known to be in the possession of the Yemen Jews, was believed by the late J. Sappir to be by Saadyah Gaon, but to judge from the context this cannot be the case. We have to mention a special compilation of a Massorah by Yahya Salih, edited by Dr. Ginsburg, with the fictitious title המסורה מתימן.[2]

It seems from J. Sappir's report that the Massorah is even now a special branch of study with the Yemen Jews, and more especially with the official readers. Their pronunciation of Hebrew is very minute and accurate according to the tonic accents. Possibly the Yemen Jews retain the old tradition of reciting Biblical passages, for it is different from that of the Spanish and German Jews. Moreover they have special tunes for the accents on the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, and more especially for the three poetical books called אמת, viz., Job, Proverbs, and Psalms, which, as it is known, have a special system of accentuation.[3]

COMMENTARIES.—Few commentaries were written by Yemen Jews in comparison with the large number produced by the Jews of other countries. We have already

---

[1] This is the title of the Hebrew translation of Judah ben Balam's grammatical treatise composed in Arabic. See Dr. W. Wickes' book, *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-one so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament.* Oxford, 1887, p. xi.

[2] *The Massorah*, Vol. III., Supplement, 1885, fol. 53, *sqq.*

[3] See Dr. W. Wickes' book : *A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Three so-called Poetical Books of the Old Testament.* Oxford, 1881.

mentioned that they studied the Bible chiefly with the aid of Saadyah's translation and commentary. It would seem from marginal notes in copies of Biblical MSS. coming from Yemen that they also possessed the commentary of Rashi, of D. Qamhi, of Moses ben Nahman, and of Isaac Armaah; whether in printed editions or in MS. cannot be said with certainty. Most likely they had them in both forms, for we saw in a dealer's hand a copy of the Rabbinical Bible, printed on vellum, brought from Yemen; on the other hand, in the list (privately printed) of the MSS. in possession of Mr. Ephraim Deinard, formerly of Odessa, now in New York, mention is made of a copy of Rashi on the Pentateuch with an epitome of the בעל הטורים by Jacob ben Asher on the margin (page 4). In the year 1339 Nathaniel ben Isaiah composed a commentary on the Pentateuch in Arabic, which contains more Midrash than exegesis, and a little later Saadyah ben David of Aden (al-Adeni) wrote another in Arabic, of which the portions dealing with Genesis and Exodus are still extant. Both commentaries are to be found amongst the MSS. in the Bodleian Library. We are not certain whether Abraham ben Solomon, author of an interesting and valuable compilation of a commentary on the Prophets, was of Yemen, but the MSS. of this compilation in the British Museum and the Bodleian Library were written in that country.

Talmud.—We have already mentioned the supposition that there was no trace of a copy of the Talmud in Yemen. That may have been the case in earlier times, but amongst the Deinard MSS. we find MSS. of the Gemara 1, of ביצה; 2, of פסחים; 3, of מועד קטן; 4, of מגילה; 5, of זבחים; written on paper by David ben Meoded. Herr Deinard states that the Mishnah is not in the same order as in our printed text; the word פיסקא is sometimes given for משנה, which is also noticeable in MSS. coming from Egypt. On the margins are extracts from Maimonides' חבור (Mishneh Thorah). On the margin of No. 4 a short commentary is

to be found, and glosses containing opinions of some Gaonim, viz., Natronoi, Aha and Haya, R. Ephraim, of a certain Judah ben Isaac, and also a gloss headed פירוש על פסאקי. In No. 5, on the margin, are glosses extracted from the *Arukh* of R. Nathan and from the *Siphrâ*. To judge from all these glosses, to which we shall have to add many others, one might perhaps conclude that Yemen was once well stocked with important works on all branches of learning, which were gradually destroyed when the country was pillaged by the Arabs. Perhaps some works will still be found through visits of travellers into the more interior parts of the country. We do not know what has become of Mr. Deinard's MSS. If not sold in America, one of our great libraries ought to endeavour to acquire them.

More common with the Yemen Jews are copies of the עין יעקב by Jacob Habib (containing the Agadic passages of the B. Talmud); of Maimonides' Arabic commentaries on the Mishnah, and his books of precepts, also in Arabic. On the margin of a MS. of the former work on the part מועד, we see glosses extracted from a work by אבן השרון, *i.e.*, Abner bar Ner hash-Sharoni; it seems that Abner wrote a twofold commentary, a lesser and a larger one, to judge from the following words עיין בפירושא זוטא דלאבן השרון בשני הפירושין, "See in the lesser commentary by Ibn hash-Sharon." If we are not mistaken this MS. is now in the British Museum.

There exists an Arabic super-commentary on Maimonides' commentary on the Mishnah, by Saadyah ben David al-Adeni, composed in the years 1478 to 1483. He is also the author of Liturgical pieces and rules on Calendar (MS. in the Bodl. Library, 619 to 622 and 1632 *a*, *b*).

MIDRASHIM.—The father of this Saadyah is the compiler of the "Great Midrash" on the Pentateuch, which Mr. Schechter is preparing for publication. We know already by articles of Dr. Hoffmann of Berlin and Dr. Levi of Breslau, that David made great use of the unknown Mekhilthâ, by Simeon ben Yohai; from Mr. Schechter's

edition, however, we hope to learn more precise information on it, and perhaps of some unexpected discovery of other Midrashim. None of the MSS. known of this Midrash bear the name of the compiler, but his name is given in another Midrash composed after him, as mentioned below.[1] In a MS. of this Midrash on Genesis, in the possession of Mr. Deinard, we read the full name of the compiler, as follows: מורנו ורבנו נר מערבי דוד ב"ר עמרם אלעדני ממדינת עדן—"Midrash of our Master and Rabbi the Light of the West, David, son of R. Amram al-Adeni." The MSS. of this Midrash, of which there are numerous copies, will be enumerated and described by Mr. Schechter. Another Midrash was composed in 1430 by the physician Zechariah (Yahya) ben Solomon, with the title of מדרש החפץ. It consists chiefly of homilies on the Pentateuch, the Haftaroth, and the books of Esther and Lamentations, of an ethical and philosophical character, in accordance with the theories of Maimonides. From his quotations[2] we can also see that there were books in Yemen; the compiler mentions, besides Saadyah Gaon and Maimonides, also Ibn Djanâh (the dictionary?), the philosopher R. Hasdai (probably Hasdai Crescas), and the Khozari (of Judah hal-Levi). A third Midrashic compilation on the Pentateuch (mostly of a philosophical character based upon Maimonides) was composed in the year 1484 to 1493 by David al-Lawani, with the title of מדרש אלוגיז אלמגני—"A short but sufficient Midrash." The compiler states that he had read of old authors the following: the Bereshith Rabba, the Mekhiloth (*sic*), the Sifrâ, the Sifrê, the Yelamdenu, and the Tanhuma; of later ones he mentions Rashi, the Leqah Tob of Tobiah ben Eliezar, and the Commentaries of Qamhi. Of the works of his contemporaries he used the Midrash compiled by the Seqili, who went from Syria to Aden[3]; that by David al-Adeni, of which we have

[1] See at the foot of this page.

[2] *Catalogue of Berlin*, by Dr. Steinschneider, p. 71 *sqq.*

[3] See *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. ii., p. 333.

previously spoken; and many others current in Yemen (enumerated in the Bodleian Catalogue, No. 2,493). Let us add that fragments of MSS. of the Pirqe di R. Eliezer written in Yemen, reached some libraries.

CASUISTICS.—Besides commentaries on the Mishnah by Maimonides, the Yemen Rabbis also possessed a few copies of his Mishneh Torah, which they quote under the title of חבור, which is the usual title given in Eastern casuistical books. Treatises on *Shehitah* and *Bediqah*, or commentaries on them, are a favourite subject of the Yemen Jews. They are by Yahya Salih, Musa el-Hadhari, by Isaac ben Abraham ונה, David ben Solomon, Vital, Yahya, אלכדיחי, by some anonymous writer; others will be found later on. Most of these treatises are in Arabic.

KABBALAH.—Besides glosses on commentaries and on the prayers, they possess the *Bahir*, the *Zohar* (with a Commentary on Leviticus in possession of Mr. Deinard), Kabbalistic pieces of Nachmanides, the writings of Isaac Loria, Hayyim Vital, Moses Zakkuth, and others. A MS. recently acquired by the British Museum (Or. 4,115), with the title of לחם שלמה, contains a Kabbalistical treatise, consisting of thirteen chapters, by Solomon ben David Kohen, composed for his son. In the preface the author says that he had at his disposal the following works: ס' תולעת יעקב וס' מנחם ריקאנאטי וס' שערי אורה ומערכת האלהות וס' סגולות וס' דרך אמונה וס' הכוונות ושרש ישי וס' הזוהר והתקונים וס' הרזים ושערי ג"ע ומדרש רות מהנעלם וס' ר' בחיי וס' יצירה וארזי הלבנון.

SIDDUR (PRAYER BOOK).—Next to copies of the Pentateuch, the Yemen MSS. are richest in copies of the Prayer-book. Naturally, each synagogue, at least, would possess one or more copies of it. The ritual rules are in Arabic; the Hebrew text is provided with superlinear vowel-points; the commentaries are in Arabic and Hebrew; the latter are overfilled with Kabbalistical explanations and applications. The *Pirqe Aboth* is provided with a rational Hebrew com-

mentary, the Lamentations with a kind of Midrash in the guise of a commentary. The *Megillath Antiochos* is usually given in Aramaic and Arabic. At the end there are the rules for the calendar, by which the date of each copy can be approximatively fixed. (We find, also, a separate treatise on calendar. See below, p. 620.) The Yemen liturgies approach closely to the Spanish rite, from which the Yemen Jews have borrowed nearly all the hymns—viz., those of Solomon ben Gebirol, of Abraham and Moses Ben Ezra, of Judah Halevi, and of a few other authors. Most of the elegies for the ninth of Ab are borrowed from the German rite. There is no trace in them of early Piyyutim before Saadyah Gaon, and not even of the liturgical poems by him or his contemporaries. This absence is difficult to explain, unless they possessed a separate hymn-book, as is the case with the Selihoth, and, as we shall show in another article, to have been the case with the Yotzroth in Egypt. We have already said that the Yemen rite nearly approaches the Spanish rite; but there are many original points, for instance, in the Hoshanoth and in some benedictions. We hope that some one will undertake a new edition of Zunz's *Ritus*, and enlarge it by aid of the discoveries of previously unknown rites. The copies of the Yemen Prayer-book, as far as it is known, are not older than the fifteenth century, when the Spanish rite was already spread throughout the East, including Egypt. It is, therefore, possible that the Yemen rite was influenced by the Egyptian, with which country Yemen had most intimate communication.

Poetry.—Special books of hymns, mixed with poetical pieces, in Hebrew and Arabic, with the Arabic metre, have reached European libraries. They contain hymns by the leading Spanish poets which we have mentioned above, and these are followed by the compositions of native poets, chiefly of Yahya al-Dhahri (Zechariah ben Saadyah) and the members of the family el-Shebzi. These comparatively modern hymnologists show considerable taste and talent, and their Arabic compositions may prove useful for the

knowledge of the Yemen dialect. We do not know any MS. containing only profane poetry. One exception is made by the above-mentioned Zechariah ben Saadyah, who imitated al-Harizi, and composed, in 1573, forty-five maqamahs, with the title ס' המוסר ("book of morals"). The dialogue is here carried on between Mordecai of Sidon and Abner of Teman. Our poet depicts with vivid colours the calamities which so often befell the Jews of Yemen. This probably caused the destruction of many old books. Harizi's maqamahs seem to have been current in Yemen, as can be seen from the MS. copy of the תחכמוני (Bodl. Library, No. 25, 17), which was written in Yemen. Harizi dedicated it in this MS. to Shemariah ben David, who had the title of Naghid.

LEXICOGRAPHY.—We have said that R. Jonah ibn Djannâh is quoted in Yemen MSS., but none of his writings have as yet been found in Yemen. On the other hand, copies of R. Thanhum of Jerusalem's Arabic Dictionary to the Mishnah exist in the Bodleian Library, and one in that of Baron David de Günzburg at St. Petersburg. Here also the marginal glosses show the existence in Yemen of many works which are now lost.

PHILOSOPHY.—Maimonides' philosophical treatise, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, was much read in the original Arabic in Yemen; this is, perhaps, the only philosophical work which reached Yemen, to judge from the MSS. which J. Sappir saw among the Jews there. From fragments found in bindings we see that they copied in Hebrew characters Averroes' Arabic commentaries on Aristotle, as well as some mathematical and astronomical treatises of Arabic authors. But for this branch of learning, cultivated by the Jews of Yemen, a newly acquired MS. by the British Museum, Or. 4,104, gives much information, and, moreover, it mentions distinctly Samuel ben Jacob as the author of the Halakhot on *Shehitah* and *Bediqah*.[1]

[1] See *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. iii., p. 543.

The following are the contents of the MS. Or. 4,104, as far as we could make them out from a rather hasty inspection, prior to its acquisition by the authorities of the British Museum[1]:—

It begins (1) with a treatise in Arabic on Shehitah, divided into twelve chapters; the Babylonian Talmud is quoted with the words גמר ר' אשי; at the end of the eighth chapter the name of Hananiah, son of Joshuah, is quoted as a commentator of a part of the treatise. (2.) A similar treatise, opening with a poem, wherein the names of Saadyah ben Y'abets and Saadyah ben Mas'ud are praised, and in the last line Saadyah ben Zechariah names himself as the compiler of the book, written at Aden in the year 1619 Sel., equal to 1308 A.D. It is arranged in the form of question and answer, and the introduction is written in Hebrew and in rhymed prose, by Ibn al-Hawas (אלחואס). He made use, besides of the Talmud, of the works of Maimonides and the Geonim Yehudai and Saadyah, also of Samuel ben Jacob, of a commentary of Abraham Maimonides, and of the Geonim in Yemen (ומגאוני אנשי תימן) viz., Yahyah ben Saad, Yahyah ben Shalom, Saadyah ben Mas'ud and Saadyah ben Ya'abets hab-Babli. In the course of an Arabic introduction, the compiler mentions the full title of Samuel ben Jacob's treatise and an unknown treatise by Saadyah Gaon, saying, ודאלך מן צאבח אלרסאלה אעני רסאלה אלברהאן והדכיה אלחיואן למר שמואל בן יעקב ז'צ'ל ומן כלאם רבינו סעדיה אלפיומי פי כתאב אלמניאה אלדי לה עלי אחכאם אלריה. This treatise, which consists of nine chapters, is followed by the answers of Yahyah ben Saadyah. The compiler also quotes the following passage of Saadyah Gaon's commentary on Leviticus, saying, נתפרש עוד בפירוש רבי' סעדיה ופי רסאלה אלברהאן אן אלנסר אין בו סימן כלל. (3.) A similar treatise by Hana-

[1] On examination of British Museum MS., Or. 4,104, we find that Sections 1-6 have been probably detached by the vendor of the MS., so that the portion that reached the Museum begins with the item here numbered (6).

niah ben Joshuah, consisting of fifteen chapters, in which also Saadyah, Samuel, and Haya Gaon are quoted. (4.) Another similar treatise in Arabic by Hasin el-Dhamari (אלצמארי), consisting of eleven chapters. (5.) Another anonymous treatise, the text of which is in Hebrew, and the commentary in Arabic, has the following superscription: בשם יוי אל עולם אתחיל לכתוב ענינים אחרים מענייני הלכות שחיטה ממה שחשתדל בחיבורם ר' אשי ז"קל. It contains large extracts from the treatise of R. Samuel, and also from Saadyah's above-mentioned treatise. (6.) A treatise on the calendar by Joseph hal-Levi ben R. Japhet hal-Levi, disciple of R. Solomon ben R. Benayah, with the title of נר ישראל, "Lamp of Israel," composed in the year 1731 Sel., or 5180 A.M., equal to 1420 A.D. It is divided into fourteen chapters and is written in Arabic, but is followed by a partial translation into Hebrew. (7.) Another Arabic treatise follows, perhaps by the same author, on Geometry, with the title of כתאב אלמסאחה, "Book of Measuring"; at the end is an Arabic poem of astronomical contents, with the following superscription: קאל אלפקיר אלי עפו אללה תעלא חמזה בן סעיד אלחראזי אלערבי, by Hamza ibn Said el-Harazi, evidently a Mussulman.

This is followed by the dates of births, and extended astronomical tables by a later hand, which ends with the following note: מצאתי כתוב מכתיבת יד החזקה יחיא ן' יעיש אלחמרי נעג זה הסוד נואלו שרי צען אל תקרי צוען אלא צנעא ניתוסף ה' פי' שימלכו בה מלכים חזקים זה אחר זה ובח' קץ הגאולה בימיו יתגלה המשיח וזה לך סוד גדול אל תגליהו ע"כ מצאתי. "Says Yahya ibn Yaish el-Hamri. This is the mystery in Isaiah xix. 13, Read Zan'a instead of Zoan, which will perish, that means that strong kings will govern one after another, and the time of the eighth is the time of the redemption, when the Messiah will reveal himself." (8.) Next comes a mathematical treatise in Arabic, divided into fifteen chapters, with following superscription: כתאב מעאריף אלפכר אלוהיג פי חל משכלאת אלזיג ממא ענא ברהאליפה אלאמאם אלעאלם אלפאצל אלכאמל אוחד אלזמאן

מחמד אבן אבי בכר אלפארסי, by Mohammed ibn Abi Bekr el-Farisi, again a Mohammedan author.

On the margin is to be found by a later hand an historical treatise concerning Yemen in Arabic, written partly with Hebrew and partly with Arabic characters. The last three pages contain (1) note on the Al-Magest, attributed to Ptolemy, by Tabit ben Qorrah, with the title כתאב תסחיל אלמגיסטי; (2) a treatise on geometry, which begins as follows: קאל אלשיך אלרייס אלאגל אחמד בן מחמד בן אברהם אלאשערי סאלני בעץ אלאכואן אן אנמע לך מכתצרא פי אשכאל אלממסוחאת, by Ahmed ben Mohammed ben Abraham el-Ash'ari, also a Mohammedan writer.

We can see from this brief sketch that the Yemen Jews, in spite of their small numbers and long-continued troubles, were productive in literary works, and displayed more taste than the Polish-Ashkenazic Rabbis.

A. NEUBAUER.

APPENDIX TO PAGE 608.

The late J. Sappir draws the following conclusions :—He says that the date of this epitaph is really 20, of the Seleucidean era, which began about the time of Simon the Just, for the thousands, according to him, are never left out. Consequently the Jewish settlement at Aden must have taken place after the destruction of the first Temple. The next deduction is that square characters, in which these epitaphs are written, must have been the old writing of the Hebrews, and not those brought from Syria and introduced by Ezra.[1] Of course the last conclusion is completely erroneous, for we know from the Siloam inscription what form of writing was in use with the Jews during the first Temple. These epitaphs contain not only formulæ which presuppose the belief in the immortality of the soul, and words which point to a late date, *e.g.*, צנועה , ירא שמים ; but also abbreviations, like רי"ת (רוח י"י תניחנו) נע"נ (נוחו גן עדן), which, if strange enough in inscriptions of the eighth century (we do not find them in the epitaphs of the same date, or even a little later in Italy),[2] are

[1] See *Studia Biblica*, iii., p. 13.

[2] See above p. 608.

inadmissible so early as 300 B.C. The Arabic names for women, such as חמאמא for יונה "Dove," לולו for פנינה Pearl, חסינה for חנה are also curious. The names of the months are the same as those of which the Talmud says that the Jews brought them from Babylonia ; the month of Iyyar has in these epitaphs the Arabic form איאר. Considering all these strange words and formulæ, we feel obliged to reject Sappir's opinion as to the date of the epitaphs of Aden, and to side with the almost unanimous opinion that they are of the eighth century A.D.

A TENTATIVE CATALOGUE OF BIBLICAL METAPHORS.[1]

ἔστι δὲ μέγα μὲν τὸ ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰρημένων πρεπόντως χρῆσθαι . . . . πολὺ δὲ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν εἶναι. μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο οὔτε παρ' ἄλλου ἔστι λαβεῖν, εὐφυΐας τε σημεῖον ἐστίν· τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστίν.

ARISTOTLE, *Poetics*, xxii.

I THINK it would repay his trouble if a real scholar were to write a good monograph upon Biblical metaphors. Such a scholar would first of all consider them from a purely literary point of view, showing their peculiar excellences and defects, and how far they obey or transgress the canons of metaphor drawn up in various ages, from Aristotle in the Rhetoric down to Messrs. Abbott and Seeley in our own day. The real scholar would then illustrate them from comparative literature, firstly from cognate religious writings such as the Babylonian and Assyrian hymns in which even a glance at Zimmern and Sayce is enough to show many a suggestive parallel; then from other branches of Oriental literature; and lastly, he would supply us with an adequate number of similar or contrasted metaphors from the literatures of Greece and Rome. And these parallels, as the most literary, most beautiful and most sympathetic of all, would also be the most profitable and interesting. This is what the real scholar would do, and, as I said before, it would, I think, be well worth doing. Bishop Lowth, in his lectures on "Hebrew Poetry," has some chapters on Metaphors, Similes, Comparisons and Personifications, treated somewhat in this way; but though the student of the history of Biblical interpretation will

[1] A Lecture delivered at the Jews' College Literary Society, on May 24th, 1891.

find them quite worth reading, they will not supply the scholar with much raw material for his work.

It is just a little such material which I have put together here in a survey of the Biblical metaphors themselves, divided off into classes and categories. Towards the production of the desired monograph I hope that even this imperfect catalogue may be of use.

One has to remember that similes and metaphors, when consciously used, are mainly to be looked for and found in poetry. This is also the case in the Bible. There are, indeed, a few metaphors in the Pentateuch and the historical books, but the vast proportion are elsewhere. But with a single exception the poetical books of the Bible were not written as mere poetry, with no ulterior object beyond pleasure or artistic satisfaction. They are didactic or liturgical, and their metaphors and similes were probably in very few cases only elaborated with a deliberate eye to artistic effect. The single exception is, of course, the love poem of Canticles. In Canticles the metaphors are mainly confined to elaborate comparisons of the hero and heroine, and of every portion of their bodies, with various animate and inanimate objects of nature. Some of these are of exquisite propriety, some at once daring and yet apposite. Has the glory of a woman's beauty and the overwhelming impression which it produces ever been more nobly expressed than in the famous lines, " Who is she that looketh forth as the dawn, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?" (vi. 10). It would be interesting to compare the images of the Canticles with the images in the love poetry of Greece and Persia, and to trace their possible influence in our own great specimens of erotic poetry, such as the " Venus and Adonis " and the " Britain's Ida." But as the Canticles lie quite outside the remaining mass of Biblical poetry, I do not propose to consider them further in the present essay.

In the Psalms metaphorical language is mainly employed to illustrate and impress the leading religious conceptions.

Thus we have a number of metaphors about God and his dealings with Israel and the nations. Divine punishment and beneficence, prosperity and sin, Israel's glory and its enemies' discomfiture, form the standing subjects which it is sought to illustrate by metaphor. Of the prophets the Book of Isaiah provides by far the largest number, and by far the best. Jeremiah's literary style is not one of his strongest points, while Ezekiel, in his metaphors as in his descriptions generally, shows exaggeration and a heavy hand. In the Book of Proverbs metaphors to illustrate general ethical ideas are naturally appropriate; but there are surprisingly few of them, except in the 25th, 26th, and 27th chapters. Among a good many metaphors in Job are some of the most striking, elaborate and poetical in all Scripture.

There are comparatively few fully worked-out similes in the Hebrew Bible. This is due, I suppose, to the fact that the similes are not used as ornament, but as illustration. In compensation for this curtness we often find a number of short, pregnant similes used one after another to illustrate the same idea.

Thus, to take an example from Hosea: the prophet declares that the sinners among his people shall disappear in the Judgment, "like a morning cloud, or like the dew which early passes away, or as the chaff which is driven with a whirlwind out of the threshing floor, or as the smoke out of the lattice" (xiii. 3). Even the worked-out similes are far shorter than the similes of Homer for, "as a rule, they but tersely mark the point of comparison, and dispense with non-essential details."[1] Very frequently, indeed, the simile is altogether dispensed with, and we get instead the true metaphor, without comparison or middle term.[2]

---

[1] Jebb's *Homer*, p. 29; and *cf.* Lowth, *Lectures* (Eng. Tr.), vol. I., p. 274.

[2] The prevalence of metaphor may on Aristotelian principles be looked upon as a merit. For the simile (εἰκών) which is a μεταφορὰ διαφέρουσα

Bishop Lowth has several acute observations about Biblical similes and metaphors. Their excellence, he thinks, is shown in their purity, their directness and their perspicuity. The last quality is partly due to the fact that the material of which the metaphors are made is taken mainly from common and familiar objects. The new idea is illustrated by well-known analogies. Secondly, there is a consistency in the Biblical use of metaphors, a *certa fere ratio et via*, the maintenance of a *recepta quaedam consuetudinis norma*, as he expresses it, which impresses them upon the imagination. Both observations are true. Many metaphors in the Bible recur at the proper places with almost wearisome iteration. Of these I shall naturally cite only a few of the best examples in each case. Lowth is equally accurate in the statement that the metaphors are almost invariably taken from common and familiar objects. As in Homer, so in the Bible, "subjective imagery, from sensation or thought, is extremely rare" (Jebb, *Ibid.*, p. 31). We should not now, however, be at equal pains with the dear, pedantic, pompous old bishop to prove the propriety of metaphors from the common world of every day.

The writers of the Bible and its first hearers or readers lived a much more out-of-door life than we do, and were thus more familiar with the simpler processes of nature. Town life suggested few metaphors to them. By far the greater bulk come from nature, from the animate and inanimate world, as well as from agricultural and pastoral life. I propose now to begin my survey or index with instances of metaphors from the animal kingdom, from beasts and birds and insects.

Let us take the wild beasts first. Among these, both in the Bible and in Homer, the lion occupies the foremost place. Lions of more than one variety, during the Biblical period, "had their lairs in the forests which have perished

---

προθέσει is ἧττον ἡδύ, ὅτι μακροτέρως· καὶ οὐ λέγει ὡς τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο· οὔκουν οὐδὲ ζητεῖ τοῦτο ἡ ψυχή. (*Rhet.* III. 10, § 3.)

with them, and in the cane brakes of the Jordan."[1] The lion may be either the emblem of irresistible hostility, or of proud and fearless confidence. Thus, Israel's enemies are frequently compared to a lion, and their war-shout to its roaring. So in Isaiah, of the Assyrian, "A roar has he like that of the lioness; he roareth like the young lions, growling and catching the prey, and carrying it away safe, so that none can rescue" (v. 29). The Psalmist's enemy "lurks in a hiding-place as a lion in his lair" (x. 9). One metaphor alludes to the family life of the royal beast, "who tears in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangles for his lionesses, and fills his holes with prey, and his dens with ruin" (Nahum ii. 11-13). God himself is compared to a lion, both as Israel's enemy (Hosea v. 14) and as his protector (*e.g.*, Hosea xi. 10; Isaiah xxxi. 4). In what has been called by Delitzsch the most Homeric simile in Isaiah, we are told how, "Like as the lion with the young lion growls over his prey, against whom there is called a troop of shepherds, at their cry he is not dismayed, and at their noise he is not cast down; so shall the Lord of Hosts come down to fight for Zion" (xxxi. 4). Conflicts between shepherds and lions were clearly frequent. Thus, the few to be saved from the judgment are compared to the issue of a fight when "the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of a lion two legs or a piece of an ear" (Amos iii. 12).

From another point of view Israel or its princes are compared to lions. Judah is described as a lion in the blessing of Jacob, Gad and Dan in the blessing of Moses. In one of his formal lamentations, Ezekiel typifies the land or people of Judah under the figure of a lioness, while the hapless kings, Joahaz and Jehoiachin, are her whelps. In Balaam's "parables" Israel is the lion who couches at his ease, and whom none can stir up against his will (Numbers xxiii. 24, xxiv. 9), while Micah predicts that the remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many peoples,

[1] Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 116.

"as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver" (v. 7).

Other wild beasts which are used for similes are the bear, the leopard and the wolf, jackals and foxes, the antelope, the wild ass and "wild ox." The she bear, bereft of her whelps, is a familiar image of terror, yet a fool in his folly is an even worse thing to meet, according to the proverb (Prov. xvii. 12; cp. 2 Sam. xvii. 8). Enemies are often compared to these creatures.[1] Their peculiar cry supplies the motive of the comparison in the case of the bear and the jackal (Is. lix. 11; Micah i. 8). To the fox, who burrows in ruins, Ezekiel compares the false prophets who widen the social breach (xiii. 4). The sons of Jerusalem who lie in a swoon, fainting, at the corners of the street, are likened to the antelope, who, after vain struggles, lies exhausted and motionless within the hunter's net (Is. li. 20). One of the most famous metaphors in the Psalter is the comparison of the soul thirsting for nearer communion with God to the hind which pants for the water brooks (xlii. 2).

Turning now to more domestic animals, we find the bull, which, after long enjoyment of free grazing in the forests or plains, often became wild (Tristram, p. 71), used to typify an enemy, just like the lion or the bear (Ps. xxii. 13; lxviii. 31). So, again, Israel is the bull. Thus in the Song of Moses, "Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked." Balak fears that Israel may "lick up all which is round about as the ox licketh up the grass of the field" (Num. xxii. 4). Then we have a few references to the whip-training of the bullock for the yoke, and to the obstinacy of the heifer (Jer. xxxi. 18; Hosea iv. 16). The rejoicing of those who are saved after the Judgment is compared by Malachi to the gambolling of the calves who have been kept in their stalls through the winter and

[1] Cp. Hosea xiii. 8; Jer. v. 6; Ez. xxii. 27; Is. lvi. 9.

are let out into the fields with the spring (Mal. iii. 20). Isaiah's famous contrast, "The ox knoweth its owner, and the ass its master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider" (Is. i. 3), is not least appreciated by those who have seen the cattle brought down at close of day from the Swiss mountains and have watched how, as they pass through the long village street, they turn in, each one of them, at the proper door. The comparison of Israel to a flock may be reserved for another connection.

There are but few metaphors from the horse. This is but natural, seeing that cattle and not horses were used for agriculture, while cavalry was always more characteristic of foreign than of native armaments. The impetuous hurry with which the people of Jerusalem pursue their ways of wickedness is compared by Jeremiah (viii. 6; see Cheyne) to the war-horse rushing into the battle. The flight of locusts is compared to the onset of cavalry in Joel (ii. 4). The surefootedness of the horse is apparently the motive of the simile that God led the Israelites through the Red Sea's bed like horses through the wilderness, without stumbling (Is. lxiii. 13, 14). From a religious point of view the horse and mule supply an effective metaphor to the Psalmist, "Be ye not as the horse or mule which has no understanding; with bit and bridle, his harness, must he be tamed, else he will not come nigh unto thee" (xxxii. 9).

It seems strange to us Westerns that the dog should only furnish images of hostility, opprobrium or contempt. The homes of our Biblical ancestors must have been the poorer and the sadder for the absence of both the dog and the cat. The cat is not mentioned in the Bible at all, while the dog, like the wild dogs of the East to-day, bears no resemblance to the dogs of our European homes. Even Homer, in spite of Argos, alludes mainly to the dog as a beast to hunt, and not as a friend to live with. The dogs that "fawn about their lord when he comes from the feast, for he always brings them the fragments that soothe their

mood" (*Od.*, X. 216), have clearly not reached a high level of canine development; one prefers the pure naturalism of the she-dog who "paces round her tender puppies growling, when she spies a man she knows not, and is eager to assail him" (*Od.*, XX. 14). In the twenty-second Psalm, dogs, like bulls and lions, typify the wicked and the hostile, and the snarl and greed of the dog are elsewhere alluded to (cf. Isaiah lvi. 10, 11; Ps. lix. 7). A dog certainly objects to strangers meddling with his ears; but it is really mournful that the Proverbs only bring in the dog to refer to this and to one other more unpalatable quality (xxvi. 11, 17). In Job, indeed, the shepherd dog is mentioned once, but Dr. Tristram tells us that even in this capacity dogs were not used as with us for driving and seeking out the flocks, but only "for protecting them from the attacks of wolves and jackals by night" (p. 78).

Many metaphors are made up from the habits of birds, although, as Dr. Tristram points out, there are strangely few allusions to their singing (cp. Ps. civ. 12; Koh. xii. 4; Cant. ii. 12). Very frequent is the reference to their capture by the fowler's snare, which, with the net, whether for beasts or birds, is a regular and standing metaphor for hidden danger and secret attack.[1] A Psalmist speaks of the snare breaking: "Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler: the snare is broken, and we are escaped" (cxxiv. 7). Striking, though not consistently worked out, is the metaphor from bird-nesting in Isaiah of the Assyrian king: "My hand reached as a nest the riches of peoples, and as a man gathereth forsaken eggs, I have gathered all the earth, and there was none that fluttered a wing, nor opened a beak, nor chirped" (x. 14). Jehovah, to Israel's foes as a lion undaunted by the shepherd's cry, is to Jerusalem as a bird, who keeps circling round and round her nest when danger is in sight.

[1] Cp. Ps. xxv. 15; xxxi. 5; xxxv. 8; cxl. 6; Isaiah viii. 14; Ezek. xii. 13; Job xviii. 8, 9. Sometimes the net is God's.

"Like birds hovering, so shall the Lord of Hosts shelter Jerusalem, sheltering and delivering, passing over and rescuing" (xxxi. 5).

Not less effective is the simile in the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 11) of the eagle teaching the eaglet to fly. "As an eagle stirs up his young ones to fly, and flutters over them, and then (when they are weary) spreads forth his wings and bears them upon his pinions (home), so did Jehovah bear his people to their promised inheritance." The Hebrew original is here illustrative of the usual desire of the Biblical authors not to waste time over their metaphors, but to come at once to the point. In this case the poet has actually transferred the latter portion of the simile to the object (here, God) with which the eagle is compared. The above inaccurate translation (as in the Authorised Version) makes the eagle the subject of all the details of the picture, whereas in the Hebrew the effect is somewhat marred by the fact that the spreading out of the wings and the bearing upon the pinions are applied to God instead of to the bird. That birds of prey train their young to flight and carry them when weary is quite correct: it is again alluded to in Exodus, "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, when I bore you as on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself" (xix. 4). On the other hand, the *sheltering* wings of female birds, under which their young can find refuge and warmth, supply a frequent figure to the Psalmists.[1]

An interesting instance of a myth leaving behind it a metaphorical use of language is supplied by the second verse of Genesis i. Here we are told that the Spirit of God brooded or hovered over the face of the waters; now the same word is used in the Song of Moses for the eagle hovering over its young, and there seems little doubt that the conception has been, so to speak, watered down or rather

[1] Cp. Ps. xxxvi. 7; lvii. 21; xi. 5; lxiii. 8; xci. 4. Ruth ii. 12. Cp. Æsch. *Eumenides*, 1002: Παλλάδος δ' ὑπὸ πτεροῖς ὄντας ἄζεται πατήρ.

spiritualised up, from the old myth of the World Egg. That God's spirit was compared with a bird we know from the stories in the Gospels.

Isaiah had contrasted the spiritual denseness of Israel with the instinctive intelligence of the ass and the ox. Jeremiah (viii. 7) makes the same contrast with birds. "The stork in the heavens knoweth her appointed times (that is her period of migration), and the turtle and the swift and the crane observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the religion of Yahveh."

We may now collect the curt allusions to particular birds scattered through the Biblical metaphors. The eagle claims the first place. Unfortunately, however, the Hebrew *Nesher*, which we ordinarily translate eagle, is not an eagle at all, but a particular kind of vulture, known according to Dr. Tristram as the Griffon or great vulture, in Latin as the *Gyps fulvus*. This creature's head is bald, a quality which is referred to by Micah, whereas the eagle's head is well covered with feathers. It is, however, not to be expected that we can give up "eagle" in our translations for a bird with the evil associations of the vulture.[1] Our eagle or vulture, whichever he be, supplies material for many comparisons which space forbids me to quote. Its swiftness is specially emphasised, and allusion is also made to its longevity and to its nests in the clefts of inaccessible rocks. Like the lion it typifies powerful kingdoms, such as Egypt and Assyria.[2]

If the joyous song of birds is not often alluded to, their mournful notes are frequently used to symbolise human lamentations. So with the ostrich, the crane, and the dove (Mic. i. 8; Is. xxxviii. 14; lix. 11). The last-named bird, in one or other of its numerous species, is a favourite with the Biblical poets. Israel is called God's turtledove, as opposed to the birds of prey its ene-

[1] But compare Job xxxix. 30; Proverbs xxx. 17; Tristram, p. 174.

[2] Compare 2 Sam. i. 23; Is. xl. 31; Jer. xlix. 16; Ob. 4; Micah i. 16; Job ix. 26; Ps. ciii. 5; Ezekiel xvii. 1-10.

mies. Hosea, however, compares Ephraim to a dove in a less flattering manner: Ephraim is like a silly dove without understanding; they avoid the hawk by falling into the net of the fowler (vii. 11, 12, see Cheyne). Elsewhere reference is made to the wild rock pigeon's precipitous dwelling-places: "O ye that dwell in Moab, leave the cities and dwell in the rock, and be like the dove that maketh her nest across the precipice on the rock's mouth" (Jer. xlviii. 28). Compare in Homer when Artemis escapes from the chastisement of Hera: "And weeping, from before her the goddess fled like a dove that from before a falcon flieth to a hollow rock, a cleft—for she was not fated to be caught—thus Artemis fled weeping, and left her bow and arrows where they lay." (*Iliad*, XXI. 493.)

Before leaving the birds we must not forget the well-known simile in Jeremiah (xvii. 11) about the partridge. It rests upon some popular delusion, which has not been paralleled by industrious commentators from other literatures: "As a partridge gathers young which she has not brought forth, so is he that getteth riches unjustly." Dr. Tristram's explanation follows the Authorised Version's rendering, but, as Professor Cheyne points out, that rendering violates the Hebrew. The point of the comparison, however, does not seem to lie where Professor Cheyne puts it; it is not that "as the young birds soon leave the false mother, so unjustly acquired riches soon forsake their possessors"; it is merely the unjust acquisitions in either case which are compared together.[1]

Serpents are naturally the emblems of the wicked, and their poison is a type of sinfulness. Thus the Psalmist's enemies "have poison as the poison of a serpent; yea, as that of a deaf adder which stops her ear; which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, nay of the most cunning binder of spells" (lviii. 5, 6). Israel shall triumph even over foes

[1] The supposed cruelty of the ostrich to her eggs supplies a simile in Lam. iv. 3. (Compare Job xxxix. 14-17.) The jackals are tenderer to their young.

like these: "Upon the lion and adder shalt thou tread; the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under foot" (Ps. xci. 13; cf. cxl. 4; Jer. viii. 17). The collocation of wild beast with serpent was not unnatural; and the latter was, perhaps, even a worse foe than the former. Thus Amos likens the folly of those who from the midst of present distresses, desire the coming of God's dreadful day—who would fly from ills they have to woes they know not of—to the case of him who fleeing from a lion was met by a bear, or "went into the house and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him" (v. 19). II. Isaiah rather awkwardly combines the snake with the spider. The wicked "hatch vipers' eggs and weave spiders' webs: he that eateth of their eggs will die, and if one be crushed, it breaketh out into a viper" (lix. 5, 6; cf. Job viii. 14). Isaiah had already used the figure of the snake to symbolise the destructive power of Assyria (xiv. 29).

Besides beasts and birds and serpents, there are metaphors from insects. Locusts were only too familiar objects for supplying a metaphor of an enemy's speed, number or voracity. The figure is most effectively employed in Nahum, though one or two of the details are obscure and disputed: "The fire shall devour thee; the sword shall cut thee off, it shall eat thee up like the locust, though thou make thyself many as the locust or the grasshopper. (Thus the locust is used now for the enemy and then for the Ninevites.) Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven; but yet the locust has spread out its wings and has flown away. (Here the merchants are the locusts.) Thy princes are as grasshoppers and thy marshals as locusts, which encamp upon the walls in the cool of day, but when the sun arises they flee away, and their place is not known where they are" (Nahum iii. 15-17). I need only allude to the famous description of the locust in Joel, which people now no longer perversely describe as an elaborate metaphor for the attack of a human enemy. Besides

the locust and the scorpion (Ezek. ii. 6), we have the moth, the emblem of mutability and rottenness (thus God will be unto Ephraim as a moth, Hosea v. 12), the worm, the emblem of lowliness and contempt, as well as the fly, the slug and the bee.[1] Says the Preacher: "Poisonous flies make the perfumer's oil to stink and ferment; even so is a little folly weightier than wisdom and honour" (x. 1); of which the meaning is that a small amount of evil outweighs and stultifies a large amount of good. The simile from the slug is very odd. Apparently the popular notion was that a slug gradually melted away into slime; and so the Psalmist amiably prays that his enemies may disappear as a slug which melts as it moves along.[2] The bee, besides one allusion in the Psalter, forms a fine figure in Isaiah (vii. 18, 19). Egypt is symbolised by a fly, and Assyria by a bee, both images appropriate to the particular countries. On the day of judgment "Yahveh will hiss to the flies at the end of the Nile-arms of Egypt, and to the bees in the land of Assyria, and they shall all of them come and settle on the steeply-walled valleys of the torrents, and on the rents of the cliffs, and on all the thorn-bushes, and on all the pastures." It is curious how metaphor and statement are here fused together. The predicted joint invasion of the Egyptian and Assyrian armies—a prediction which, by the way, was not fulfilled—is not merely likened to a swarm of bees and flies: Assyria *is* the bee, and Egypt *is* the fly, while the invasion is described in terms suitable, not to the human armies, but to the insect hosts. Homer never contracts his similes in this way; but he also has a simile from bees, and it is worth while setting it side by side with Isaiah's: "Even as when the tribes of thronging bees issue from some hollow rock, ever in fresh procession, and fly clustering among the flowers of spring, and, some on this hand and some on that, fly thick, even so, from ships and boats before the low

[1] Cp. Ps. xxxix. 12; Is. l. 9; Ps. xxii. 7; cxviii. 12.

[2] Ps. lviii. 9. Cp. Pliny's *Natural History*, ix. 51.

beach, marched forth the many tribes (of the achaians) by companies to the place of Assembly." (*Iliad*, II. 87.)

If we pass now to inanimate nature, we find that a large number of standing or customary metaphors are drawn from the elemental forces of water, wind, and fire. Water in all its forms is a constantly recurring image; but the billows of the sea are less frequently in the minds of the Biblical writers than the billows of Jordan and the torrents of swollen mountain streams.

To begin with, great waters are the symbol of calamity and Divine punishment.[1] Isaiah, as usual, can show the noblest examples and the greatest variety of application. How fine is the contrast between the waters of Shiloah in Jerusalem, which symbolise the calm and gracious rule of God realised by faith, and the waters of the proud Euphrates, which symbolise the armies of Assyria! "Forasmuch as this people has rejected the waters of Shiloah, which flow softly, ... therefore behold the Lord bringeth upon them the waters of the river, mighty and great; and it shall mount over all its channels and go over all its banks, and shall sweep along into Judah, shall overflow and pass over, reaching even to the neck; and the stretching out of its wings shall fill the breadth of thy land" (viii. 6-8). Here it is curious to note how the metaphor of the river passes over at the end into a metaphor from a bird of prey. So, in a later chapter, Isaiah uses the strange compound of a "flooding scourge" (xxviii. 15). We have heard the battle-cry of the enemy compared to the lion's roar: it is also appropriately likened to the roaring waves: "Ah! the tumult of many peoples, like the tumult of the seas they are tumultuous; and the uproar of nations, like the roaring of mighty waters they roar" (xvii. 12-14). So in Homer: "And as when at the mouth of some heaven-born river

---

[1] A sea of troubles is a Greek metaphor also. Cp. Æsch., *Prom. Vinct.* 476 has πέλαγος ἀτηρὰς δύης.

a mighty wave roars against the stream, and arouses the high cliffs' echo as the salt sea bellows on the beach, so loud was the cry wherewith the Trojans came." (*Iliad* XVII. 263.) The powers of earth hostile to Israel and Israel's God are continually symbolised as waters. In the Psalms it is curious to note how this symbolism is, as it were, used by the way. There is often no direct simile; it is only pure personification and metaphor, and several passages make sense even without the symbolism. So in the ninety-third Psalm. On the face of it, it appears to be a hymn of the Divine rule over nature, and such a meaning is not excluded, but the indirect reference to the nations was probably more prominent in the writer's mind. "The streams have lifted up, O Yahveh, the streams have lifted up their voice; the streams lift up their roaring. Than the voices of many waters, mighty waters, breakers of the sea, more mighty is Yahveh on high."[1] A good example of the water metaphor meaning calamity is the opening of the sixty-ninth Psalm: "Save me, O God, for the waters are come in, even to the soul. I am sunk in the mire of a gulf where there is no standing; I am come into watery depths, where the tide overwhelms me." Here we get swamps as well as water, and the two are often combined. Professor Cheyne, after his experiences in Palestine, says that the imagery becomes intensely vivid in the light of travel. I do not like to omit the fine passage in the forty-second Psalm: "Flood calls unto flood at the sound of thy cataracts; all thy breakers and billows have gone over me." And one of the noblest and truest sayings of the whole Bible makes use of the same standing metaphor: "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it" (Cant. viii. 7).

We also find the great volume of a sea or a river's waters used metaphorically for other purposes. There is

[1] Cf. Ps. lxv. 7, 8, and Cheyne's *Notes*.

Amos' passionate demand (v. 24): "Let justice run down as waters, and righteousness as a perpetual flowing stream." With which we may compare: "Then would thy peace have been as the river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea" (Is. xlviii. 18; cf. lxvi. 12). Not to be forgotten, also, is the comparison between the fulness of the knowledge of God in the Messianic age with the waters, which in their measureless abundance cover the bottom of the sea (Is. xi. 9; Hab. ii. 14). Here may be mentioned too the similes from the sand of the sea-shore, which is sometimes used to typify the prospective numbers of Israel.[1] A more striking image is that of the hundred and thirty-ninth Psalm, where the Divine thoughts are said to outnumber the sand. Job in one passage employs it as a symbol of weight: "If his griefs were weighed in the balance they would be found to be heavier than the sand of the sea" (vi. 3). Two other applications of the water metaphor may here be added. One is from Isaiah lvii. 20: "The ungodly are like the sea that is tost up; for it cannot rest, and its waters toss up mire and mud." The other is from Hosea x. 7: "Samaria's king shall disappear as a chip of wood upon the water's face"; where Professor Cheyne has pointed out that this true rendering contains a figure even more appropriate (in its fine contrast between the helpless fragment of wood and the irresistible power of the current) than the Authorised Version's translation, "as the foam upon the water."[2]

This metaphor from Hosea leads us naturally on to a few others connected with the flow of streams and rivers.

---

[1] Cf. Hosea ii. 1; Gen. xxxii. 12; Ps. lxxviii. 27. So with the dust of the earth; Gen. xiii. 16. We get the sand in *Iliad* II. 800, and sand and dust together, *Iliad* IX. 385. The last passage is cited by Aristotle as an example of an hyperbole, a form of metaphor which he regards as having a juvenile character, signifying vehemence, and chiefly used in anger. (*Rhet.* III. 2. § 16.)

[2] Another simile from water is in Job xiv. 19. "The waters wear the stones; the overflowings thereof wash away the dust of the earth; even so thou destroyest the hope of man."

The ceaseless flood of tears has often, I suppose, in all literatures, been likened to the flow of a river; so in Lamentations, "Utter thy cry unto the Lord, O virgin daughter of Zion, let tears run down like a torrent, day and night" (Lam. ii. 18, Bickell), with which we may compare Jeremiah's outburst, "O that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears" (viii. 23). One of the few elaborate similes in Scripture deals with the torrents of winter, which dry up in the heat of summer. It is a simile noticed by Lowth as combining all the qualifications of a good comparison, vivid illustration, elegance, beauty, and what not. The wealth of detail in it is quite Homeric. Job, reproaching his friends, declares, "My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a torrent, as the channel of torrents which pass away; which (in the spring) are dark by reason of the (melted) ice, and in which the snow is hidden; at the time when they feel the glow, they vanish; when it is hot, they are consumed out of their place. The paths of their ways become crooked, they dissolve into nothing and disappear. The caravans of Tema looked, the companies of Sheba hoped for them; they were abashed because they had been confident; when they came thither they were ashamed" (Job vi. 15-20). In two passages in the Book of Isaiah God is compared to a stream. Indeed, there are few objects in nature at all used for metaphors, to which, in one or other of his manifestations, the Deity is not compared. In the fifty-ninth chapter the Name of Yahveh is represented as coming to judgment "like a narrowed stream which the wrath of Yahveh driveth on;" and in the thirty-third chapter occurs the curious and difficult passage, "For there (in Jerusalem) shall be for us a mighty one, even Yahveh, in place of rivers and broad canals, and upon him (namely, upon Yahveh compared to a river) oared galley shall not go, neither shall majestic ship sail over it."[1] In the next verse but one (23), Jerusalem

[1] Cp. Psalm xlvi. 5 and the commentators. The text is corrupt or incomplete.

is compared to a ship. In the day of danger "its ropes had become loose; they could not keep the mast firm in its stand, nor keep the sail spread out." A ship and streams suggest swimming. The Hebrew word for "swimming" is only twice found in the Bible, and on both occasions metaphorically. In the Psalms we have the exaggerated metaphor, "I am wearied with my groaning; every night I make my bed to swim, I melt away my couch with my tears" (vi. 7); and in Isaiah—that book of metaphors—we find the prophecy, "that Moab shall be trampled down in his place, as straw is trampled down in the water of a dung pit, and though Moab shall spread out his hands within it, as a swimmer spreadeth out his hands to swim, yet God shall press down his pride in spite of the artifices of his hands" (xxv. 10, 11).

From streams we pass to fountains. The most striking metaphorical use of them is the directly religious one, where the source or the contents of religious truth are symbolised as fountains. Through this Biblical usage, the water and well of life have become religious metaphors so common that their figurative character is well-nigh forgotten. To trace and determine their earliest employment would land us in critical difficulties. I should be inclined to suppose that Jeremiah is the author of this, as of one or two other striking religious conceptions. In his second chapter he charges Israel with a twofold sin: "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the Fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, hollow cisterns, that can hold no water" (ii. 13; xvii. 13; cf. *Abot* ii. 11). A later song-writer speaks of drawing water out of the wells of salvation (Isaiah xii. 3). More famous is the appeal of the prophet in Babylon, in which the metaphor from water passes into a more general metaphor from food: "Ho every one that thirsteth—come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come buy wine and milk, for that which is not money and for that which is not a price." Metaphors

from food and feasting, which we shall have to notice presently, were naturally combined with metaphors from water and drinking, as in a famous passage of the thirty-sixth Psalm—the high-water mark of the Psalter's religious mysticism: "How precious is thy loving kindness, O God! [in thee] do the children of men [put their trust]; in the shadow of thy wings they find refuge; they feast upon the fatness of thy house, and of the river of thy pleasures thou givest them their drink. For with thee is the fountain of life; by thy light do we see light." What excellent use is made of the metaphor from water in the fourth Gospel is familar to all readers of that wonderful and fascinating book. "A well of life" is a familiar figure in Proverbs, to which are compared the mouth of the righteous, the teaching of the wise, and the fear of the Lord (x. 11; xiii. 14; xiv. 27). Other distichs use similar figures. Thus, "The words of a man's mouth are deep waters, a gushing brook, a well-spring of wisdom" (xviii. 4; cf. xx. 5). And again: "A righteous man yielding to the wicked is a troubled fountain, and a corrupted spring" (xxv. 26, See Del.). An isolated, but striking use of a cistern metaphor is that in Jer. vi. 7: "As a cistern keeps fresh her waters, so Jerusalem keeps fresh her wickedness." It is as natural to Jerusalem to be always providing a perpetual supply of wickedness, as for a cistern to be always providing a continual supply of cool, fresh water.[1]

From the waters upon the earth we pass on to those from the sky, to rain and snow and dew. Rain, as the cause of the earth's fertility, may fitly symbolise the cause of a nation's material or spiritual well-being. Thus, we have a king's favour compared to rain both in Psalms and Proverbs (*e.g.*, Psalm lxxii. 6; Prov. xvi. 15). The author of the Song of Moses hopes that his words may have an effect in their own province equally beneficial: "May my

[1] A striking metaphor from artificial irrigations is that in Prov. xxi. 1: "A king's heart in Yahveh's hand is like to canals of water; he leads it whither he will."

doctrine drop as the rain, may my speech distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass" (Deut. xxxii. 2). Job declares that in his prosperous days men waited for his speech "as for the rain, and they opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain" (xxix. 23). Both God and God's Word are compared to rain. Thus, in Hosea, God's salvation "is certain as the dawn; he will come unto us as the heavy rain, as the latter rain which waters the earth" (vi. 3). Rain and snow are divine messengers or angels, and are so treated in the splendid simile of II. Isaiah: "For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and thither returneth not, except it has watered the earth, and made it bring forth and sprout, and given seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me empty" (lv. 10, 11).

A purely secular metaphor from rain is that in Proverbs xxvii. 15: "A continual dropping in a very rainy day and a contentious woman are alike." Dr. Geikie tells us that this is an excellent proverb. "A rain-soaked roof is only too well known in Palestine. In my own case, at Tiberias, the rain fell through the tent on me in great drops; there was no protection from it. Rest was impossible; the annoyance made the whole night miserable. Could there be a better comparison for a brawling woman than this perpetual splash, splash, when one wished, above all things, to be quiet?"[1]

There are four separate metaphors from snow in the Bible, all noticeable and all different. In the first we get snow as the whitest thing in nature, to typify innocence or purity: "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall become white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall become as wool"[2] (Is. i. 18). With which may be compared the Psalmist's, "Purge me with hyssop and I shall

[1] Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, Vol. I., p. 53. The sense of Prov. xxvii. 16 is too doubtful to be here made use of.

[2] Snow is itself compared to wool, Ps. cxlvii. 16.

be clean: wash me and I shall be whiter than snow" (li. 9). Colours are not elsewhere used to typify sin and purity. A totally different use of snow is met with in Proverbs. "As the cold of snow"—*i.e.*, as a draught (*e.g.*, of wine) made cool by snow—"in the time of harvest, so is a faithful messenger to them that send him; for he refreshes the soul of his master" (xxv. 13). According to Delitzsch, snow is still stored up by the peasants of Menin, near Damascus, in a mountain cleft, and brought for sale in the summer to Damascus and the cities of the coast. A similar proverb runs, "As cold water to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country" (xxv. 25). Snow in summer may make a lovely drink (and a Greek epigram of Asklepiades[1] agrees with the proverb just quoted); but from an agricultural point of view it is decidedly in the way. So we get the further proverb: "As snow in summer and rain in harvest, so honour is not seemly for a fool" (xxvi. 1). Lastly, in Job we find the following: "Drought and summer heat consume the snow waters, so Sheol consumes sinners" (xxiv. 19). Here the point of comparison is the sudden rapidity of disappearance.

Dew in Palestine is heavier in quantity and more important in its effects than in England. It is as a matter of fact not dew at all, but a sort of night-mist, the cause and nature of which can be read up in Geikie, Neill and the encyclopædias. However, I do not think that in our translations we need substitute "night-mist" for dew; it would be as bad as having to put the bald vulture or griffon for the eagle. Three qualities were noticed in the dew: its great amount, its speedy disappearance, its beneficent effect. Each quality supplies a metaphor. Thus for the first we have a phrase of Hushai's in his false advice to Absalom. He counselled the rebel son to collect the whole manhood of Israel in a host "as the sand that is by the sea for multitude," so that when they light upon David and his

[1] Mackail, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, I. 2, p. 91.

fellows it may be "as the dew falleth on the ground" (2 Sam. xvii. 12). A metaphor from the transitoriness of dew has already been quoted. In another passage, also from Hosea, Israel's superficial and momentary repentance is aptly compared "to the morning cloud, and to the dew which early goeth away" (vi. 4). But most frequent is the metaphorical application of the dew's reviving and fertilising agency. God himself is compared to dew by Hosea, a writer to whom the dew was a peculiarly favourite metaphor: "I will be as the dew unto Israel; he shall blossom as the lily" (xiv. 5). God's blessing, if Professor Cheyne be right, and not brothers' unity, is the subject of the famous double metaphor in Psalm cxxxiii., of which the first is "the fine oil upon the head, that descends upon the beard, even Aaron's, that descends upon the (upper) border of his vestures;" while the second is "the dew of Hermon that descends upon the mountains of Zion." Israel, as well as Israel's God, is compared to dew. The instance is in Micah, and illustrates the contrasted conjunction of two opposite metaphors which we have already noticed in the comparison of God to a roaring lion and to a protecting bird in successive verses of Isaiah. Here the conjunction is of the lion with the dew. The lion metaphor has been already quoted, and relates to the conquering and destructive operations of God's people in the opening of the Messianic age. It is, however—oddly enough—preceded by another metaphor in which Israel is compared to the dew. "And the remnant of Israel shall be in the midst of many peoples as a dew from the Lord, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men" (v. 6). Hitzig rather prosaically explains this metaphor upon the analogy of the passage from Samuel: there is no real contrast between it and the lion metaphor, but only a variety of the same thought. Israel will fall upon the nations as suddenly and swiftly as the dew falls upon the ground. But it is more probable that the two metaphors were deliberately chosen to symbolise the double

aspect of Israel's work, the one redemptive and beneficial, the other violent and punitive. This interpretation is the more probable in view of the parallel antithesis in Proverbs (xix. 12), "The king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion, but his favour is as dew upon the grass." With this proverb, which seems couched courtier-like in mock heroics to us to-day, but was a grim reality when it was made, we may take leave of water metaphors and pass on to the clouds and to the winds.

There are, indeed, clouds and clouds. Gog the invader is likened to the storm-cloud by Ezekiel: "Thou shalt ascend and come like a storm; thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land" (Ezek. xxxviii. 9, 16; Jer. iv. 13; and cf. the grand simile, *Iliad* VI. 275). Lighter clouds pass quickly. So in Isaiah: "Who are these that fly as clouds, and as the doves to their lattices?" and in Job: "My welfare passeth away as a cloud;"[1] and the grander simile in one of his gloomiest speeches: "As the cloud is consumed and vanishes away, so he that goeth down to Sheol shall come up no more" (Isaiah lx. 8; Job xxx. 15, vii. 9). Some clouds are deceptive, and give no rain when rain is longed for. Thus: "Whoso boasts with a deceitful gift is like clouds and wind, and yet no rain" (Prov. xxv. 14).

The wind, taken by itself, is metaphorically a type of judgment and calamity. Thus in Hosea: "For though Ephraim bear fruit among his brethren (a pun here upon the meaning of "Ephraim" and a metaphor of states or tribes with trees) an east wind shall come, a wind of Yahveh, coming up from the desert, and his spring (from which the tree derived its nourishment) shall become dry, and his fountain shall be dried up" (xiii. 15).

Here the destructive east wind symbolised the Assyrian conqueror (cf. Is. xxvii. 8; Ez. xvii. 10, xix. 12; Ps. xlviii. 8). It is similarly used of calamity in general. So in Job,

[1] Cp. Demosthenes *De Corona*, § 188: *τὸν τῇ πόλει περιστάντα κίνδυνον παρελθεῖν ἐποίησεν ὥσπερ νέφος.* For this and a few other classical parallels I am indebted to Mr. Mackail.

of the sudden destruction of the wicked: "He lays him down rich, but shall not do so again; he openeth his eyes, and is not. Terrors overtake him like waters; by night a whirlwind steals him away. An east wind carries him off, and he departs; it sweepeth him out of his place" (Job xxvii. 19-21, where see Delitzsch's note on east winds, north winds, and whirlwinds in Palestine, and cf. Geikie, Vol. II., pp. 61-64). In one passage in Jeremiah sinful Israel is apparently compared to a wind: "A sharp wind from the bare hills of the desert is the way of my people, not for fanning, nor for cleansing; a stormy wind from them meets me (saith the Lord), therefore will I hold judgment upon them" (Jer. iv. 11). The words "not for fanning, nor for cleansing," imply that the wind was too violent for winnowing the grain, a process which is still carried out in Palestine by the help of a light wind. (Geikie, I., pp. 146, 149, 150). The most frequent metaphorical use of the wind is in conjunction with dust and stubble, to indicate the destruction and dispersion of enemies: "Let them be as chaff before the wind"; "I beat them small as the dust before the wind"; "They shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and as whirling dust before the whirlwind"; "Wilt thou terrify a leaf driven to and fro, and wilt thou pursue the dry stubble?" Such sentences as these are too familiar to need further illustration.[1] But before passing from the wind, we ought not to omit the proverb: "As the north wind bringeth rain, so does a backbiting tongue an angry countenance" (xxv. 23).

We pass now from wind to fire. Here we may well distinguish between the few examples in which there are similes from fire and the more numerous cases where fire is used metaphorically to express what is spiritual by a material symbol. Of the first class Isaiah can, as usual, supply the finest specimens. Here are two. The first

[1] Cf. Ps. xxxv. 5, lxxxiii. 14; Isaiah xvii. 13, xl. 24, xli. 2; Jer. xiii. 24; Job xiii. 25, etc.

combines the simile of fire with the familiar symbolism of the tree: "Therefore as the fire's tongue devoureth stubble, and hay melteth in a flame, so their root shall become as rottenness, and their blossom go up as dust." And again: "Unrighteousness burnt like fire, consuming thorns and briars, and kindled in the thickets of the forest, so that they rolled upwards in a volume of smoke" (Isaiah v. 24; ix. 17. Cf. xxxiii. 11; Mal. iii. 19; Joel ii. 5; Ps. lxxxiii. 15; *Iliad XI.* 155f).

Fire may be the symbol of mischief, trouble, or punishment. Thus of the first, in Isaiah l. 11: "Behold all ye that kindle a fire and set light to brands, begone into the flame of your fire and into the brands that ye have kindled." The meaning of the figure is not wholly clear, but it probably refers either to the rage of unrestrained passions among a certain section of the exiles, or more definitely to the plots and persecutions to which the same party subjected the pious. Fire as the symbol of trouble can be illustrated by the proverbial phrase (Ps. lxvi. 12), "to go through fire and water," which is elaborated by II. Isaiah into the stately period: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee" (xliii. 2). Then for fire as punishment we get the following from the same writer: "Behold they are become as stubble, the fire hath burned them; they cannot rescue their soul from the clutch of the flame; it is not a coal to give warmth, a fire to sit before" (xlvii. 14). The last line is very grim.

That Yahveh should frequently be symbolised by or compared to fire is, from an historical point of view, perfectly natural. For to the fire the essence of his being, or the substance of his nature, was originally akin. I do not therefore, propose to deal here with the numerous descriptions of Divine theophanies, either past or predicted, in which there is a half-literal, half-metaphorical usage of the

fire symbolism.[1] Yet two passages in Isaiah can hardly be passed over. Both relate to the judgment of God upon Assyria. In the first it is to be noticed how the image from fire is changed into an image from water, and this again into one from agriculture, and that into one from hunting: "Behold the name of Yahveh cometh from far, burning with anger, and in thick uplifting of smoke; his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue like devouring fire, and his breath is like an overflowing torrent, dividing even to the neck, to swing nations in the face of nothingness; and a bridle which leadeth astray (shall be) upon the cheeks of the peoples" (xxx. 27, 28). The second is prefixed by an image from sickness, so that the Assyrians are first compared to a robust man, and then to a forest and a garden: "The Lord shall send against his fat limbs wasting leanness, and under his glory shall burn a burning like the burning of fire; and the Light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame, and it shall kindle and devour his briars and thorns in one day; and the glory of his forest and of his garden-land shall it consume; and the remnant of the trees of this forest shall be few, that a child may write them" (x. 16-19).

Jeremiah compares God's Word to fire. "Is not my word like as a fire, saith Yahveh; and like as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" (xxiii. 29). It is here compared to a fire because of its prevailing character of severity and punishment. In another passage the object of the metaphor is very different. Jeremiah gives us a glimpse of the inward conflict that was perpetually being carried on in his own soul between the desire for tranquillity and peace and the higher compulsion to embody the felt Divine inspiration in impassioned utterance: "When I say, I will not make mention of him nor speak any more in his name, then it becometh in my heart as a burning

[1] Pure metaphor was, I suppose, intended in such late passages as Zech. ii. 9; Isaiah xxxiii. 14.

fire shut up in my bones; and I weary myself to hold it in, but cannot" (xx. 9; cf. Ps. xxxix. 4; *Æneid* IV. 12).

If God and his word are thus compared to fire, they are naturally also compared to light: "The Lord is my light" (Ps. xxvii. 1). "In thy light do we see light" (*ibid.*, xxxvi. 9). "The sun shall be no more thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory" (Is. lx. 19). These passages, and such as these, are too familiar for comment. The last is a good instance of the half-literal, half-metaphorical language of the Babylonian Isaiah.

Both the first and the second Isaiah use light as an emblem of prosperity and salvation. Thus, "The people that walk in darkness see a great light; they that dwell in the land of deadly shade, light shineth brilliantly upon them" (ix. 1; cf. Psalm xviii. 29). Or, again, "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thy healing will spring forth speedily" (Is. lviii. 8). Light is truth and goodness; darkness falsity and evil: "Woe unto those that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" (Is. v. 20.) There are three interesting instances of the metaphor in Proverbs: "A commandment is a lamp, and teaching is light, and reproofs of instruction are the way of life" (vi. 23; cf. Ps. cxix. 105). The second is very curious, and of importance to the archæologist. "A lamp of Yahveh's is the spirit of man; it searches through all the chambers of the body" (xx. 27).[1] Delitzsch states that it was upon the basis of this adage that the seven-branched candlestick became an old Jewish symbol of the soul. The proverb itself, with its quaint psychology, apparently implies that the spirit is able to penetrate into every nook and corner of the human personality, and establish a rigid self-inspection and a searching moral criticism. The last of

[1] Among the examples of metaphors quoted by Aristotle (*Rhet.* iii. 10 § 7), is ὅτι τὸν νοῦν ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἀνῆψεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ· ἄμφω γὰρ δηλοῖ τι.

the three is simpler and more direct; it speaks of the difference between the wicked and the righteous: "The path of the wicked is thick darkness; they know not at what they stumble. The path of the righteous is as the brightness of the morning light, which becomes brighter and brighter till the fulness of day" (iv. 18, 19). The victorious confidence and prosperous security of the righteous deepens more and more as life goes on—a curious illustration of the inveterate Old Testament combination of goodness and prosperity. For the light of the righteous, in so far as it typifies his spiritual knowledge and the firmness of his faith, may not improbably advance in brightness from year to year; but to the author of the proverb such a fuller knowledge and deeper faith implied also a corresponding outward prosperity, so that the "light" typifies both the inward essence and the outward accident.

Before passing from light and fire to the sun, their source, and to the stars of the night, two isolated metaphors should not be passed over without quotation. The first is from Job (v. 7): "Man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward," in which the point of comparison, the natural necessity of either quality, is very remarkable and unusual.[1] The second is from that 25th chapter of Proverbs, which, with the two following chapters, has already provided us with so many interesting metaphors. "If thine enemy be hungry give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty give him water to drink; for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee" (21, 22). Apparently the coals of fire are intended to symbolise the inward pangs of remorse and self-reproach, pangs such as Jean Valjean felt when the Bishop, confronted with the thief, pretended that the stolen candlesticks were a gift.

It is curious that, although by far the greater number of Biblical metaphors are taken from outward nature, there

---

[1] Compare the string of questions in Amos iii. 3-8.

should be so very few from the heavenly bodies. Perhaps they were too distant to impress. That, at least, is the quality which has suggested a few comparisons, *e.g.*, "As the heaven is high above the earth, so great is God's mercy to them that fear him" (Ps. ciii. 11; cf. xxxvi. 6, lvii. 11). Or were they too constant and changeless? (cf. Ps. lxxxix. 37, 38; Isaiah lxvi. 22). For the stars, at any rate, supply no metaphor or comparison, except from their numberlessness (Gen. xv. 5, xxii. 17; Jer. xxxiii. 22).[1] Oddly enough the poet of the Iliad hardly ever uses the stars for that purpose; it is their clear shining and dazzling brilliancy which form the subject of his glorious star similes, and even in the single exception to this rule it is their brightness, as well as their number, which provokes and substantiates the simile, as readers of the Laureate will remember. But there is one Biblical exception to the contrary rule, and that a notable one in a notable passage; for it occurs in the prophecy of the resurrection in the book of Daniel: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting abhorrence. But they that be wise shall shine as the shining of the firmament, and they that have brought many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. xii. 2, 3; cf. Wisdom iii. 7).

Here may find a place the fine simile in the "last words of David": "Who ruleth justly over men, who ruleth in the fear of God, is like the morning light at sunrise, a morning without rain, when through sunshine after rain grass springeth from the earth" (2 Sam. xxiii. 3, 4). And here also the image from Malachi of the "Sun of righteousness, with healing in his wings" (iii. 20), in which righteousness is symbolised under the figure of the sun,

[1] Mr. Morris Joseph reminds me of Numbers xxiv. 17 ("A star shall come forth out of Jacob"), to which should be added Isaiah xiv. 12. For sun metaphors he also adduces Judges v. 31, Ps. lxxxiv. 12 (God a sun), Jer. xv. 9 (sun=prosperity), and Cant. vi. 10 quoted above.

and the sun under the figure of a bird, of which the wings are rays.

It is now high time to come down from heaven to earth, and from elemental forces to the concrete objects of inanimate nature.

Let us first collect metaphors from vegetation generally, and then from that portion of it which is under the control of man, and nurtured for his benefit.

I suppose that the poets of all races have used the decay, death and resurrection of the vegetable world as a subject for metaphor and parable. Trees and flowers are either like man because they fade and die, or they are unlike him because though they die to-day they are re-born to-morrow. Both thoughts occur in the Scriptures. The first may be expressed generally, as in the beautiful 103rd Psalm: "As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field, so he flourishes. For the wind passes over it and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more" (ciii. 15, 16). Or again, in the 90th Psalm, where the idea of the perpetual renewal and the perpetual decay of humanity are touchingly alluded to: "Thou (*i.e.*, God) stormest upon them (*i.e.*, men); they fall into sleep; in the morning they are as grass which sprouts again; in the morning it blossoms and sprouts again; in the evening it is cut down and withers" (xc. 5, 6). This touches close upon the famous metaphor in the sixth book of the Iliad, to which there is so curious a parallel in Ecclesiasticus: "Even as are the generations of leaves, such are those likewise of men; the leaves that be the wind scattereth on the earth, and the forest buddeth and putteth forth more again, while the season of spring is at hand; so of the generations of men, one springeth and another passeth away" (VI. 146; cf. Ecc. xiv. 18). More usually in Scripture this metaphor is employed for the speedy fate which dogs, or, it is hoped, may dog, the fortunes of the wicked. The most famous example is from Psalm cxxix., where, as is usual in the Homeric similes, but is so rare in the Bible, there is a number of incidental accessories to make the

main idea more vivid. "Let (the wicked) be as the grass of the housetops, which withers before it is unsheathed; with which the mower fills not his hand, nor he that binds sheaves his bosom; and they that go by say not, The blessing of Yahveh be upon you; we bless you in the name of Yahveh" (cxxix. 6-8; cf. Cheyne's Notes, and Geikie i. 42; cf. also Ps. xxxvii. 2; xcii. 8; Job viii. 12; Isaiah xxxvii. 27).

Yet flowers and trees have a resurrection or immortality of their own, which, according to earlier thought, is denied to man. It is interesting to compare two examples of this same idea, one from Hebrew and one from Greek literature.[1] The Hebrew instance—it is from Job—does not, like the Greek, allude to the ordinary yearly resurrection of plants, but to a more peculiar quality of trees, characteristic especially, as it would appear, of the palm, but also, as we shall see from Isaiah, where the same metaphor is used for a more hopeful purpose, of the terebinth and the oak. Job then complains:—

> For the tree there is hope: if it be cut down it will sprout again, and its shoots will not fail. Though its root wax old in the ground, and its stock perish in the dust, yet through the scent of water it will bud and bring forth boughs like a plant, but man——

the contrast is also worth quoting, for it contains a fresh, hitherto unquoted, metaphor from streams or canals:—

> ——but man dieth and lieth low; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from a lake, and a river decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more he shall not awake, nor be aroused out of his sleep.[2]

The Greek parallel is from *Moschus' Lament over his Master Bion*:—

---

[1] Here too is one in Latin: Redditur arboribus florens revirentibus ætas; ergo non homini quod fuit ante redit? (Albinovanus, *El.* ii. 113.)

[2] Job xiv. 7-12. See Delitzsch's *Commentary* and Wetzstein's illustrative note. Also, Cheyne's *Job and Solomon*, p. 28; for verse 11, cf. Isaiah xix. 5, for the author of Job probably thought of the Nile, and יבש is not *die* See, but *der* See.

Ah me, when the mallows wither in the garden, and the green parsley, and the curled tendrils of the anise, on a later day they live again, and spring in another year; but we men, we, the great and mighty, or wise, when once we have died, in hollow earth we sleep, gone down into silence : a right long, and endless, and unawakening sleep. (*Moschus* III. Mr. Lang's Translation).

I said, in passing, that the metaphor from a cut-down tree was used by Isaiah. It occurs at the end of his inaugural sixth chapter, in connection with the doctrine of the Remnant. Judgment must succeed judgment, but without a full extermination, "for as the terebinth and the oak, of which, after the felling, a stock (*i.e.*, a stock from which fresh shoots will spring) remaineth, so a holy seed shall be the stock thereof (*i.e.*, of the tree which symbolises Israel)."[1]

Job and Moschus contrast reviving vegetation with the mortality of man ; the Second Isaiah contrasts the decay of vegetation with the eternity of God's Word. But the passage is too familiar to justify citation (Isaiah xl. 6-8).

Before passing on to metaphors proper taken from trees, there is one noble simile in Isaiah which must not be overlooked: "The heart of Ahaz shook, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the forest shake before the wind" (vii. 2. Mr. Mackail compares Soph. *Fr. Aegeus* 24).[2]

In a passage from Isaiah, quoted above, we have already come across the metaphor of a forest or a thicket to typify a hostile army. It is a fairly frequent usage. Thus, in the same chapter: "Behold the Lord Yahveh of Hosts lops off the mass of boughs with a terrible crash, and the high of station are felled, and the lofty are brought low ; and he shall cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon (still the Assyrian army) shall fall through a glorious one."[3]

---

[1] Isaiah vi. 13. Cf. Dillman's note. Cp. also Isaiah xi. 1 ; liii. 2.

[2] Notice also, "As the days of a tree are the days of my people" (Is. lxv. 22).

[3] Isaiah x. 33, 34 ; cf. ii. 13, xxxii. 19 ; xl. 24 ; Ezekiel xxxi. 3-18 ; Jer. xii. 2 ; Amos. ii. 9 ; Ps. xxxvii. 35 ; see Cheyne.

In this passage and in others referred to in the note, it is Israel's enemies which are described as trees. In other places it is Israel himself who is now symbolised as an olive (Hos. xiv. 6; Jer. xi. 16), and now as a fir (Hos. xiv. 8), a cedar (Ezek. xvii.; cf. Numbers xxiv. 6), and a forest (Ezek. xxi. 1-4). So also of the righteous individual, who may possibly often himself be only the personification of Israel. Thus, we have the elaborate simile in Jeremiah: "Blessed is the man that trusts in Yahveh, and whose hope Yahveh is. For he is as a tree planted by the waters, that spreads out its roots by the river, and does not fear when the heat comes, but its leaf is ever green, and it will not be careful in the year of drought, neither cease from bearing fruit."[1] Or, again in the Psalms, where, however, "the righteous" are probably synonymous with Israel: "The righteous shall spring up like a palm tree; he shall wax tall like a cedar in Lebanon (in contrast to the scrubby and transitory grass that symbolised the wicked in verse 8). Planted in the house of Yahveh, they shall spring up in the courts of our God. They shall still shoot forth in old age, full of sap shall they be and flourishing" (Ps. xcii. 13-15; cf. lii. 10. *Odyssey* VI. 162).[2]

With just a reference to a few metaphors from mountains and thorns,[3] we may now pass on to metaphors from man's relations to nature, whether in pastoral or agricultural life, and to such objects as the fig tree and the vine, which receive tending and cultivation from the hands of man.

In this connection, one thinks at once of the long agricultural parable in Isaiah xxviii. 23-29. Unfortunately, the application of the parable is by no means clear. Is it that, as the farmer ploughs in order to sow, and threshes different grains with different degrees of violence, even so

[1] Jer. xvii. 8; cf. the contrast xvii. 5, 6; Ps. i. 3; Job xxix. 19.

[2] As to the meaning of lii. 10, xcii. 14, see especially Hupfeld.

[3] Psalm xxx. 7; xxxvi. 7; Prov. xv. 19; xxvi. 9; 2 Samuel xxiii. 6; Nahum i. 10; Micah vii. 4; Ez. ii. 6; Koh. vii. 6; Numb. xxxiii. 55.

are there degrees of rigour in God's judgment processes and redemptive ends beyond the judgment, for which alone it was inflicted? Or, again, are we to interpret it with Professor Cheyne, but against Dillmann, as an appeal to the politicians to observe moderation and rationality in their moral and civic conduct? The former seems, upon the whole, the more probable explanation, in spite of the want of connection with the preceding portion of the chapter.

Here is the place for a whole series of detached metaphors from ploughing and sowing, and all the various details of agricultural procedure.

Similes in this province are not numerous; it is mainly metaphor. Noticeable, however, is the interrogation of Amos (vi. 12): "Shall horses run upon the rock? Does one plough the sea with oxen? For ye have turned justice into gall, and the fruit of righteousness into wormwood,"—of which the meaning, apparently, is that the perversion of justice in Israel is as unnatural as the former idea, and as wanton or profitless as the latter.

There is an odd mixture of personification and metaphor in the 129th Psalm, in which personified Israel complains that his enemies "have plowed upon his back, and made long their furrows."

Frequent is the transference of the ideas of ploughing, sowing and reaping from the material to the spiritual. These metaphors are already prominent in Hosea. Thus in x. 11, the comparison of Ephraim to a heifer leads on to further images from agriculture: "Ephraim is a heifer broken in and loving to thresh, and I have (hitherto) spared the beauty of her neck; (but now) I will make Ephraim to draw, Judah shall plow, and Jacob shall break up his clods."[1] Here, according to Professor Cheyne, whose rendering I have, as usual, quoted, we have Israel in its prosperity figured as a heifer whose business was but to thresh, for

[1] "Judah" is out of place here. See Oort, *Theol. Tijd.*, 1890, p.496. His emendation of v. 12 on basis of LXX. seems very dubious.

"the work of treading out the corn was pleasant and easy," while the coming distress and judgment are typified as ploughing and tilling under a galling yoke. Then in the next verse, while the heifer metaphor is given up, the agricultural images are continued: "Sow to yourselves according to righteousness, and ye shall reap in proportion to love: break up your fallow ground, for it is time to seek Yahveh, till he come and rain righteousness upon you. Ye have plowed wickedness, ye have reaped injustice: ye have eaten the fruit of lies." To reap injustice here means that the only result of their evil life—typified as a ploughing of wickedness—will be (the perfect is prophetic) the cruel oppression of the foreign conqueror (cf. Job iv. 8). A similar metaphor is Jeremiah's (iv. 3): "Break up for you a fallow ground, and sow not among thorns." And the kindred image in Hosea: "They have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind: it (*i.e.*, Israel typified as a cornfield) has no standing corn, the blade will yield no meal; or if it yield, strangers shall swallow it up" (Hosea viii. 7; cf. Prov. xxii. 8). Simpler and more familiar is the beautiful figure of the Psalmist: "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. Though he goeth on his way weeping, bearing the store of seed, he shall come back with joy, bearing his sheaves" (Ps. cxxvi. 5, 6).[1]

Harvest joy is proverbial, and was connected with religious thanksgivings (cf. Isaiah ix. 2 with Cheyne's note; Ps. iv. 7). Metaphorically, reaping and gleaning stand for punishment. So Isaiah: "And it shall be as when the husbandman gathereth blades of corn together, and his arm reapeth the ears; yea, it shall be as when one gathers ears in the valley of the plain. And a gleaning shall be left thereof, as at the striking of an olive tree two or three berries at the uttermost point, four or five on the branches of the fruit tree" (xvii. 5, 6; cf. xxiv. 13; Jeremiah vi. 9, ix. 21,

[1] Sowing and reaping metaphors are also found in Greek, *e.g.* Æsch. *Pers.* 821, and Plato *Phaedrus*, 260 C. Aristotle (*Rhet.* III. 3, § 4) calls them too poetic for prose. See Thompson's note on the Phaedrus passage.

xlix. 9; Ob. 5).[1] Similarly in Joel, where the wine-press is added to the harvest: "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; come tread, for the press is full; the vats overflow, for their wickedness is great" (iv. 13).[2]

The scattering of Israel by exile is not only aptly likened to winnowing (Jer. xv. 7) but, by a striking though confused metaphor, to the sifting of corn in a sieve. "For, lo, I will command, and I will shake the house of Israel to and fro among all nations, as corn is shaken in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth" (Amos ix. 9).

In all these instances the thresher, reaper and winnower is God, but sometimes it is Israel who punishes his enemies. So in II. Isaiah: "Behold, I will make thee a new threshing roller, sharp, double-edged; thou shalt thresh mountains and crush them, and shalt make hills as chaff" (Isaiah xli. 15-16, Micah iv. 13; cf. Jer. li. 33).

Other details of agricultural life furnish material for occasional similes and metaphors. Thus we have the yoke,[3] typifying either slavery and oppression (1 Kings xii. 4; Is. ix. 3) or a burden of iniquity (Lam. i. 14), the cart that shakes under its weight of sheaves (Amos ii. 13), the weeds that spring up in the furrows of an ill-kept field (Hosea x. 4), the booths of a vineyard neglected after the vintage. This last figure is more than once strikingly applied. So in Isaiah's first chapter: "The daughter of Zion is left as a booth in a vineyard, or a lodging-place in a cucumber-field" (Is. i. 8; cf. xxiv. 20). So in Job, of the wicked, whose glory is transitory: "He builds his house as the moth, and as

---

[1] Mr. Mackail thinks one might here compare the lovely lines of Sappho' (*Fr.* 93, ed. Bergk) :—

οἷον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἐρεύθεται ἄκρῳ ἐπ' ὔσδῳ
ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ· λελάθοντο δὲ μαλοδρόπηες,
οὐ μὰν ἐκλελάθοντ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐδύναντ' ἐπίκεσθαι.

[2] Ripeness for harvest supplies a strange simile in Job v. 26: "Thou shalt come to the grave in unbroken strength, as a sheaf of corn is gathered in its season."

[3] 'Yoke' in the religious sense is not yet found in the O.T. Yet cp. "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth" (Lam. iii. 27, cp. Psalms of Solomon vii. 8, with Ryle and James' Notes).

the booth which the watchman maketh" (xxvii. 18, with Delitzsch's note and Tristram, *Natural History of Bible*, p. 443). These booths, as occupied, form a different simile for Jeremiah: "The enemies of Jerusalem have encamped against her round about as keepers of a field" (iv. 17).

The two cultivated trees which are the subjects of the largest number of Biblical similes and metaphors are the fig-tree and the vine. The early fig was a great delicacy; hence we get similes like: "The fading flower of Ephraim's glittering bravery shall become as an early fig before the fruit harvest, which whoso seeth, while it is yet in his hand he swalloweth it" (Isaiah xxviii. 4; cf. Nahum iii. 12; Micah vii. 1). Israel, again, is likened to, or typified as, a fig-tree. Thus, Israel in his youth was found by God "as grapes in the wilderness, as the first ripe in the fig-tree at her first season" (Hosea ix. 10). So, in Jeremiah, we get the parable of the two baskets of figs, one having the first ripe, very good figs, the other very naughty figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad (xxiv.).

No metaphor from the vegetable world is more usual than that which is connected with the vine-tree, with the grape, and with the drunkenness which is the grape's most characteristic fruit.

Israel is often represented under the figure of a vine. One starts with the blessing of Jacob. Joseph is there typified as "a young, fruitful vine by a well, whose branches run over the wall" (Gen. xlix. 22). Then comes Hosea: "Israel was a luxuriant vine, which freely put forth fruit" (x. 1). Then there is the famous parable in Isaiah, too familiar for quotation (Isaiah v. 1-7). The metaphor of a vine degenerating is taken up by Jeremiah: "I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: how, then, art thou turned into the degenerate shoots of a strange vine unto me?"[1] Ezekiel uses the vine figure in his usual elaborate

[1] ii. 21. Cf. vi. 9, xii. 10; and for bad grapes typifying the enemy Deut. xxxii. 32.

way (xvii. 1-10, xix. 10-14). The metaphor seems to have become so common that in one passage he even covers it with contempt. Jerusalem and the men of Judah need not boast themselves of their prominent glory as the vineyard of God. For "what is the vine-tree more than any other tree, or the vine-branch more than any other branch among the trees of the forest?" It is meet for no work, but is cast in the fire for fuel (xv. 1-8). At great length is the vine metaphor worked out by a late Psalmist (lxxx. 9-17), and we find it once more in a late prophecy now included in Isaiah. God's vineyard shall ultimately triumph over its enemies: "In days to come Jacob shall take root, Israel shall blossom and bud, and they shall fill the face of the world with fruit" (xxvii. 1-6).

Israel's foes are far more rarely typified as vines. Once Isaiah uses the metaphor for the Assyrians: "For thus hath Yahveh said unto me, I will be still and look on in my mansion, while there is clear heat in sunshine, while there are clouds of night-mist in the heat of the vintage. For before the vintage, when the blossom is over and the bud becometh a ripening grape, he shall cut off the branches with pruning-knives, and the shoots he heweth away" (xviii. 4, 5, with Cheyne's Notes; cf. Deut. xxxii. 32).

A more domestic simile is that of the Psalmist: "Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine in the recesses of thine house; thy children like olive plants round about thy table" (cxxviii. 3).

The unripe grape suggested the familiar proverb: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Jer. xxxi. 29; Ezek. xviii. 2); while the result of the wicked's injustice in that he is deprived of offspring, is, in an odd simile in Job, compared to a vine which, not suffering its grapes to come to maturity, shakes them off while they are yet unripe (xv. 33. See Del.).

The fermentation and effervescence of new wine is alluded to by Elihu: "Behold it is within me as wine which

has not been opened; like new bottles, it is ready to burst" (Job xxxii. 19).[1]

Not wholly clear is the simile in II. Isaiah: "As when the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it, so will I do for my servants, that I destroy not the whole" (lxv. 8); which Dillmann explains to mean no more than that as the grapes which already contain serviceable juice, suited for the vintage, are tenderly dealt with, so will God act towards his people. Delitzsch and Cheyne give more detailed interpretations.

Another curious image from a particular trait in the treatment of wine is found in Zephaniah and Jeremiah. It appears to have been the custom to leave the new-made wine with—that is, upon—its lees or sediment, to the end that it might retain and absorb more strength and aroma. Such wine, so kept and then passed through a strainer, was much prized (Is. xxv. 6). But bad or poor wine left on its lees would become the worse and the more ill-flavoured. So Zephaniah (i. 12) speaks of the men in Jerusalem who are "settled or thickened on their lees"—that is, who have become deeply ingrained with spiritual callousness, and who say, in their heavy dulness, "The Lord will not do good, neither will he do evil." Jeremiah (xlviii. 11) speaks of Moab as having been at ease from his youth: "He has become settled on his lees, and has not been emptied from vessel to vessel; therefore his taste remains in him, and his scent is not changed." This means that Moab's quiet life has confirmed and deepened the traits—here, doubtless, unflattering traits were referred to—of his national character. The punishment which is to befall him continues the figure: "I will send tilters unto him, and they shall tilt him, and shall empty his vessels and break his bottles" (xlviii. 12. See Cheyne).[2]

[1] In the simile Ps. cxix. 83, "I am become like a wine skin in the smoke," the point of comparison is only that he is regarded as equally useless and valueless as an empty unused wine skin hung up amid the smoke. See Nowack and Del.

[2] Apparently, too, transferring the wine from one cask to another, or

God's cup of reeling is a frequent symbol for confusion, bewilderment and distress. "Thou hast showed thy people hard things; thou hast made us to drink of the wine of reeling" (Ps. lx. 5). Or, again: "Wake thee up, arise, O Jerusalem, who hast drunk at the hand of Yahveh the cup of his fury: the goblet-cup of reeling hast thou drunken and wrung out" (Isaiah li. 17, 21, 22; Ezek. xxiii. 33; Hab. ii. 16). The image is portrayed as a concrete fact in Jeremiah, who receives from God's hand his cup of fury, and is bidden to make the nations drink it (Jer. xxv. 15-28). The following verse from the seventy-fifth Psalm has, perhaps, suggested a glorious stanza in Rabbi Ben Ezra: "In the hand of Yahveh there is a cup with wine—foaming wine that is full of mixture; and he pours out to this one and to that one; surely the dregs thereof shall all the ungodly of the earth sup up and drink"[1] (lxxv. 8).

Drunkenness may typify spiritual blindness or perplexity (Isaiah xix. 14; Jer. xxiii. 9). It also supplies the figure for sailors of a ship in a storm at sea, who reel about the deck in bewildered witlessness (Ps. cvii. 27); and, finally, it is combined with the image of the wind-tossed booth to illustrate the convulsions of the earth upon the Judgment-day (Isaiah xxiv. 20).

Other products of agricultural life also used for metaphors are butter, oil, and honey—butter for smoothness, oil for softness. So in the Psalter: "His mouth is smoother than butter, but his heart is all war; his words

---

from skins to skins, made it milder; but care had to be taken lest this process made the wine sour. See Lowth on Isaiah xxv. 6, and a curious Latin metaphor for degeneration taken from wine becoming sour by being poured from vessel to vessel:—"Quare quum integri nihil fuerit in hac gente plena, quam valde eam putamus *tot transfusionibus coacuisse*"—"Since in this people in its original unity there was nothing good, how much must it have degenerated through so many transplantations." Cicero, *Scaurus* § 43, quoted by Naegelsbach *Lateinische Stylistik*, p. 445 (ed. 1881).

[1] So Cheyne. See his Notes. He compares *Il.* XXIV. 527.

are softer than oil, and yet they are drawn swords."[1] The precious oil that ran down upon Aaron's beard (Ps. cxxxiii. 2) has already been noticed; the metaphor of another Psalmist is, perhaps, also worth a line of printer's ink: "Let the righteous smite me in kindness and correct me; oil so fine let not my head refuse."[2]

A number of conventional similes and constant metaphors are constructed from the net, as well as from the "broad" or the "slippery path." The net is the trouble in which the righteous have been involved through the machinations of the wicked. It is parallel to and sometimes combined with the gin and the snare.[3] God's net, symbolising his judgment, is used by Hosea (vii. 12), Ezekiel (xii. 13, xvii. 20, xxxii. 3), and the author of Job (xix. 6; cf. Lam. i. 13), while Isaiah boldly compares God to a snare: "He shall be for a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many shall stumble thereat and fall, and be broken and snared and taken" (Isaiah viii. 14, 15).

The "broad path" in the Psalter typifies prosperity and deliverance (xviii. 20, xxxi. 9, cxviii. 5), and an "even path" has a quite similar meaning (xxvi. 12, xxvii. 11, cxliii. 10; Prov. xv. 19).[4] Slippery or narrow paths, on the contrary, typify circumstances of calamity or danger (Ps. lxxiii. 18, xxxv. 6; Jer. xxiii. 12). "Slipping off the path" may have a more spiritual meaning, as in lxxiii. 2, where it stands for religious unfaith; while "firm steps" may denote moral stability, as in xxxvii. 31.[5] A more directly

---

[1] Ps. lv. 22. For honey, cf. Prov. v. 3, xvi. 24; Ps. xix. 11, cxix. 103. For a simile from butter-making cf. Prov. xxx. 33.

[2] Ps. cxli. 5. See Cheyne, and for the assonance cf. Ko. vii. 1.

[3] Cf. Psalm xxv. 15, xxxi. 5, xxxv. 7, cxl. 6, lxiv. 5, cxli. 9, 10, cxix. 110.

[4] Cf. the use of "mountains" for security. Ps. xxx. 8.

[5] Cf. further Ps. xl. 3, xxiii. 3; Isaiah xxvi. 7.

religious metaphor is the "path of life,"[1] which is equivalent to the ways or paths of God.[2]

Pastoral life furnishes the standing metaphor of the flock, which symbolises Israel, while the shepherd is either its king (and in the plural its princes and rulers), or he is God. Perhaps the oldest use of the figure is in Kings (1 Kings xxii. 17), where Micaiah says that he saw "all Israel scattered upon the mountains as sheep that have not a shepherd. And Yahveh said: These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace." The figure is fully worked out both by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Jer. xxiii. 1-4; Ezekiel xxxiv. 1-31). It is most delicately handled by II. Isaiah in a single verse: "God will feed his flock like a shepherd; he will gather the lambs in his arms, and carry them in his bosom, and will gently lead those which give suck" (xl. 11; cf. Micah vii. 14). It is very frequent in the Psalter; Israel is the sheep of Yahveh's pasture (c. 3, lxxvii. 20, lxxviii. 31, lxxix. 13, xcv. 7), while this phase of the figure culminates in the famous Psalm, "The Lord is my Shepherd" (xxiii.), in which the figure is more or less kept up through the first four verses.

Israel is also represented as the helpless sheep which are driven to the slaughter. So in the Maccabean Psalm (xliv. 23): "For thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter."[3] Jeremiah compares himself to "a mild lamb, or an ox that is led to the slaughter" (xi. 19); and in the great fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, whereas Israel has gone astray like a flock, the suffering Servant let himself be humbled, and opened not his mouth; "as the sheep that is led to the slaughter, and an ewe that before her shearers is dumb" (liii. 6, 7; cf. Ps. cxix. 176).

---

[1] Ps. xvi. 11, and frequent in Proverbs; *e.g.*, ii. 19, v. 6, vi. 23, x. 17, xv. 24. [2] Ps. xvii. 5, xxv. 4, xxvii. 11, cxliii. 10.

[3] Cf. Mackail's *Select Epigrams*, etc., XII. 35, p. 276.

We now may turn from outdoor life and objects of nature to life within the home and the domestic relationships. The relation of father to son, of mother to child, of husband to wife, are all made use of for metaphorical purposes, and chiefly in that to each of them is likened the relation of God to Israel. Thus for the first we have Hosea's touching expostulation: "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son . . . . I taught Ephraim to walk, and took them up in my arms. . . . I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love."[1] So in Deuteronomy: "In the wilderness thou, Israel, hast seen how that the Lord thy God bare thee, as a man doth bear his son, in all the way that ye went until ye came into this place."[2] And, again, with a different example of paternal behaviour: "As a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord chasteneth thee"; which is improved in Proverbs into the adage, "Whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth;" and with which we may also compare the Psalmist's, "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him."[3] Deutero-Isaiah uses the relationship of mother and child to express the unforgetting kindness of God's love for Israel: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, she may forget, yet I will not forget thee" (xlix. 15; cf.

---

[1] Hosea xi. 1-3. The figure is not kept up consistently. For the text see Cheyne, who also cites a pretty parallel from the *Rig-Veda*, "Thou barest him as a father bears his son on his lap."

[2] i. 31. Cf. Isaiah xlvi. 3, 4; lxiii. 9. Moses repudiates such a charge Numbers xi. 12.

[3] Deut. viii. 5; Prov. iii. 12; Ps. ciii. 13. Cf. Mal. iii. 17. The greatest grief is likened to the sorrow for an only son. Am. viii. 10; Jer. vi. 26; Zech. xii. 10. The idea that God, as a loving father, chastens his human children is also found in Seneca, *e.g.*, *De Prudentia* II, where a difference is drawn between a father's severe training and a mother's spoiling. God's method is like a father's: "Patrium habet Deus adversus bonos viros animum, et illos fortiter amat; et operibus, inquit, doloribus, ac damnis exagitentur ut verum colligant robur" (Stewart's *Seneca, Minor Dialogues*, 1889, Bell; p. 4).

lxvi. 13). A better simile for peaceful and happy resignation in God's inscrutable will it would be hard to find than the Psalmist's: "Surely I have composed and quieted my soul, as a weaned child in its mother's arms; my soul is within me like a weaned child" (cxxxi. 2). The weaned child (in the East one must suppose a child of at least three years,)[1] is happy and content by the mere presence of and contact with its mother; so the resigned spirit, filled with faith, is happy and content in the mere consciousness of nearness to and communion with God.

The relationship of husband and wife applied metaphorically to the relation of God to Israel is a too elaborate chapter in the religious history and thought of the ancient Hebrews to be touched upon here. Suffice it to allude to the similes taken from the joyousness of bridegroom and bride (Is. lxii. 5), of which one outward feature was the festive attire with its ornaments (*e.g.*, Jer. ii. 32; Isaiah lxi. 10). In the book of Proverbs ornaments of head and neck typify teaching and instruction (*e.g.*, i. 9, iv. 9, xx. 15). They also suggest the material for many a simile. Thus: "As a jewel of gold in a swine's snout, so is a fair woman who is without discretion." Or again: "As an ear-ring of gold and an ornament of fine gold so is a nice speech upon a listening ear." And, lastly: "Apples of gold in chased work of silver; a word smoothly spoken."[2] Prominent and prized among personal ornaments is the seal-ring or signet. So we get in Jeremiah: "As I live, saith Yahveh, even though Coniah . . . be the signet upon my right hand, yet will I pluck him thence" (Jer. xxii. 24). And contrariwise in Haggai; "I will take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, and will make thee as a signet, for

---

[1] See Professor Cheyne's *Commentary*. (I hope Prof. Cheyne will forgive me for having perpetually made use of his translations all through this paper.)

[2] Prov. xi. 22, xxv. 12 (LXX., xxv. 11); for which see Cheyne, p. 144, and Delitzsch *ad loc.*

I have chosen thee, saith Yahveh of Hosts."[1] Nor must the fine exclamation of the Beloved in the Song of Solomon be passed over: "Set me, as a seal, upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm" (viii. 6), a verse which has been so aptly introduced by Swinburne in the third antistrophe of his great ode upon the Proclamation of the French Republic:

> "Who shall heal me; who shall come to take my part?
> Who shall set me as a seal upon his heart?
> As a seal upon his arm made bare for fight?"

The lower household relations, those of slave and handmaiden to master and mistress also furnish their quota to the metaphorical store. For who does not remember the simile of the Psalmist: "As the eyes of servants are upon the hand of their master, as the eyes of a handmaid are upon the hand of her mistress, so our eyes are upon Yahveh our God, until he have pity upon us" (cxxiii. 2). The day-labourer's life supplies a simile for Job. "Has not man a hard service upon earth? Are not his days as the days of an hireling, as a servant, who pants for the shadow, and like a hireling who looks for his labour's reward?" (vii. 2). A few other isolated and not especially interesting metaphors of this class may find a place in the notes.[2]

Of what goes on within a household not the least

---

[1] ii. 23, an important passage when taken in connection with the preceding one from Jeremiah; see Stade, *Geschichte*, vol. II., 127.

[2] Thus we have metaphors of a "tent" applied to the heavens or to a city (as in Isaiah xl. 22, xxxiii. 20, liv. 2; Jer. x. 20; cf. Job iv. 21): A door and its hinges supplies a comparison in Prov. xxvi. 14, the corner pillars of a house in Ps. cxliv. 12. If we call our bodies "houses of clay," that comes from Job iv. 19. We have a metaphor from a *peg* and a *key* in Isaiah xxii. 22-25 (where see Dillmann), and from the former in Ezra ix. 8; a simile from singing and playing in Ezekiel xxxiii. 32, and one from throwing a ball in Isaiah xxii. 18. I do not propose to enter into the discussion of the long passage in Koh. xii. 1-7, nor how far the description of old age is symbolic and metaphorical in its every detail or not. Cf. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, ps. 226-230. I should not have omitted to quote in the text the proverbial "I will sweep it with the besom of destruction" (Is. xiv. 23).

important part are the doings in the kitchen. It is not surprising, therefore, that we get many metaphors borrowed from cooking, or from food and drink—all the more so as with a solemn feast religious ideas are clearly associated. Even the scullery supplies a simile which, simple as it is, has won the warm approval of Bishop Lowth. It occurs in a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, and is preceded by a figure from building: "I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab: and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down" (2 Kings xxi. 13). From wiping dishes there is only a step to the oven, which, in its glowing heat, is a common simile without further expansion (*e.g.*, Lam. v. 10; Isaiah xxxi. 9; Ps. xxi. 10; Mal. iii. 19). The simile is elaborated in Hosea. The prophet is denouncing the Ephraimite aristocracy: "They are all adulterers," he says, "as an oven kindled by the baker, who ceases from kindling after he has kneaded the dough until it is leavened. . . . . For their inward part is like an oven, their heart burns in them; all the night their anger smokes: in the morning it burns as a flaming fire (Hosea vii. 4, 6). This is the rendering, with emendations in v. 6, of Professor Cheyne, and the explanation of the metaphor must be sought for in his Notes.[1] Then, besides the oven we have the seething pot. Thus, in Micah, as a figure of horrible oppression: "Ye princes of the house of Israel . . . . who pluck their skin from off them, and their flesh from off their bones; who also eat the flesh of my people, and flay their skin from off them; and they break their bones, and chop them in pieces, as for the pot, and as

[1] See also Q. P. B. Less available for every student may be Oort's proposed emendations in *Theol. Tijd.*, 1890, p. 481. He reads in verse 4, מְנַפְּחִים for מְנאפִים, and בֹּעֵר הֵם אֹפֶהוּ for ב' מ', and מִבְעֵר for מֵעִיר, and then translates: "They are all glowing with heat; they are like a burning oven, the baker of which ceases to kindle it after he has kneaded the dough until it is leavened." For another metaphor from cooking cf. Hosea vii. 8. and Cheyne's note.

flesh within the caldron" (Micah iii. 2, 3). The representation of Jerusalem, under the figure of a pot, is well worked out by Ezekiel (xxiv.). Elsewhere he quotes a popular saying, in which the metaphor of the caldron is quite differently applied. The men of Jerusalem in Zedekiah's reign, believing that the danger had passed over, were apparently wont to say in their fancied security: "This city is the caldron and we are the flesh."[1]

From implements of cooking we pass to food. With tears as food and drink (or with ashes as bread, Ps. cii. 9) we are familiar from the Psalms (*e.g.* lxxx. 5; xlii. 4). "The bread of adversity and the water of affliction," was original in Isaiah (xxx. 20; cf. 1 Kings xxii. 27); "gall and vinegar" make a sort of accentuated double metaphor in Psalm lxix. 21, where food and drink stand for comfort and pity, and vinegar and gall for the mockery which was dealt out in their stead (cf. Jer. viii. 14; ix. 14; xxiii. 15; Lam. iii. 15, 19). Vinegar reminds one of two good Proverbs: "As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes, so is the sluggard to them that send him" (x. 26). "Vinegar falling upon a wound, and he who sings songs to a heavy heart" (xxv. 20, Cheyne, p. 148).

What is the meaning of Koheleth's exhortation, "Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days?" (xi. 1). If, as is still possible, it refers to charity, there is a curious parallel, by way of contrast, in Theognis, who (l. 105) compares the beneficence shown to the bad with the sowing of seed upon the "hoary" sea.

Metaphors from feasts are usually of a religious character. But these may be prefaced by the quite general simile in Isaiah. The disappointment of the enemies who war against Zion shall be: "As when a hungry man dreameth, and behold, he eateth, but he awaketh, and his soul is

[1] Ezek. xi. 3, 7. So Cornill; but see also Smend and Orelli, who explain differently. Ps. lviii. 10 is unfortunately too corrupt to be made use of here. See Cheyne.

empty; and as when a thirsty man dreameth, behold, he drinketh, but he awaketh, and, behold, he is faint and his soul craveth." (Isaiah xxix. 8. Note that the dream simile is also used with a different, more Homeric application, in the preceding verse.)

Feast metaphors are frequent in the Psalms. So in the twenty-third, "Thou furnishest a table before me in the presence of my foes; thou hast anointed my head with oil, my cup is abundance."[1] And again in Psalm xxxvi. 9, "They feast upon the fatness of thy house; and of the river of thy pleasures thou givest them their drink." This imagery is, of course, borrowed from the temple ritual, the fat of sacrificed bullocks becoming the figure for spiritual joys (cf. Psalm lxiii. 6). A similar image is expressed in the twenty-fifth chapter of Isaiah: "The Lord of Hosts shall make unto all peoples in this mountain a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well strained." The prophecy is Messianic and universalist (xxv. 6; see Cheyne and Dillmann against Grätz).

It is remarkable how few similes and metaphors are taken from the sights or avocations of life in cities. Such proverbs as "He that has no rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down and without walls;" or such comparisons as "My soul waiteth for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning" (Prov. xxv. 28; Ps. cxxx. 6), are isolated and rare. The commonest religious metaphor from city life is that of the law-suit, in which God is the plaintiff (and the judge) and Israel or the nations the defendants.[2]

There are a few similes from clothes. The sad mutability of human raiment was as common a feature then as now. (So *e.g.*, Ps. cii. 27; Is. li. 6.) To put on either virtue or

---

[1] Psalm xxiii. 6, so Cheyne. God Himself is "the portion and the cup" in Ps. xvi. 5.

[2] *E.g.*, in Hosea iv. 1, xii. 2; and then onwards in Isaiah i. 18; iii. 13; Micah vi. 2; Jer. xxv. 31; II. Isaiah xli. 1, and *passim*; Joel iv. 2, etc.

disgrace as a vesture or as a girdle is a usual figure of speech.[1] Jeremiah uses the odd figure of Nebuchadnezzar "wrapping himself in" the land of Egypt "as a shepherd wraps himself in his mantle," which apparently means that the Babylonian king will be able to collect together the spoils of Egypt as easily as a shepherd can fling his night cloak around his shoulders (Jer. xliii. 12, Ewald).[2]

Among the town-life metaphors are some interesting examples from building. The corner-stone supplies one or two, to appreciate which one must, as Professor Cheyne points out, recollect the "enormous size and cost of the foundation-stones of Eastern public buildings." Thus in Psalm cxviii., of Israel, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief corner-stone" (see Cheyne), and before the Psalmist, in a difficult passage of Isaiah, the application of which is much disputed, "Behold, I am he that hath laid in Zion a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone of solid foundation."[3] In the next verse (xxviii. 17) we get the metaphor of the line and the plummet, "I will set justice for a line, and righteousness for a plummet." Here God's action or work is likened to a building, for which the main implements used are righteousness and justice. In other places the line and plummet are very strangely employed contrariwise in metaphors of destruction, to indicate that God will carry out his work of ruin with the same care and accuracy as a builder carries out his pre-arranged design. (See Del. on Isaiah xxxiv. 11.) So in the vision of Amos, "I will set a plumb-

---

[1] *E.g.*, of virtues, Isaiah xi. 5, lxi. 10; Job xxix. 14; in Isaiah lix. 17 armour is included; of cursing and disgrace, Ps. cix. 18, 19, 29.

[2] From weaving we get Isaiah xxxviii. 12: "Thou hast cut off, like a weaver, my life; from the warp did he sever me" (So Ch.; but see Dill.), and Job vii. 6, "My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle." Job illustrates the fleetness of his life by many other similes. Note *e.g.*, the three figures in ix. 25, 26, from the runner, the ship and the eagle—a collocation of the swiftest things on earth, in the sea and in the air.

[3] See Dillmann and Cheyne for the various interpretations of the text and the metaphor.

line in the midst of my people Israel" (vii. 8), and in a prophecy against Edom, "God will stretch out upon it the line of chaos and the plummet of desolation" (Isaiah xxxiv. 11; cf. 2 Kings xxi. 13; Lam. ii. 8). A Psalmist likens himself in his weakness "to a toppling wall, a fence pushed in" (lxii. 4), and Isaiah (xxx. 13) compares the sinful policy of the Jerusalem statesmen, which must inevitably end in ruin and collapse, to "a swelling (*i.e.*, increasing) and threatening breach in a high wall, which is shattered suddenly in a moment." (So Dillmann; but cf. Cheyne.) Last among the building metaphors shall come a fine passage from Ezekiel, in which Jerusalem is symbolised as a wall, the cracks and breaches in which the false prophets vainly hide by a coating of a whited plaster. God will throw down the wall with his hailstones and his wind, so that men shall say, Where is the wall, and where are they that plastered? (Ezek. xiii. 10—15. See Smend and Cornill. The interpretation is clear.)

From the art of building we may now turn to that of pottery and metal work. Books upon Palestine make the frequent pottery figures of the Bible intelligible to us. There still is made in Syria an enormous amount of coarse pottery, which is very brittle and very cheap. The comparison of Israel in its hour of tribulation to a "vessel wherein there is no pleasure" lay ready to hand and is of frequent occurrence since Hosea (Hosea viii. 8; Lam. iv. 2; Ps. xxxi. 13; Jer. xxii. 28; cf. Jer. xlviii. 38; Ps. lx. 10). So Isaiah, immediately after the wall simile quoted above, predicts that Yahveh will break this bulging wall "as one breaketh an earthen pitcher, shivering it unsparingly, so that not a sherd is found in its shivered pieces for taking fire from the hearth, or drawing water from a cistern." Dr. Geikie thus illustrates the figure:—

> When accident has caused the breaking of a large vessel there are naturally some fragments comparatively large, and these are still of some use. A hollow piece serves as a cup in which to lift water from the spring, either to drink or to fill a jar. Nothing is more common

than for neighbours to borrow a few lighted coals in a hollow pot-sherd from each other to kindle their fire, or for a poor man to come, in the evening, to the baker's oven with his lowly fire-pan and get from it a few glowing embers to boil his tin of coffee or heat his simple food (II. 51).

This simile of his predecessor Jeremiah is commanded to enact as a visible parable before the eyes of the capital's inhabitants. He is bidden to buy a potter's earthen bottle, and take of the elders of the people and the elders of the priests, and then having gone "forth unto the valley of the sons of Hinnom," and having uttered there his prophecy of ruin and retribution, "to break the bottle in the sight of the men" that went with him, and to say, "Thus saith Yahveh of Hosts: Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel that cannot be made whole again" (xix. 1-11 ; cf. Ps. ii. 9).

It was a further but natural development of the figure to make God the potter and man the pot. Isaiah leads the way. He laughs bitterly at the folly of those who would hide their purposes from God as if he could not detect and discern the machinations of their heart. "O your perverseness! should the potter be accounted as clay, that the work should say of him that made it, He made me not? and the thing formed say of him that formed it, He hath no understanding?" (xxix. 16). Jeremiah once more transforms the simile into a concrete parable in his famous visit to "the potter's house" (Jer. xviii. 1-10), and in the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah the metaphor of the potter is twice employed with admirable effect. Thus, first: "Woe unto him that striveth with him that formed him, a potsherd among potsherds of the ground! Doth the clay say to him that formeth it, What makest thou? or his work (say), Thou hast no hands" (xlv. 9, reading פעלו; see Dill.). And, secondly, in the long prayer which extends from lxiii. 7 to lxiv. 12, the same figure is humbly used, and its truth acknowledged by the human suppliants themselves. "And now, O Yahveh, thou art our father;

we are the clay, and thou our fashioner, and the work of thy hands are we all."[1]

As regards the individual metals, iron and brass are naturally types for obstinacy or endurance. (Compare Isaiah xlviii. 4; Jer. i. 18; xv. 20.) In Proverbs we come across the pregnant adage: "Iron is sharpened by iron, and a man sharpens the face of his friend" (xxvii. 17). Gold can be a type of scarcity (Isaiah xiii. 12), or of preciousness. That the gain of wisdom is better than the gain of gold, or that wisdom should be sought for as men search for silver, are familiar comparisons in Proverbs. More striking is the metaphor in Lamentations in which the nobles of Jerusalem are likened to gold: "How is the gold become dim: how is the most fine gold changed! The hallowed stones are thrown down at the corners of every street. The sons of Zion, the precious ones, who were comparable to fine gold, how are they esteemed as earthen pitchers, the work of the potter's hands" (Lam. iv. 2).

But by far the most frequent metaphor suggested from the precious metals is that of refining—metaphors from alloy and dross, from their removal by the purifying processes of the furnace, or from the pure metal which is so produced. Thus, first generally in Proverbs: "Remove the dross from the silver, and the vessel is ready for the goldsmith: remove the wicked from before the king, and his throne is established in righteousness" (xxv. 4). And, again: "Silver dross spread over an earthen vessel—fervent lips and a bad heart" (xxvi. 23). Next, in the distinctly religious sphere. In the Psalms the words of God are often spoken of as pure—that is, as free from

[1] xiv. 8. Eliphaz calls men "dwellers in houses of clay" (Job iv. 19) with which expression Delitzsch compares πηλοῦ πλάσματα in Aristoph., *Aves*, 686; in a fragment of Æschylus, quoted by Liddell and Scott, man is called πηλόπλαστον σπέρμα. The idea, Mr. Mackail tells me, is frequent in later Greek poetry. He compares *e.g.* Anth. Pal. x. 45 (ἐκ πηλοῦ γέγονας κ.τ.λ.). There is only one simile from the potter in Homer; and the point of comparison is the light swiftness of the motion of the potter's wheel (*Iliad* XVIII. 600).

alloy. The figure is expanded in Psalm xii. 7: "The sayings of Yahveh are pure from dross—silver well tried (and running) to the ground, seven times refined." (So Cheyne, and compare his Notes.) Then we have the metaphor of God refining by trouble the mingled human character, and purging the State, by his judgments, from the wicked, which are its alloy. Thus, in the Psalms: "Thou, O God, hast proved us; thou hast tried us as silver is tried" (lxvi. 10; cf. xvii. 3); and in Zechariah, of the residue yet left after the Judgment: "I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried" (xiii. 9). In these passages the persons who are freed from their own dross, and are thus made pure, are one and the same; in others (of which class there are more), the dross represents the wicked who are removed by death. So, in Isaiah's opening chapter: "Thy silver is become dross, thy choice drink thinned with water. . . . But I will smelt out as with lye thy dross, and will take away all thy alloy" (Is. i. 22, 25). The same figure is worked out at some length, both by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Jer. vi. 27-30; Ezekiel xxii. 18-22), and the "last of the prophets" repeats it (Mal. iii. 2, 3). With which of these various passages—whether of the first or of the second category—is that verse (xlviii. 10) of the Babylonian Isaiah parallel, to which we owe a now familiar phrase, "the furnace of affliction"? Some (*e.g.*, Ewald and Dillmann) would compare it to Jer. ii. 27-30, in which the prophet laments that the frequent purification of calamity has not separated the metal from the dross; or may we, with Professor Cheyne, assimilate it to the prediction in Zechariah, and translating "Behold I have refined thee, but not *as* silver," interpret the distinction to imply that the Divine furnace of affliction is less severe and more discriminating than the furnace of the human refiner?[1]

[1] Note that in Prov. xvii. 3 the comparison merely means that God, with perfect knowledge, weighs the human heart in the balance of judgment (cf. xvi. 2); xxvii. 21 is obscure.

From metals fashioned into implements of war there are still a few metaphors to be collected.

They are usually employed when dealing with Israel's enemies. The cruel and reviling tongue is naturally comparable to a sword. So in the Psalms: "Their teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword." "They have whet their tongue, like a sword, and stretched their arrow—a bitter speech" (lvii. 5, lxiv. 4; cf. lix. 8; Prov. xii. 18, v. 3, 4). But II. Isaiah uses the sword differently in the soliloquy of the Servant: "God hath made my mouth as a sharp sword, in the shadow of his hand he hid me; and he made me a polished shaft, in his quiver he covered me" (xlix. 2). This verse leads us on from the sword to the bow. The true bow may be an emblem of strength (Gen. xlix. 24; Hosea i. 5; Jer. xlix. 35; Job xxix. 20), while the bow whose arrow flies aslant is the emblem of deceit (Hosea vii. 16; Ps. lxxviii. 57). God's arrows are the calamities he sends (Deut. xxxii. 23; Job vi. 4), but to a man's arrows may be compared his best support. So the Psalmist: "As arrows in the hand of a warrior, so are sons of (a man's) youth. Happy is the man that has filled his quiver therewith" (cxxvii. 4, 5). The slinger furnishes a metaphor to Jeremiah for violent expulsion and captivity (Jer. x. 18), and a twofold sling metaphor in a prose book is familiar to us all from the spiritualised use of its first half upon every tomb within the "House of Life": "And should a man rise up to pursue thee, and to seek thy soul, may the soul of my lord be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God; but the souls of thine enemies, them may he sling out, as from the hollow of a sling" (1 Sam. xxv. 29. Prov. xxvii. 17 is obscure).

Most of the biblical metaphors have been included in one or other of the foregoing classes. A few, however, yet remain which are interesting from a religious point of view, and should not, therefore, be passed over. We have already noticed the large number of natural objects to which God, in one or other of his aspects or operations, has been com-

pared. He was likened to beasts of prey, such as the lion and the bear; to birds that carry their young upon their wings, or flutter hovering over the nest; to a stream and to a fountain; to rain and to dew; to destroying fire and to purifying light. In the Psalms, in addition to these, he is also addressed in prayer as a rock, a tower, and a shield.[1] Passing over the ordinary anthropomorphisms of God as warrior and judge, we have found him represented as, or likened to, a father, a mother, and a husband; as a shepherd, with Israel for his flock; as a refiner or as a potter, with Israel for his metal or his clay. A prayer in the book of Jeremiah (xiv. 8, 9) adds to this last by complaining that God, whose intercession and deliverance amid the prevailing trouble had been vainly sought, has become "as a stranger in the land, and as a wayfaring man that turneth aside to tarry for a night." It is more usual to speak of God as the host or owner; man as the guest and sojourner. Thus besides the mystic allusions to God's house with which I have dealt elsewhere, we get metaphors such as that in Lev. xxv. 23, where the figure is half real and half metaphorical: "The land is mine, and ye are strangers and sojourners with me." The figurative sense predominates in the fine prayer put into David's mouth by the Chronicler: "We are strangers before thee and sojourners, as all our fathers were; our days on the earth are as a shadow, and there is no hope" (1 Ch. xxix. 15)—a verse partly borrowed from an earlier Psalm (xxxix. 13).

---

[1] Cf. also Isaiah xxv. 4, 5: "Thou hast been a fortress to the weak, a fortress to the poor in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat. As heat in a parched land, thou subduest the uproar of foreigners; as heat by the shadow of clouds, the song of terrible ones is brought low." 4*b* is omitted as a gloss; so Dill. Note how God's action is first compared to heat, and then to the shadow which overcomes the heat. Compare Is. xxxii. 2: "A great man shall be as a hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the rain-storm, as rivulets in a parched land, as the shadow of a huge cliff in a thirsty land." The cool protection of the shade is strikingly used in the appeal: "Make as the night thy shadow in the midst of the noon" (Isaiah xvi. 3).

Again, many examples of the transference by metaphor of the physical into the spiritual sphere have already been instanced. Here, in conclusion, may be adduced a few others, which seem to fall outside our categories.

First may be mentioned three metaphors concerning the heart, of which the first two were clearly framed to contrast outward form with inward spirit. Whether Jeremiah, or his contemporary the Deuteronomist, first coined the happy phrase of "circumcising the heart" is a disputed point in criticism. At any rate, this heart-circumcision appears to be the only form of that rite which is countenanced or approved by the law-giver. Joel's bidding is expressed in a metaphor of similar kind, "Rend your heart and not your garments" (ii. 13); while Ezekiel, the supposed "legalist" and man of externals, must be credited with the invention of the metaphorical opposition between the "heart of stone" and the "heart of flesh" (xi. 19; xxxvi. 26).

Another interesting set of spiritual metaphors is the transference of bodily infirmities to the religious sphere. Thus sickness is a type of sin, and, as sin and affliction are closely co-ordinated, it is also a type of calamity. Already in Hosea it is found as a figure for the "corruption of the body politic" (v. 13, see Cheyne; vi. 1). Isaiah, in a splendid personification of the State, works out the metaphor more fully. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint. From the sole of the foot, even to the head, there is no sound part in it; wounds and wales and festering sores—not pressed, and not bound up, and not softened with oil."[1] Wounds and breaches (here the figure is from a wall) are frequent metaphors for calamities in Jeremiah. For in his day the breach was incurable, and the wound desperate. No medicine or plaster could heal

[1] Isaiah i. 5, 6. So Cheyne, except that with Dillmann I have substituted, "the whole head" for "every head." Cp. metaphors with νιοεῖν in Greek.

them, no Gilead balm or physician effect a cure.[1] In the Psalms sickness is more directly associated with sin. Calamity and iniquity are co-ordinated in the distich: "There is no soundness in my flesh for thy fervent ire; no health in my bones because of my sin."[2] with which one might compare the double use of the word in Isaiah liii., in which the sinless Servant is described "as a man of pains, and familiar with sickness," whereas he it was who "bore our sicknesses and carried our pains" (liii. 3, 4).

More specifically we frequently find the infirmities of eye and ear transferred to the lack of comprehension and knowledge of spiritual truth. To close the eyes is to shut the capacity of spiritual discernment. Thus Isaiah is bidden: "Make the heart of this people fat, and its ears heavy, and its eyes besmear, lest it should see with its eyes and hear with its ears, and its heart should understand, and it should be converted and be healed" (vi. 10; and cf. xliv. 18; for the fat heart cf. Ps. xvii. 10; cxix. 70). And the same figure recurs as an amazing passage in a later chapter, which is itself a perfect forest of metaphors:—

> Astonish yourselves, and be astonished; blind yourselves, and be blind! They are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink. For Yahveh hath poured out upon you a spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes which see, and your heads hath he covered, so that the vision throughout is become unto you as the words of a sealed book, which if one delivers to a man that is book-learned, saying, Pray read this, he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed; and should the book be delivered to one that is not book-learned, saying, Pray read this, he saith, I am not book-learned.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Jer. viii. 21, 22, x. 19, xiv. 17, xv. 18, xxx. 12, 17, xxxiii. 6; cf. Nahum iii. 19.

[2] Ps. xxxviii. 4, 6; cf. vi. 3, xxxi. 11, xxxii. 3, xli. 4.

[3] A striking simile from a scroll is that in Isaiah xxxiv. 4, "The heavens shall roll up as a scroll, and all their host shall fade, as foliage fades from the vine, and as fading leaves from the fig-tree." Cf. Steinthal *Zu Bibel und Religionsphilosophie*, p. 46, "*Poetisch gewaltiger wirkt die dritte Form, wenn das Bild das Kleine bietet, an welchem gemessen die Sache ihre Grösse offenbart.....Diese Form dürfte in der Bibel die häufigste sein.*" The Greek Rhetoricians would hardly have approved of this method.

Yet in the time to come, "a very little while," "the deaf shall hear the words of a book, and out of gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind shall see" (xxix. 9-12, 18; cf. xxxii. 3, 4). In the great list of curses in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy analogous metaphors are employed: "Yahveh shall smite thee with madness and blindness, and astonishment of heart, and thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways" (xxviii. 28, 29; cf. Is. lix. 10). The Babylonian Isaiah (and his disciples?) is especially fond of this metaphor, and he associates it with others, such as those of the dungeon and of thirst, which all express the same line of thought, though occasionally, as in the case of the dungeon, a more literal reference may be also possibly combined. I need here do no more than allude to the famous contrast of the Janus-faced Servant in the forty-second chapter, who in his higher aspect so spiritually keen and tender "that he will not break the crushed reed nor quench the dimly-burning wick," and destined "to open blind eyes, to bring out captives from the prison, and those who sit in darkness from the house of restraint," is in his lower aspect himself among the deaf deafest and blindest among the blind.[1]

The idea of self-purification or of Divine forgiveness lent itself naturally to metaphor. For inward sin is described as outward impurity. Man is either bidden to wash him of his sin and be clean, or he bids God to do it for him (Isaiah i. 16; Ps. li. 4, 9). It is only through judgment that God can wash away the filth of the daughters of Jerusalem (Isaiah iv. 4); and at a later period the wickedness of Judah was such that, "though thou wash thee with natron and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is in-

[1] Isaiah xlii. 3, 7, 18-20; cf., too, xliii. 8. For the figure of the reed see Cheyne, and cf. xxxvi. 6; Ez. xxix. 6-7, where it is used as a figure of the outward weakness of Egypt. In Ps. xxxviii. 14, deafness and dumbness are emblems of humility; cf. Is. liii. 7. In Isaiah xxxiv., xxxv., many images of the great Second Isaiah are imitated and exaggerated. See Dillmann.

grained before me, said the Lord God" (Jer. ii. 22). Yet God can work the miracle: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness will I cleanse you" (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; cf. Ps. xxvi. 6, lxxiii. 13). The ordinary words for forgiveness are palpably metaphorical, the idea in each case being that the sin is removed by being covered up or wiped out from the sight and memory of God. Unforgiveable sin is "written before God with a pen of iron and with the point of a diamond" (Jer. xvii. 1; cf. Job xix. 24), or it is carefully tied up as in a bag, and laid up in store among God's treasures (Job xiv. 17; Hosea xiii. 12; Deut. xxxii. 34). But what men pray for is that God will subdue their iniquities, and cast the burden of them "into the depths of the sea"[1] (Micah vii. 19).

It would be interesting, did space allow, to consider how far certain originally material conceptions in the earlier Hebrew religion were spiritualised by later teachers. How far, for example, did the idea of God's glory free itself from material associations, and become, as God's face became, purely metaphorical? And, again, it would be interesting to discuss whether the contrary process has ever taken place, and whether within the Bible itself or in the post-Biblical period metaphors have been misunderstood and hardened into rites. A prominent instance lies immediately to hand (cf. Exodus xiii. 9-16; Deut. vi. 8, 9, xi. 18; Prov. iii. 3, vi. 21, vii. 3). And these inquiries might lead on to a more general one: how far symbol and metaphor must be always a constituent feature of religious teaching; and what, in such a case, should be their limits and their function. But these great questions are beyond the scope of an index, and beyond the powers of an index-maker.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

---

[1] I have been compelled from lack of space to omit all Biblical personifications.

THE QUOTATIONS FROM ECCLESIASTICUS IN RABBINIC LITERATURE.

THE quotations from Ecclesiasticus, or, as the Jews usually term it, the "Book of the Son of Sira," which are scattered over the Rabbinic literature, have been collected by various scholars. The last collection was made by Reifmann, in the periodical *Haasif* III. (1886), p. 243 *seq.* As far, however, as I am aware, these quotations have never been put together with full parallels, and the different readings which the MSS. and the older editions offer. Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (p. 102 *seq.*), rarely gives the Hebrew text. Dukes, in his *Blumenlese*, has only few parallels, and even Reifmann refers nowhere to Rabbinovicz's great work, *Variæ Lectiones*, which is better known by its Hebrew title of דקדוקי סופרים. Besides, there are to be found some quotations of and parallels to Sirach in Rabbinical works, which have only been edited during the last few years, and were, therefore, inaccessible to these scholars, a fact which makes their collections incomplete. In the present article an attempt will be made to supply this want.

The works employed by me for this end were, besides the usual Rabbinic literature, with its commentaries, the above-mentioned *Variæ Lectiones*, which extend in fifteen volumes over the greater part of the Babylonian Talmud. For the variations to the two quotations from the tractates *Jebamoth* and *Niddah* (which remained unedited by Rabbinovicz), I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Perles, Chief Rabbi in Munich, who collated them with the famous MS. of the Talmud in the Royal Library in that town. The Oxford

MSS. of *Jebamoth* I have collated myself. The MSS. which were at the disposal of Rabbinovicz, and to which a reference is made in this article, came from the libraries at Munich, Hamburg, Karlsruhe, Oxford, Paris, and Rome, which I have indicated by the initials, whilst the MSS. *Agadoth Hattalmud*, and the *Jalkut* (in MS.), are designated by AT and JM.

The order adopted in the present collection is to give first the quotations to be found in the Talmud of Babylon—containing, as it does, the greatest number of the references to Sirach—afterwards those to be found in the Talmud of Jerusalem, followed by quotations from the Midrashim, and the later literature. These quotations I give all in full, except the Aramaic one in Synhedrin 100*b*, which is already recognised as not having formed a part of the *real* Sirach. But I have confined myself in this place only to three classes of passages, viz., those which bear the name of Ben Sira, those which are cited from the *Kethubim*, and, thirdly, those that are introduced (even if only in a variation) with the word שנאמר, which also proves that they came from a book which had some Biblical character. As they are not to be found in the Bible, they were undoubtedly taken from Ecclesiasticus. The two exceptions made were with regard to Nos. 1 and 2 which, besides the fact that one of them is described by the glossaries as belonging to Ben Sira, leave by tone and style hardly a doubt that the Rabbi was there speaking in quotations from Sirach. The other parallels to Sirach, which are by no means yet exhausted by the various collectors, I hope to treat, at an early opportunity, in an article by itself.

The age in which the Talmuds and the Midrashim were compiled is to be found with more or less precision in every history of Jewish literature. A few words, however, seem necessary on the character of the פרקא דרבינו הקדוש ("chapter of our teacher the saint") and the *Baraitha* of Kallah. The former, which is attributed to R. Judah the Saint, on account of its beginning with a sentence

bearing the name of this Rabbi, is arranged after subjects grouped in numbers of three, four, and so on, and forms by its very nature a compilation from older works. It exists in many versions, all post-Talmudical (see Zunz, *G. V.*, 284). The most complete, however, is that edited by Herr Schönblum (Lemberg, 1877), from a MS. now in the possession of the Chief Rabbi, Dr. H. Adler. The fact that some passages in it differ from the parallels in the Talmud, which Herr Schönblum brings forward in favour of its high antiquity, proves nothing but that the compiler's copy of the Talmud varied in some places from ours. The compiler might also have had some Agadic collections which have not come down to us. Nor is the latter, the *Baraïtha* of Kallah, of an earlier age than that of the Geonim, being perhaps still later. Herr Halberstam, in his appendix to Coronel's edition (112*b*), gave some valuable hints with regard to its composition. At any rate, it does not represent the Tractate *Kallah* to which the Rabbis (*Kiddushin* 89*b*, and elsewhere) referred.[1] That part in it which pretends to be *Gemara*, and to which Nos. 19 and 20 of the present collection seem to belong, was aptly characterised by Luzzatto and Kirchheim as only "aping" the Talmud.[2] The text is hopelessly corrupt, and even the commentary of R. Abraham Ibn Yarchi is not of much help.[3] As to the

---

[1] See Zunz, *G. V.*, p. 90, and Weiss, *Geschichte der Tradition*, II., 248.

[2] See כרם חמד, VII., 219, where Luzzatto says, הלא כל זה בעין גמרא ולא גמרא ממש אלא בקוף בפני אדם ואין ספק כי מדורות מאוחרים היא. For Kirchheim, see *Hammagid*, 1865, p. 149.

[3] This commentary is only extant in two MSS., the one in the Merzbacher Library (אהל אברהם, p. 11, No. 106), and the other in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary at Breslau, which the librarian, Dr. Zuckermann, kindly lent to me. But before I received it, Dr. Perles had drawn my attention to it, and had also copied for me from the Merzbacher copy some important extracts, of which the following will not be without interest for the subject:—ואצ"ל אותם הבחורים אשר מדרך מוסר יצאו אשר לא שמעו ולא ראו וכתבו להם ספרים באהבת הנשים ובמרמתן [ובמראתן] ובלחישתן אין לי חלק בהם לא מדובשתן ולא מעוקצתן וראו

Aramaic quotation in particular (No. 22), both its rhymes and its Peitanic tendency (see notes) mark it as a late production, recalling very strongly certain Aramaic compositions for Shebuoth, which are all versifications of older and later Agadoth, imitating the *Targum Jerushalmi* both in language and style.[1]

I have given these quotations just as they are in the works from which they are taken, without putting them in verses or even providing them with stops. Such an arrangement would have implied some metrical division, which I strongly desired to avoid.

I have also added an English translation, in the preparation of which the advice of Mr. C. G. Montefiore was of great assistance. The words in square brackets are taken from other readings mentioned in the notes, while those in round brackets have been added to make the meaning plainer. Though I have done my best to give the reader a fair idea of the Hebrew, it will nevertheless always be advisable, for critical purposes, to refer to the original. That my collection will contribute much towards solving the great Sirach difficulties, I in no way flatter myself. The quotations are too few in proportion to the bulk of the book to throw much light on the problem. I must also distinctly state that the quotations do *not* always exactly correspond with references given to Ecclesiasticus. Sometimes only *one* of many sentences of the quotation is contained in Sirach, sometimes none at all. And thus they can only be

---

לכותביהם לגונזם כי המכתבים עמל כתבו שתפסו להם מקראות מארבעה ועשרים אשר נאמר ברו"ק והמשילו בתועבות הנשים ועושים מתורת אמת פלסתר לכפורת עליה פסכתר ואוי להם ולמעתיקיה החופרים [הסופרים] והבונים בהם ···· והקורא בהם עונשו כקורא ספרים [בספרים] החיצונים שאין להם חלק לעו"הב ומאן נינהו ספרי מינין ואף הקורא בס' בן סירא במקומות מועטין שיש בהם הבאי ודברי שחוק וע"כ אמר לו לאדם להתעסק בהם···· . The variations are from the Breslau MS.; the two words והבונים בהם are not there.

[1] See Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, 74-80.

used after the closest examination. But still I venture to think that the bringing together of all the passages with their *variæ lectiones* will be of some service to the student, as revealing the fact that the version of Ecclesiasticus known to the Rabbis was mostly written in pure Hebrew. And when the Rabbis who did not quote literally made some alteration, it was for such terms as are to be found in the Mishnah or the *Baraithot, e.g.*, the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan. But it seems to me that even the language of the latter differs from that of such phrases as לא לבסר לעלים מחזר and similar phrases (see Professor Margoliouth's *Inaugural Lecture*), as the language of a prayer like the eighteen Benedictions, for instance, differs from the Piyutim of Kalir and his successors. In fact, if I had found such phrases in the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan I should have marked them without the slightest hesitation as later interpolations. This point will be made even clearer in the second article, where several quotations will be given from the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan and the related literature.

In conclusion, I should like to draw special attention to the words דגנזוה רבנן לחאי ספרא דבן סירא (in No. 8), which are missing in our editions, but confirmed by many MSS. From this we might perhaps infer that Ecclesiasticus was once included in the canon, and thus it may really once have been a part of the Kethubim. The title חכמת וחכמים for Ecclesiasticus (see No. 8) is also worth noting, as it occurs only once in Jewish literature. It is also worthy of note, that, according to a statement by the late Firkowitz, (*Hammeliz*, 1868, p. 201) the Gaon R. Saadyah mentioned the author of Ecclesiasticus as שמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא and among other quotations also gave this one משונאך חבדל ומאחביך הזחר (see Ecclesiasticus vi. 13, and Benseeb's Hebrew translation, vi. 15), whilst the quotation במפלא ממך, etc. (see No. 4), he cited from a book ספר החכמה by one אלעזר בן עיראי.

Of more importance is a letter from Firkowitz addressed to Gurland (*Hashachar*, iv. 492), in which, among others

he alludes to this passage in the *Sepher Haggalui* in the following words:—ודברי המאור הגדול הרס"ג נ"ע שכתב בהקדמת ספרו הגלוי שהביא שמות המחברים בימי בית שני שכתבו חבוריהם בפסוקים ונקודות וטעמים כמו שכתבו הנביאים כתבי הקדש הא' שמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירה חבר ספר הדומה למשלי הב' אלעזר בן עיראי ס' חכמה הדומה לקהלת הג' בני חשמונאי יהודה ושמעון ויונתן ויוחנן ואלעזר בני מתתיה במה שקרה להם הדומה לס' דניאל בלשון הכשדים כלם בפסוקים ונקודות וטעמים בימי בית שני:

"The words of the great light R. Saadyah Gaon, who wrote in the preface of his book *Haggalui*, where he mentioned the names of the authors (who lived) during the Second Temple, who wrote their books divided in verses, and (provided them) with vowels and accents as the prophets wrote the Holy Scriptures. The first is Simeon the son of Jeshua, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sira, who composed a book similar to the Book of Proverbs. The second, Eleazar the son of Irai (composed a) *Book of Chochmah*, which is similar to the Book of Ecclesiastes. The third (are) the Hasmonæans, Judah, Simeon, Jonathan, Jochanan, and Eleazar, the sons of Mattathias (who composed a book) about the things which happened to them in the Chaldaic language, which is similar to the Book of Daniel. All these were (written) in verses, vowels, and accents during the Second Temple."

More full is another communication by Firkowitz, made in the Hebrew periodical *Hammagid* (1873, p. 203):—מדברי הקדמת ספר הגלוי לרבינו סעדיה ... וז"ל: ובראות הרשעים כי חברתי ספר בלשון הקדוש בפסוקים ונקודות וטעמים התחילו להתלוצץ ואמרו כי זה ספר נבואיי וזה מכלותם כי הם חשבו כי גדרי הספרים הנבואיים היותם בפסוקים ונקודות וטעמים ואינם כן גדריה כו' כי המעשה הזה ר"ל להפסיק לנקד ולהטעים רשאים לעשות כל מי שירצה כמו

שעשה שמעון בן ישוע בן אלעזר בן סירא ספר מוסר דומה לספר משלי בחלקיו ופסוקיו בנקודות וטעמים וכמו שחברו אלעזר בן עיראי ספר חכמה הדומה לספר קהלת בסדרו ופסוקיו בנקוד וטעמים וכמו שחברו בני חשמונאי יהודה ושמעון ויוחנן ויונתן ואלעזר בני מתתיה במה שקרה להם הדומה לספר דניאל בלשון כשדים מפוסק לפסוקים בנקודות וטעמים ואין אחד מהם נביא :

"From the words of the preface to the *Sepher Haggalui* by our master Saadyah . . . And these are his words: 'And when these wicked people saw that I had composed a book in the holy language (divided into) verses, and provided with vowels and accents, they began to scoff, and said that this is a prophetic book (that is they accused him of the ambition to imitate the Scriptures). But this is only through their folly, for they thought that the definitions (essential features) of the prophetic books are that they are provided with verses, vowels, and accents, but its definitions are not so, etc. For this action, viz., to divide (a book) into verses and to provide it with vowels and accents is permitted to every man who can do so if he likes; just as Simeon the son of Jeshua, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sira, composed a book on ethics which is like the books of Proverbs in its divisions (chapters), its verses, vowels, and accents; and as Eleazar ben Irai composed a *Book of Chochmah*, which is like the book of *Koheleth* in its order, verses, vowels, and accents; and the Hasmonæans, Judah, Simeon, Jochanan, Jonathan, and Eleazar, the sons of Mattathias, (composed a book) on the things which happened to them in the Chaldaic language divided into verses (and provided) with vowels and accents, without any one among them having been a prophet.'" We learn from these statements that the Hebrew version of the Book of Sira, which the Gaon saw, endeavoured, at least as regards its form, to be a close imitation of the Book of Proverbs. This would in itself make a metrical arrangement impossible. And the fact that R. Saadyah speaks only of division

into verses and the addition of vowels and accents, without mentioning any other peculiar feature, will also tend to prove that the Hebrew version of Sira which he knew was not composed in metre, otherwise he would certainly have mentioned it. The continuation of the passage quoted above from Firkowitz contains some remarks of great interest for students of the Books of the Maccabees, but I omit them, as they are foreign to my present subject. I may also mention the fact that I had lately, through the courtesy of Dr. Neubauer, the opportunity of seeing among the new MS. acquisitions of the Bodleian Library, a very old fragment, which I have strong reason to believe represents a piece from the above-mentioned *Sepher Haggalui.* It is indeed divided into verses and provided with vowels and accents, but it did not seem to me to have any metre. Now, if R. Saadyah's Sira had been metrical, we can hardly understand why he should have neglected to imitate this feature also, whilst in all other respects it served him as a model for his composition. However, we must not conceal the fact that Firkowitz is hardly a safe authority on which to base an important theory, and we must wait for the forthcoming edition of the *Sepher Haggalui* by Dr. Harkavy, before we can arrive at a definite conclusion.

(For Notes see p. 697.)

1.

ואמר רבא בר מחסיא א"ר חמא בר גוריא אמר רב כל חולי ולא חולי מעים כל כאב ולא כאב לב כל מיחוש ולא מיחוש ראש כל רעה ולא אשה רעה[1]: (*Sabbath*, 11*a*; Ecclus. xxv. 13 and 19).

Raba bar Machassia said, in the name of R. Chamma bar Guria, in the name of Rab: "Any illness but the illness of the stomach; any pang but the pang of the heart; any ache but not headache; any evil but not an evil wife."

2.

א"ל רב לרב המנונא:—בני אם יש לך היטב לך שאין[2] בשאול תענוג ואין למות התמהמה[3] ואם תאמר אניח לבני[4] חוק בשאול מי יגיד[5] לך בני האדם[6] דומים לעשבי השדה[7] הללו נוצצין והללו נובלין[8] (*Erubin*, 54*a*; Ecclus. xiv. 11-19).

Rab said to Rab. Hamnuna: "My son, if thou hast (aught), enjoy it, for there is no enjoyment in Sheol, and death does not linger. And if thou say, I will leave (aught) to my children, who will declare to thee the law in Sheol? The sons of men are like the grass of the field; some blossom, some wither."[9]

3.

אמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר רב:—כל שאין דעתו מיושבת עליו אל יתפלל משום[10] שנאמר[11] בצר אל יורה[12] (*Erubin*, 65*a*; Ecclus. vii. 10).

Rab. Chiya b. Ashi said in the name of Rab: "He whose mind is not settled within him should not pray. For it is said: He who is in trouble should not teach."[13]

4.

שכן כתוב בספר בן סירא:—במופלא ממך אל תדרוש ובמכוסה ממך אל תחקור במה שהורשית התבונן אין[14] לך עסק[15] בנסתרות[16] (*Chagigah*, 13*a*; Ecclus. iii. 21-22).

For so it is written in the Book of Ben Sira: "That which is too hard for thee seek not out, and into that which is veiled from thee inquire not. Reflect upon that which is permitted to thee; thou hast no business with secret things."[17]

5.

ומשולש בכתובים דכתיב[18]:—כל עוף[19] למינו ישכון ובני[20] אדם לדומה לו (*Baba Kamma*, 92*b*; Ecclus. xiii. 15-16).

And it is repeated for a third time in the Writings: "Every bird dwells with its kind, and the [son] *of man with his like."*

6.

כדכתיב [21] בספר בן סירא—הכל שקלתי בכף מאזנים ולא מצאתי קל מסובין וקל מסובין חתן חדר בבית חמיו וקל מחתן [22] אורח מכניס אורח וקל מאורח [23] משיב דבר בטרם ישמע (*Baba Bathra*, 98*b*).

As it is written in the Book of Ben Sira: "I have weighed everything in scales and found nothing lighter than bran; yet lighter than bran is a bridegroom who lives in the house of his father-in-law, and lighter than a bridegroom [*who lives in the house of his father-in-law*] *is a guest who invites* (*another*) *guest, and lighter than a guest* [*who invites another guest*] *is he that answers a matter before he hears it."* [24]

7.

רב יוסף אמר בספר בן סירא—נמי אסור למקרי [25] .... ואלא משום דכתיב [26] בת לאביה מטמונת שוא [27] מפחדה לא יישן בלילה בקטנותה שמא תתפתה בנערותה שמא תזנה בגרה שמא לא תינשא נישאת שמא לא יהיו לה בנים הזקינה שמא תעשה כשפים [28] (*Synhedrin*, 100*b*; Ecclus. xlii. 9-10).

Rab. Joseph said: "In the Book of Ben Sira it is also forbidden to read. But (*the reason for this prohibition is*) *because it is* [*therein*] *written: 'A daughter is for her father a vain treasure. Through his anxiety about her he does not sleep in the night; during her minority, lest she should be enticed; during her majority, lest she should commit adultery; when she has ripened, lest she should not marry; when she has married, lest she should have no children; when she has grown old, lest she should practise witchcraft.'"* [29]

8.

אמר רב יוסף מילי מעלייתא דאית ביה דרשינן לחו [30]: אשה טובה מתנה טובה [31] בחיק ירא אלהים תנתן [32] אשה רעה צרעת לבעלה [33] מאי תקנתיה יגרשנה מביתו ויתרפא מצרעתו [34] אשה יפה אשרי בעלה מספר ימיו כפלים העלם עיניך מאשת חן פן תלכד במצודתה אל תט [35] אצל [36] בעלה למסוך [37] עמו [38] יין

ושכר[39] כי בתואר אשה יפה רבים חושחתו ועצומים כל הרוגיה רבים היו פצעי רוכל[40] המרגילים לדבר ערוה[41] כניצוץ מבעיר גחלת[42] ככלוב מלא עוף כן בתיהם מלאים מרמה[43] מנע רבים מתוך ביתך ולא חכל[44] תביא ביתך רבים יחיו[45] דורשי[46] שלומך[47] גלה סודך לאחד מאלף משוכבת חיקך שמור פתחי פיך[48] אל תצר צרת מחר כי לא תדע מה ילד יום[49] שמא למחר איננו[50] ונמצא מצטער על עולם שאינו שלו[51] (*Synhedrin*, 100*b*; Ecclus. xxvi. 1-4; ix. 8, 9; xi. 29-34, and vi. 6; perhaps also xxx. 21).

Rab. Joseph said: "[*If our masters had not hidden the Book of Ben Sira*] *we might interpret*[52] *the good things which are in it. A good wife is a good gift* [*to her husband*]; *she shall be given into the bosom of the God-fearing man. A bad wife is a leprosy for her husband.*[53] *What is his redress? Let him divorce her from his house, and he will be cured from his leprosy. A good wife is a bliss to her husband; the number of his days will be doubled. Hide thine eyes from a beautiful woman, lest thou be entangled in her net. Turn not* [*to her*] *to mingle with* [*her*] *wine and strong drink. For by the form of a beautiful woman many were destroyed, and all her slain are a mighty host. Many are the wounds of the pedlar,*[54] *which accustom one to lewdness, like the spark which lights the ember.*[55] *Like a cage full of birds, so their houses are full of iniquity. Restrain many people from thy house, and bring not everybody*[56] *into thy house. Let many inquire after thy peace, but reveal thy secret* (*only*) *to one out of a thousand. Keep the doors of thy mouth from her that lieth in thy bosom. Sorrow not for the sorrow of to-morrow, for thou knowest not what the day may bring forth; perhaps to-morrow he is no more, and so he shall be found sorrowing over a world which is not his.*"

9.

כל ימי עני רעים[57] בן סירא אומר אף לילות בשפל גגים גגו[58] ובמרום[59] חרים כרמו ממטר גגים לגגו ומעפר[60] כרמו לכרמים (*Synhedrin*, 100*b*).

All the days of the poor are evil. Ben Sira said, "the nights,

too. The lowest roof[61] *is his roof, and on the highest mountain is his vineyard. The rain off (all) roofs (falls) on his roof, and the earth of his vineyard (crumbles down) upon (all other) vineyards."*[62]

10.

לכדכתיב בספר בן סירא — שלשה שנאתי וארבעה לא אהבתי שר הנרגל[63] בבית המשתאות והמושיב שבת במרומי קרת[64] והאוחז באמה ומשתין מים והנכנס לבית חבירו פתאום[65] (*Niddah*, 16*b*).

With reference to what is written in the Book of Ben Sira: "Three things I hate, and four things I do not love: A prince who frequents banquets,[66] *(a man) who makes his abode in the hills of the town,*[67] *. . . . and (a man) who enters the house of his neighbour suddenly."*

11.

בסיפרא דבן סירא[68] כתיב:—סלסליה ותרוממך ובין נגידים תושיבך[69] (*Jerushalmi Berachoth*, ed. Krotoschin, 11*b*; Ecclus. Syr., vi. 32).

In the Book of Ben Sira it is written: "Exalt it,[70] *and it shall promote thee, and it shall set thee among princes."*

12.

בר סירא אמר: — אלוה העלה סמים מן הארץ[71] בהם הרופא מרפא את המכה ובהם הרוקח מרקח את המרקחת[72] (*Gen. Rabbah*, ch. x.; Ecclus. xxxviii. 7, 8).

Bar Sira said: "God brought forth spices from the earth. With them the physician healeth the wound, and with them the apothecary compoundeth the confection."

13.

בר סירא אמר:—לב אדם ישנה פניו בין לטוב ובין לרע[73] (*Gen. Rabba*, ch. lxxiii.; Ecclus. xiii. 25.)

Bar Sira said: "The heart of man changes his countenance both for good and for evil."

14.

בר סירא אמר:—חיתה לפניו גחלת ונפח[74] בה וביערה[75] רקק בה וכבת[76] (*Lev. Rabbah*, ch. xxxiii.; Ecclus. xxviii. 12).

Bar Sira said: "There is a coal before a man; he blows upon it and it is kindled; he spits upon it, and it is quenched."

15.

אמר בן סירא—בטרם תדור הכן נדריך בל תהיה כמתעה[77] (*Tanchuma* וישלח, § 8; Ecclus. Syr. xviii. 15).

Ben Sira said: "Before thou vowest prepare thy vows, lest thou be like a deceiver."[78]

16.

א"ר אלעזר כתוב בבן סירא:—אוקיר לאסיאך עד שלא תצטרך ליה[79] (*Tanchuma* מקץ, § 10; Ecclus. xxxviii. 1).

R. Eleazar said: "It is written in Ben Sira: 'Honour thy physician before thou wantest him.'"[80]

17.

מתלא אמר בן סירא:—טב לביש לא תעביד ובישא לא ימטי לך[81] (*Tanchuma* חקת, § 1; Ecclus. xii. 4, 5).

Ben Sira said a proverb: "Do no good to the bad, and evil will never happen to thee."[82]

18.

וכן מתלא אמר:—אם בנערותיך לא חפצתם איך תשיגם בזקנותיך[83] (*Aboth de R. Nathan*, ch. 24; Ecclus. xxv. 3).

And so the proverb says: "If in thy youth thou hast not [gathered] them, how wilt thou find them in thy old age."[84]

19.

וכן בן סירא אומר:—הדר אלהים בני אדם והדר בני אדם כסותו[85]

And so Ben Sira says: "The glory of God is the sons of men,[86] *the glory of the sons of men is* [*their*] *raiment."*[87]

20.

ואמר בן סירא בענין הזה:—ועל הסליחה אל תבטח לחוסיף עון על עון ותאמר רחמיו רבים לרב עונותינו יסלח ואף עמו ועל רשעים ינוח עוזו[88] (ס׳ מעשיות, by R. Nissim; Ecclus. v. 5-7).

And Ben Sira said (with regard to) this matter: "Put not thy trust in forgiveness, to add sin to sin, saying, His mercies are great; the multitude of our sins he will forgive.[89] *And wrath is with him, and upon the wicked will rest his strength."*[90]

21.

ולעולם אל ימהר אדם לבית חבירו שכך כתו׳ בספר בן סירא:—רגל נבל מהרה אל בית ואיש מזימות יכניע רבים[91] ולעולם אל יסתכל אדם לשער חבירו שכן בספר בן סירא: אויל מפתח יביט אל בית וכבוד לאיש בבית עמיו[92] (פרקא דרבינו הקדוש, 14*a*, ed. Schönblum; Ecclus. xxi. 22, 23).

A man should never rush into the house of his neighbour. For so it is written in the Book of Ben Sira: "The foot of the fool rushes into the house, but the man of thoughts will humble many."[93] *. . . And a man should never look into the gate of his neighbour, for it is* (*written*) *in the Book of Ben Sira: "The fool looks from the door into the house, but there is honour to a man in the house of his people."*[94]

22.

כתיב בספר בן סירא:—חוי רחים לשלמא דעליה קם עלמא · רחים כל עמא ואיזדהר מגיאותא דלא יבא [95] לכל גברא, מבערא אפין מעקרא סיפין · ומבניא אילון חלף תופין · יליף ממלכין ואלופין וסעתחון למסגד תורפין וסיפא ביקוד טריפין [96] רחים עינוותא דלא תיתי לענייתא [97] דהיא מאיכא ובסירא קדם יקרא לא יאיא אלהין למאן דהוה כדין עבד גבורן דלא סבירן אלפא אלפי אלפיא מלאכין ושרפיא נקשן גפיא משמען כמתתפיא וחוא מרישא איתגאי ביומיה עטיף גיותא בגלימיה, וחו לבושיה כל יומא [98] ברם למצפצפין בשמיה מכיך רומיה [99] ומשמי שמיא מטפיל לענייא ויתמיא [100] מה משבח ויאיא חוה נבייא דאישתבח מפום בריא לית כעבדי נבייא: [101] מאן בניין מינכו אחסין בתר מלכו · ריש חכמה וסברא מדחול מקמא מרא ולא יימרינך לבך דהא לא כן [102] רובך ולא תציית לרובך [103] דטמיר בגובך: אסתכל [104] ואחני נפשך יומא דכל אפא משך כד יקוד גוף ונפש משך [105] (*Baraitha Kallah*, ed. Coronel, 7*b*).

Love peace, for on it the world is stayed. Love all people, and be careful of pride [*of the heart*] *against any man.* (*Pride*) *kindles wrath, roots out the threshold and builds up woes instead of* (*the mirth of*) *tabrets. Learn from kings and princes and their company, who worship idols, for their end was to burn in the fire. Love humility, that thou comest not to poverty. For* (*pride*) *is despised and contemptible before God. It only befits him who does great things which are not conceivable.* (*Before him*) *millions of angels and seraphim beat their wings, which they make to sound like tabrets. From the beginning he triumphed* [*in his heights*]. *He envelopes himself with glory as his garment, and this is his garment every day. But to those who whisper in his name he bows down from his heights, and from the heavens of heavens he tends the poor and orphans. How glorious and beautiful was the prophet, who was praised by the mouth of his Creator. There is none like my servant the prophet. Who among you has inherited the crown of kingdom? The beginning of wisdom and reason is the fear of the Lord. And let not thy heart tell thee that God*

[*does not understand thine iniquity*]. *And do not listen to* [*thine enemy*], *who is hidden within thee. Meditate upon, and remind thy soul of, the day on which every face is darkened, when thy body will burn and thy sun will be obscured.*[106]

23.

כתוב בספר בן סירא:—זכור את יום אסיפתך ואסוף חרפה וקבץ זכיות כי ביום אסיפת האדם אין מלוחו הון ורב כח כי המעשה נכון ילך לפניו וצדקתו תאיר עיניו[107] (*Baraitha Kallah*, ed. Coronel, 7*b*).

Remember the day of thy being gathered in (*death*), *and take away* (*thy*) *reproach. For on the day of a man's ingathering neither wealth nor plenitude of strength accompany him. But* (*his*) *work will go before him, and his righteousness will make his eyes to shine.*[108]

24.

מפרש בספר בן סירא:—לכך קורא מקום להקב"ה לפי שהוא מקומו של עולם ואין העולם מקומו:[109]

It is explained in the Book of Ben Sira: "He calls the Holy One, blessed be he, Place, because he is the place of the world, and the world is not his place."[110]

S. Schechter.

Notes.

[1] M.H.O., JM., ed. Venice, and some older commentaries, read ולא רעת אשה, and O. adds the words, כל חסרון ולא חסרון מלאך המות במערבא אמרי חסרון כים קשה מכולן. AT. and ed. Soncino, כל דעת דעה (S.) ולא דעת אשה. The former adds במערבא, etc. In the פרקא דר"ח, 22*a*, ארבעה קשין זה מזה מכת הלב קשה ממכת הגוף ומלאך המות קשה ממכת הלב ואשה רעה קשה משניהן וחסרון כים קשה מכולן. The

expression מכת הלב also occurs in the parallel in *Koheleth Rabba*, c. viii., but where, probably only by mistake of the copyist, the passage begins with ג׳ דברים, leaving out אשה רעה. In מעשה תורה (*Beth Hammidrash*, Jellinek II., 95) we have the version ד׳ דברים קשים זה מזה מכת כלב קשה בגוף חולי מעים קשה ממכת כלב אשה רעה קשה משתיהן חסרון כיס קשה מכולן. The version in חא״ר agrees with פרקא דר״הק, but reads מכת המות (instead of מלאך המות). See also כבוד חופה by Horowitz, p. 50, and notes.

[2] M. O. Soncino and AT., כי אין. [3] AT., ולמות אין התמהמה.

[4] From ed. Pesaro it would seem that some added ולבנותי.

[5] M. and the first ed. of the *En Jacob*, יודה.

[6] M., אדם. [7] M., האדמה. O., עשב השדה.

[8] In the margin of some editions of the Talmud we read here, כל זה עד נובלין הוא מס׳ בן סירא. See also Bacher, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer*, p. 26, note 171. R. Shem Tob Palqueira, in his ספר המבקש, quotes this passage in the following version: אם יש לך היטב לך כי אין בשאול תענוג .... ואם תאמר אניח לבני ולבנותי בני אדם דומים לעשבי השדה הללו רוצין והללו נובלין.

[[9] See, however, Rashi and other commentaries, as well as note 5; for the text reading gives a poor sense. I should, accordingly, be inclined to translate: "And if thou say, I will leave a portion for my children, who will thank thee (for it) in Sheol." (Cf. for חוק Lev. x. 13 and Proverbs xxx. 8, R. V.)]

[10] M. O. JM. and many older authorities (as the *Or Zarua*, etc.), have not the word משום.

[11] Ed. Pesaro has not this word. *Halachoth Gedoloth* (הלכות ברכות פ״ה) and R. Abraham, the author of the אשכול (p. 24), as well as Ed. Soncino read דאמר מר.

[12] Bacher, c. L., p. 23, note 193, and Reifmann propose to read יודה (cp. *Jerushalmi Berachoth*, 8*d*, המצר אסור להתפלל). The Vatican MS., בה״ג (p. 39), reads מֵצֵר אל יורה.

[[13] See note 12. We should, accordingly, translate: "Should not give thanks," which is equivalent to prayer.]

[14] M., ואין. [15] M., חקר.

[16] As parallels to this passage we have:—

a) *Jerushalmi Chagigah*, 77*c*. ר׳ לעזר בשם בר סירה:—פליאה ממך מה תדע, עמוקה משאול מה תחקור, במה שהורשיתה, etc.

b) *Gen. Rabbath*, c. viii. ר׳ אלעזר בשם בן סירא: — בגדול ממך אל תדרוש, בחזק ממך בל תחקור, במופלא ממך בל תדע, במכוסה ממך אל (בל) תשאל, במה שהורשית התבונן. ואין (שאין) לך עסק בנסתרות

The words in the brackets give the reading of Nachmanides of this passage in the Midrash in the preface of his commentary on the Pentateuch. Brit. Mus. Add. 27,169, reads . . . . בר סירה . . . . שהורשיתה . . . . אין לך

c) *Midrash Haggadol*, MS. Montefiore, I. 2*a*, — : וכך שנו רבותינו במופלא ממך אל תדרוש, ובמכוסה ממך אל תחקור במה שהרשיתה דרוש, ואין לך עסק בנפלאות Compare also מדרש כונן (in *Beth Hammidrash* Jellinek II., p. 34), where we read כ"כ בספר בן סירא במופלא ממך אל תחקור ובמכוסה ממך אל תדרוש ובמה שהורשת התבונן ואין לך עסק בנסתרות.

[[17] The version of the Jerushalmi is: "R. Lezer (said), in the name of Bar Sira, 'It is too hard for thee; what canst thou know? It is deeper than Sheol; what canst thou inquire? In what,'" etc. *Gen. Rabbah* has: "R. Eleazar, in the name of Ben Sira, said: 'That which is greater than thou art, seek not out; into that which is stronger than thou art, inquire not; that which is too hard for thee, thou shalt not know; about that which is veiled from thee, ask not. Reflect upon that which is permitted to thee; and (according to another reading 'for') thou hast no business,'" etc. The Midrash *Haggadol* has: "And so taught our teachers—that which is too hard," etc. (as in the text). "That which is permitted to thee, seek out," etc. (Cf. also Mr. Streane's "Translation of Chagigah," p. 67, and the references there given.)]

[18] H. F. R., AT. and *Jalkut* have not this word דכתיב.

[19] From the *Tossaphot* (catchword משולש) it would seem that they read עוף כנף.

[20] H. R. and *Jalkut*, ובן. Interesting is the parallel in תנא דבי אליהו as quoted in *Jalkut* (123*d*), הכתוב אומר מה לתבן את הבר כל עוף למינו ישכון ובן אדם לדומה לו.

[21] M., כתיב. [22] R. adds הדר בבית חמיו.

[23] The מגדל עוז in the רמב"ם איסורי ביאה, c. 21, § 15, adds מכנים אורח

[[24] Compare Pessachim 113*a*. The Rabbis thought that for a man to live with his wife's parents might lead to immorality and extravagance in the household.]

[25] P. has after אמר the word אפילו. OT., (read ספר) ר' אמר בספר בן סירא נמי ספרי מינין הוא, while Jalkut MS. and R. Isaac Fassi read: ר' אומר הקורא בס' ב"ס בקורא בספר מינין.

[26] M. adds ביה. [27] P. adds היא.

[28] See also *Alphabetum Siracidis*, ed. Steinschneider, p. 19*a* and 30*a* and *b*, where this passage was subjected to much alteration to suit the alphabetical arrangement. Hence, *e.g.*, טמונת for מטמונת; but it is not impossible that the compiler of this work had, instead of שמא תזנה the words שמא תיאנס, which would make a good parallelism with שמא תתפתה.

[[29] The life of women with regard to certain legal questions is divided in the Talmud into three periods—minority, majority, and ripeness. The first continues till the age of twelve years and one day; the second lasts only six months, when the third begins, which lasts for the whole life. (See Maimonides' *Hilchoth Tishuth*, chap. ii., and commentaries.) Cf. however L. Löw's *Lebensalter*, pp. 138 *seq.*, and 169, where it is proved that this division dates from a comparatively late time, and was brought about by Roman influence. This shows that our quotation has suffered some alteration in course of time. See also note 28, according to which it is possible that the reading was, "lest she should be seduced by force."]

[30] M. OT., ... אמר רב יוסף אי לאו דגנזוה רבנן להאי סיפרא כי הני מילי JM. and Rabbi Meir Halevi have also this reading, only adding after סיפרא the words דב"ם (=דבן סירא), whilst K. has: אמר רב אף על גב דגנזו רבנן להא ספרא דב"ם כל מילי. The א"ר was however corrected in the MS. into א"ר יוסף. In *Jebamoth*, 63*b*, where the whole of this quotation (with the exception of a single line) is to be found, it is introduced with the words כתוב בספר בן סירא.

[31] *Jebamoth*, c. L., adds here the word לבעלה, but MS. Oxford of this Tractate (Cat. Neubauer, 367) and the Glosses of R. Joel Sirkes have not this word.

[32] In *Jebamoth*, וכתיב טובה בחיק, but the MS. and Sirkes read like *Synhedrin*, only that the word אלהים is wanting in the former.

[33] In M. and K. this line is preceded by the words אשה רעה מתנה רעה בחיק רשע תנתן. Also Rashi had the first four words, but cancelled them as a bad reading.

[34] MS. of *Jebamoth*, יגרשנה וירפא מצרעתו, also K. has not the word מביתו, whilst P. reads ויתרפא בכפלים. Other versions from this passage we have, *a*) in חופת אליהו, ed. Horwitz (in the כבוד חופה), p. 56: בספר בן סירא אשה רעה מתנה רעה בחיק רשע תנתן אמר ר' אשה רעה צרעת לבעלה מאי תקנתיה יגרשה ויתרפא מצרעתו; *b*) א"ר, ח', in the ראשית חכמה has: וכן כתב בן סירא אשה רעה מתנה רעה בחיק רשע תנתן אשה טובה מתנה טובה בחיק ירא אלהים תנתן שנא' מצא אשה מצא טוב אמר ר' אבהו אשה רעה צרעת לבעלה, etc.; *c*) פרקא דרה"ק, ed. Schönblum, p. 42*b*, ... וכתיב בספר בן סירא אשה טובה שכך כתיב בספר בן סירא אשה רעה צרעת לבעלה מד' תקנתה יגרשנה ממנו ויתרפא שנ' גרש לין ויצא מדון.

[35] AT., תלמוד, MS. *Jebamoth* תלכד.

[36] M. and P., אצלה עם, and all the older editions of *Rashi* have אצלה, omitting the בעלה.

[37] P. למשוך.

[38] Older editions of *Rashi*, עמה.

[39] P. and MS. *Jebamoth* שכר, leaving out יין.

[40] I remember to have read somewhere נוכל (instead of רוכל), but am unable to identify the place.

[41] P., AT. and MS. *Jebamoth*, עבירה. See *Pirke Aboth*, ed. Dr. C. Taylor (Hebrew part), IV., 19, where with the similar phrase also these two readings occur.

[42] MS. *Jebamoth*, נופלת.

[43] K., מלאים טוב על כן גדלו ויעשירו. The word טוב was however corrected into מרמה. See Jer. v. 21.

[44] Old reading in *En Jacob* of *Jebamoth*, רוכל.

[45] MS. *Jebamoth*, היו. [46] AT., מבקשי. [47] P., סודך.

[48] P.K., AT. and JM. omit from משוכבת to פיך. It is also missing in *Jebamoth*.

[49] See Appendix to *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* (ed. Schechter, 81*b*), where the passage occurs, ועוד בחכמת חכמים אל תצור צרת מחר כי לא תדע מה יולד יום.

[50] *Jebamoth*, שתא מחר בא ואיננו; JM., למחר הוא מת.

[51] *Jebamoth*, ed. נמצא מצטער על העולם שאין שלו; but MS. *Jebamoth* and *En Jacob* agree with the reading of Syn. ed., whilst M. reads על יום שאינו שלו. See also ראב"ן (Prague, 1610) 121*a*, where the reading is as follows:—אל תצר צרת מחר כי לא תדע מה ילד יום שמא מחר בא ואיננו ונמצ' אתה מצטער על עולם שאינו שלך:

It is to be noticed the order in *Jebamoth* is: כן בתיהם ' אל תצר · כי לא שמא · נמצא · מנע · ולא הכל · רבים · גלה. In MS. M. of *Jebamoth* the order is מנע רבים, etc., and אל תצור, etc.

[52] "Interpret" seems to mean to use it as text for homiletical purposes. See Rashi, *ad loc.*]

[53] Some MSS. and parallels have here: "A bad wife is an evil gift: she shall be given into the bosom of the bad man."]

[54] By his frequent coming in contact with women, the pedlar's occupation was considered as an immoral one. (Cf. *Kidushin*, 82*a*.)]

[55] So Edeles, Rashi, and R. Samuel.]

[56] Instead of "everybody," one reading has "a pedlar."]

[57] M., כך כתוב בספר בן סירא כל ימי עני רעים. The parallel in *Baba Bathra*, 146*a*, the passage begins כתיב בספר בן סירא, etc., but these words are missing in the Frankfurt edition of this tractate. In the parallel in *Kethuboth*, 110*b*, וכתוב בספר ב"ס.

[58] K., AT. and JM. read גנים גנו, and so below גנים לגנו.

[59] Ed. *Baba Bathra*, ברום, but all the MSS. have ובמרום.

[60] *Baba Bathra*, מעפר. It is to be noticed that the order there is: בשפל ; ממטר ' ברום · מעפר.

[61] Some MSS. have "garden" instead of "roof."]

[62 "Crumbles down;" *i.e.*, as valuable soil.]

63 In the Talmud here (ואמרי לה שר הנרגן) ואמרי לה שר הנרגן is added. The last four words are put in brackets, in some later editions, as a sign not to be read. They are also wanting in M. See *Aruch* שר, II.

64 See *Pessachim*, 112*a*, where R. Akiba says to his son, אל תשב בגובהה של עיר. Cp. Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, I. 277, note 2.

65 M. has also not the word חבירו.

[66 According to others: "Who is spoken of in public houses."]

[67 According to some commentaries, this means a scholar who gives lectures or teaches his pupils in market-stalls, which was considered as a sign of vanity.]

68 In the parallel *Nazir*, 54*b*, דסירה.

69 With this version agree *Gen. Rabbah*, c. xci., and *Koheleth Rabbah*, c. vii. In the parallel *Bably Berachoth*, 48*a*, no mention is made of Ben Sirah and in some editions the quotation runs [תכבדך כי] סלסלה ותרוממך תחבקנה]. There can hardly, however, be any doubt that the words in brackets were interpolated by some later hand to make the quotation agree with Prov. iv. 8. Indeed, they are wanting in the MS., whilst all other editions (Soncino, Venice, Basel, Cracow) read instead ובין נגידים תושיבך. Many old authorities again, as R. Isaac b. Moses of Vienna (או"ז I., § 198), and the Tossaphists (*Erubin*, 65*a*, and *Baba Kamma*, 92*b*) read נדיבים (instead of נגידים). MS. Coronel (בית נתן, 29*a*), quotes first the verse from Proverbs and adds to it וכתיב בספר בן סירא ובין נגידים תושיבך. This seems also to have been the reading of some Geonim, see תשובות גאונים קדמונים, 23*b*.

[70 According to the application of the Talmud, "it" means the Torah. (Cf. Prov. iv. 8.]

71 From the commentary attributed to Rashi, it would seem that the author read וכתב בן סירא העלתה סומכי (perhaps סממנין), מן הארץ, whilst the ספרי רבותינו שבכרך agreed with our reading.

72 See Rashi, *ad loc.*, who reads והרוקח מרקח מרקחותיו. B. M. Add. 27,169 reads בר סירה · · · מרפא המכה ורוקח את המרקחת, while MS 16,406 has אם העלה סמנין . . . רוקח. The Rashi Commentary, MS. Oxford 147 has, as Dr. Neubauer kindly informs me, והבשם רוקח.

73 B. M. Add. 27,169 reads בין טוב בין רע

74 *Jalkut* I. 192*c*, on גופה. 75 *Jalkut*, *ib.*, בערה.

76 *Jalkut*, *ib.*, כבתה. It is to be noticed that *Jalkut* does not give the source. B. M. Add. 27,169 reads בר סירה . . . כבת

77 Reifmann suggests to read כמנסה, in accordance with Ecclus. xviii. 15.

[78 See note 77, where I refer to Reifmann, who proposes to read, "as one *tempting* God." I rather think that the phrase is taken from Gen. xxvii. 12.]

[79] The parallel in *Jerushalmi Taanith*, 66*d*, is : א״ר לעזר אוקיר לאסייך עד דלא תצטריך ליה. The *Pessikta Rabbathi* (ed. Friedmann, 127*a*) has א״ר אליעזר כבד את רופאיך עד שלא תצטרך לו, whilst *Exod. Rabbah*, c. xxi., reads, א״ר אלעזר בן פדת המשל אומר כבד את, etc. See also *Alphabetum Sir.*, 1*a*, אוקיר לאסיא, etc.

[[80] This sentence is also mentioned as a popular proverb.]

[81] In *Tanchuma*, ed. Buber IV. 50*a*, the words בן סירא are missing. In the parallel in *Lev. Rabba*, c. xxii., the reading is דברייתא אומרין טב לביש עבדת בישא and instead of עבדת טב לביש לא תעביד וביש לא מטא לך ובישא the reading there is וביש, etc. *Gen. Rabbah*, c. xxii., has מן תמן אינון אמרין טב, etc. See also *Koheleth Rabbah*, V., where the words וטב לביש אין עבדת בישא form the end of the sentence. *Alphabetum Sir.* reads also מטא (instead of ימטא).

[[82] In some parallels this sentence is also mentioned as a popular proverb, without giving the name of Ben Sira.]

[83] Some MSS. have שנאמר מנעורך לא קצצת איך תשיגם בשיבתך, whilst another MS. reads, וכן מתל אומר בנערותך לא קפצת מינהו איך תשיגה בזקנותך (see 73*b*), etc. Probably it ought to be corrected into קבצת.

[[84] The sentence refers to the study of the Torah.]

[85] Quotation in the שבולי הלקט (ed. Buber 23*a*), from the *Tanchuma*, not to be found in our editions; cp. Buber's introduction to this book, 50*a*, where the reading בסותן is given. In the לקוטים of the ילמדנו, in Jellinek's Beth Hammidrash, VI., 85, we read : בן סירא אומר הדרים [הדר אלהים] בני אדם והבגדים מכבדים האדם. See also, תניא רבתי, ed. Horwitz, p. 31 and notes. Another version of הדרים is to be found in ד׳א זוטא, cc. 5 and 10.

[[86] This adage is connected with the Hagadic notion that God has created men (and especially Israel) with the express purpose that they should proclaim his praise. Thus Is. xliii. 21 is explained : "The people which I have formed for myself *with the purpose that* they shall tell forth my praise." (See *Numb. Rabbah* xlv.) Proverbs xiv. 28, "In the multitude of people is the king's honour," is also applied to God as the King, whilst Israel is the people. (Cf. Sukkah 52*b* and references, and see in particular Jalkut Shimoni II. 148*d*. (ed. Frankfurt).]

[[87] Befitting dress was regarded by the Rabbis as the glory of the outward man. Thus the scholar, amongst other indications, is also to be recognised by his dress (Derek Erez Suta, c. v.), whilst R. Jochanan is said to have called his dresses, "the things which do me honour" (*Sabbath*, 113*a*). See also 1 Cor. xi. 7 "As he (the man) is the image and *glory* of God." This parallel was suggested to me by Dr. C. Taylor.

[88] Reifmann proposes to read רוגזו. The first who has drawn attention to this quotation is Rapoport in his biography of R. Nissim, in בכורי

העתים, XII., p. 80, note 40. I have taken the ed. of Constantinople, 1519, which also agrees with ed. Venice, 1544, p. 76*a*. Ed. Ferrara, 1557, p. 40*a*, from which all later editions have borrowed, has ואמר בן סירא ובסליחה אל תבטח להוסיף עון על עון ותאמר ורחמיו רבים לרב עונותי יסלח לי ורחמיו רבים ואף עמו ועל רשעים ינוח עוזו: Dr. Taylor suggested to me that according to the Greek there must have been the word חסד or חן before ואף. Perhaps the repetition of ורחמיו is meant for this. I doubt, however, whether the Ferrara edition can count for more than a reprint.

[89 See note 88. Accordingly, we might here add: "And though his mercies are great, wrath also is with him," etc.]

[90 Reifmann suggests that we ought to read "his anger," instead of "his strength."]

91 Brüll, Jahrbücher, vii. 48, proposes to read יכנע מפני רבים, in accordance with the Latin version. Perhaps the reading should be, with the Syriac, יכניע ראשו.

92 Brüll, *ib.* 47, proposes to read יעמד. Herr Schönblum's quotation in the Introduction (viii.) בבית חמיו, is wrong. The liberality of the Rev. Dr. H. Adler, from whose MS. Schönblum edited this piece, enabled me to collate this quotation (71*a*), which is as given in the text.

[93 See note 91. Dr. Brüll's emendation, "he will be humbled before the many," hardly conveys any good sense. If my own suggestion be correct, we should translate: "But the man of thoughts will bow his head."]

[94 See note 92. According to Brüll's emendation, we should translate: "It is an honour to a man to *stand*;" and we should have to supply the word, "without."]

95 Coronel suggests to read דלא יאה. Perhaps it ought to be דליבא (the pride of the heart.)

96 See *Baba Bathra*, 10*b*. כל המתיהר נופל בגיהנם.

97 See *Sabbath*, 33*a*, עניות סימן לגסות הרוח.

98 See *Pesikta Rabbathi* (ed. Friedmann), 163*b*, and parallels (Ps. cxiii. 1). בשנגלה על הים לבש גאות שנאמר ה' מלך גאות לבש. Accordingly, we might perhaps read here בסוף ימא.

99 Most of these passages were probably based on the אותיות דר' עקיבא (*Beth Hammidrash*, ed. Jellinek, III., 29), where we read, with allusion to Ps. xxxiv. 19: דבר אחר קרוב ה' לנשברי לב שכל שבורי לב חביבין לפני הק'ב'ה יותר ממלאכי השרת שמלאכי השרת מרוחקין מן השכינה שלשים וששה אלפים רבבות פרסאות שנאמר שרפים עומדים ממעל לו .... אבל שבורי לב הב"ה קרוב להם . לנשברי לב הוא קרוב ולא לנמהרי לב .... אלא מלמד שהק'ב'ה הוא מרחיק שכינתו מעל גבהי לבב ברם. The words למצפצפין בשמיה refer probably to Midrash on Ps. xcii. (cp. *Pesikta Rabbathi*, 114*b*), according to which Israel's prayer is not received now on

account of their not knowing the mystery of the שם המפורש, for which humility is one of the first conditions (see *Kidushin*, 71*a*, צנוע ועניו).

[100] See *Megillah*, 29*a*.

[101] See Midrash גדול וגדולה (Jellinek, *ib.*, 122) גדולה ענוה שבה נשתבח ראשית חכמה ישער הענוה פ״ו. Cp. מר״עה שנא׳מר והאיש משה עניו מאד where this Midrash is given in a complete form. Moses also belonged to those who knew the שם המפורש. See *Chapters of R. Eleazar*, c. 40, and the commentary of Loria, note 46.

[102] Probably this should be corrected to דבבך, "thy enemy." Cp. Sukkah 52*a*, where, among other designations, the יצר הרע is termed שצפון ועומד בלבו של אדם: שונא, but is also described there as צפוני, because

[103] Coronel says that the word can also be read בן.

[104] Brüll, *ib.*, proposes to read ואהעד (from the Syriac עהד).

[105] Reifmann, in the *Hakkarmel* (new series), II., p. 130, proposed to arrange and correct this whole quotation in the following way:

א) הוי רחים לשלמא
דעליה קם עלמא
רחים כל עמא:

ב) ואזדהר מן גאיותא
ולא תבזו לכל בְּרִיתָא

ג) מבערא אַפִּין
מעקרא סיפין
ומסגיא אִילָנִין חלף תוּפִּין,
אליף מְמַלְכִין ואלופין
דסגדו לְתָרָפִין
וסופא ביקוד שְׁרִיפִין:

ד) רחים ענוותא
דלא תיהי לעניותא:

ה) דהיא מאיסא ובסירא
קדם מלכא דיקרא:

ו) לא יאיא כדין
אלהין למאן דהוא
עביד גְּבוּרִין
דלא סבירין:

ז) אלפי אלפיא
מלאכין ושרפיא
נקשן גפיא
משמען בַּמתְפַּיָא:

ח) והוא מרישא אתגאי ברומיה
עטיף גיותא כגלימיה
והוא לבושיה כל יומיה,
ברם למצפצפין לשמיה
מביך רומיה:

ט) ומשמי שמיא
משפיל לענייא ויתמיא
מה משבח ויאיא
הוה נביא
דאשתבח מפום בריא:
„לית כעבדי נביא

י) „מאן נביין מיניכו
„דאחסין כתר מלכו?"

יא) ריש חכמא וסברא
מדחיל מקמי מרא

יב) ולא ימרינך לבך
דהוא לא בֶן חוּבָך
ולא תצות לדובך
דטמיר בגובך :

יג) אסתכל ואדכר נפשך
יומא דכל אפא חשׁך
כד יקוד גופך ונשׁף שׁמשׁך :

We think, however, that only the discovery of all the Midrashim on which this Piyut is based, will lead to the right understanding of it. The whole tone and style give the impression of versified Midrashim, as is the case with other Piyutim.

[106 The text of this passage is almost hopelessly corrupt. The above translation is purely tentative. Various emendations of Brüll, Reifmann, and myself have been introduced in it in order to make any sense at all.]

107 See Brüll, *ib.*, where he proposes to read פניו instead of עיניו.

[108 Cf. the so-called *Perek Kinyan Torah* : "For in the hour of his death neither silver, nor gold, nor jewels, nor pearls accompany the man, but only Torah and good works."]

109 This quotation is given by R. Isaac Solomon in his commentary to Aboth MS. (in the Library of St. John's Coll. Camb., MS. K. 7) on Perek II., 13. I owe it to the kindness of Dr. C. Taylor, who drew my attention to it and lent me the proofs of his Catalogue of Aboths, from which I have copied it. I could not find it in my version of Ecclus., but it is to be found in *Genesis Rabbah*, c. lxviii. (see also parallels, esp. Pessikta Rabbah ed. Friedmann 104*b*). I greatly suspect that it was originally בראשית רבה, which was afterwards abbreviated, as usual, into ב"ר, of which another copyist made ב"ם, which was lastly expanded into בן סירא.

[110 Such a passage is to be found in the Midrashim. See especially *Gen. Rabbah*, c. lxviii., on the verse, "And he lighted upon the *place*" (Gen. xxviii. 10), where the word *place* is interpreted by some Rabbis to mean *God*. On this R. Hunna says, in the name of R. Ammi, "Why do they surname God by place? Because," etc. (See Dr. C. Taylor's notes, Aboth, ii. 17, for parallels in the New Testament and Philo. Cf. also E. Landau's *Synonyma für Gott in der Neu-Hebräischen Literatur* (Zurich, 1888, pp. 30-47.]

THE SABBATH LIGHT.[1]

NARRATIVES of successive and connected events are either scientific, religious or legendary. Scientific when reporting facts supported by evidence; religious or dogmatic when the professors of a creed are asked to believe them in the interests of their creed; legendary when the narratives are preserved in a people's memory, generation after generation, and no demand is made on universal acceptance.

The memorials raised to the past are likewise of a three-fold character; according to the class of historical subject they are intended to figure. For it is not only the dogmatic narrative that is utilised by religion; the mythical and historical forms are also pressed into its service. A religious memorial may even be built up out of various historical elements intimately blended.

The Lights associated with Chanukah, for example, perpetuate a historical fact—the Maccabean victory over the Syro-Greeks. They recall, at the same time, a popular legend—the miracle of the flask of oil. The religious principle which these Lights bring to view is the conviction that Judas' victory was achieved not by natural means, but through the direct interposition of Providence. The Rabbis attached great importance to the duty of reviving and fostering the historical consciousness of the nation. The Talmud records the legend. The Liturgy of the festival recites the historical facts. The ceremony of kindling the Lights—a memorial of ancient times—receives, at the hands of our wise men, the force of a divine commandment.

---

[1] An Address delivered on the first evening of the Feast of Lights, 1890, to the Afiké Jehudah Society in Prague.

Hence the form of its accompanying blessing: "Praised be thou, O Lord our God, who hast sanctified us with thy Commandments and *commanded us* to light the Chanukah Lights."

The Talmud (*Sabbath* 23*a*), after stating that Rav, the Head of the College of Sura, composed and *introduced this Benediction,* rightly enough asks, "Where has God commanded us?" The answers are as follows:—

"R. Avya says: 'The injunction to abide by the decision of the highest religious authorities applies not only to their interpretation of the law, but also to the innovations they introduced.'"

"R. Nechemya says: 'The institution of Chanukah Lights may be directly and specifically deduced from Scripture. For the Torah bids us note the events that befall our race and treasure them in our memories. Does it not say, Remember the days of old; consider the years of every generation; ask thy father, that he may tell thee, and thy elders that they declare unto thee?'" (Deut. xxxii. 7.)

But how else than through memorials can ancestors speak to their remote descendants?

In truth, no people possesses so many and such various historical monuments as the Jews. These are not works of art, in stone or bronze. Our national heroes were conscious that to their people the future belonged. They speak of "the last days" when, according to their prediction, all mankind would be saved. They, likewise, had a prevision that their race would be dispersed in all parts of the world. Therefore the Jewish memorials were closely interwoven with the Jewish life. History was embodied in institutions and observances. Not only are the Jewish feasts and fasts such memorials, but also a large, if not the largest portion of our ceremonial laws, including, in part, those relating to diet. Everything almost in Judaism is אות, Sign; זכר, Memorial; זכרון, Remembrance; עדות, Testimony.

In observing the life of a Jew, and his customs from the

beginning of the year to its end, you are reading a volume of hieroglyphics which contains the history of thousands of years.

The Psalmist, when rehearsing the past history of his people, gives clear expression to this idea: "What we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us, we will not hide from our children; showing to the generation to come the praises of the Lord, and his strength, and the wonderful works that he hath done. For he established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born; who should arise and declare them to their children" (Ps. lxxviii. 3-6).

To one of these signs I purpose drawing your attention to-day, viz., the Sabbath. This monument of Jewish antiquity is covered with numerous inscriptions. First and foremost, the Sabbath is the day on which our forefathers are traditionally said to have entered into a holy covenant with God at the foot of Mount Sinai. Our oldest Rabbinical historical work, the *Seder Olam*, notes this fact, "The Decalogue was revealed on the sixth day of the third month; which, in that year, fell on a Sabbath." The Sabbath, then, was a sign that God had sanctified Israel. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; *that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you*" (Ex. xxxi. 13). The Fourth Commandment expresses, in its first sentence, the same idea. "Remember the Sabbath Day to sanctify it"—*i.e.*, keep this day in mind as a day of sanctification. In the Book of Deuteronomy, where the Commandment is simply repeated, the phrase used is naturally, "Observe the Sabbath."

The Sabbath, being the seventh day of the week, and marking the conclusion of a period of time, is a sign that God created the world in six days. "It is a sign between

me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth." (Ex. xxxi. 17.)

Finally, the ordained day of rest commemorates Israel's redemption from Egyptian slavery. Special prominence is attached in Deuteronomy to this aspect of the Sabbath, "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt" (Deut. v. 15).

This weekly festival is distinguished by a peculiar custom. At its arrival and departure lights are kindled and appropriate blessings recited. The custom is remarkable, if only in this respect, that husband and wife take equal part in its performance. On the eve of the Sabbath the wife kindles the lights, and praises God for having appointed the institution.[2] At the exit of the Sabbath, however, it is the husband's duty, as soon as he sees the flame of a fire or candle, to praise God for having created those artificial rays.

In the first blessing and the ceremony connected with it, the point of interest is not the blessing itself, but the circumstance that the duty of kindling the Friday evening Lights is relegated to the wife. The blessing may have been introduced by the women themselves. It is unknown to the ancient Rabbinical literature, being first mentioned in the Gaonistic period, and its retention was, in a subsequent epoch, debated. What is the purpose of the Sabbath Lights? is a question that has been justly raised. The Karaites repudiate the institution; and, at one time, many of them used every Friday evening, as a practical protest, to sit in total darkness; a foolish practice which was gradually abandoned.

The second question that needs solution is, Why is it especially women's duty to kindle the Lights? The Talmudic reply to these queries is that the precept aims at

---

[2] Its extension, in course of time, to the other festivals forms a debatable topic among the later decisionists. Its discussion falls outside the scope of this address.

securing שלום בית—*domestic peace.* This phrase is usually explained in a utilitarian sense. Jews are forbidden to kindle fire on the Sabbath day. Unless, therefore, lights were lit before the Sabbath was ushered in, the harmony of the household might suffer. This rationalistic justification, however, can hardly be accepted by itself as sufficient. An entire chapter of the Mishnaic treatise, "Sabbath," the noted *Bameh-Madlikin*—the retention of which in the Liturgy has been the subject of so much controversy—is devoted to the discussion of this institution. Would it be hedged round with so many prescriptions and regulations if its object were nothing else than to secure household harmony? If this were indeed so, it would be a keen satire on later times, that an institution founded for the purpose of promoting peace, should indirectly have been a source of dissension.

Moreover, this view does not adequately explain the harsh threat of punishment which, according to a statement at the end of the chapter, will be meted out to those women who are negligent in the fulfilment of this duty.

Thus, the problem remains why this obligation was made especially incumbent on women. Surely it is the master's place to take measures to insure peace and quiet at home. The rationalistic school, that of Maimonides, for instance, readily replies that all household duties devolve upon the mistress.

A glance at the older Hagadists will convince us, however, that they did not look at this custom from so simple and narrow a point of view. Their pronouncement on the subject sounds somewhat mystical: "A woman it was who extinguished the light of life. Women, therefore, shall make atonement by kindling the Sabbath Lights." Reasons of this mystical character are poetical enough, but fail to satisfy the historian. A critical study of the style in which the Mishnah treats this custom proves that, at that time, it was already an ancient and firmly established institution, which the Rabbinical authorities only desired to

modify and regulate. The style of the Mishnah also makes it evident that it was not the ordinary household illumination, but a special Sabbath Lamp that formed the subject of discussion. This is also a just inference from the turn of the phrase להדליק נר של שבת.

These considerations will guide us to a right conclusion if only we consider the manner in which customs originate and spread. Of course, every custom has its own history and development. Nevertheless, the following may be accepted as generally applicable.

Many customs are nothing else than ghosts of obsolete prescriptions. When a nation changes its religious conceptions and gives up the institutions connected with its old cast-off beliefs, these institutions are apt to reappear in a new dress, adapt themselves to the new religious constitution, and survive as customs. Women especially display a conservative tendency in clinging to these old usages. Of many examples which might be given one must here suffice.

On New Moons it was, and in many congregations still is, the custom for women to abstain from work. It is clear, from several passages in the Bible, that, in the days of the Prophets, the New Moon was regarded by the people as a festival like the Sabbath. The Mosaic legislation, however does not include it in the list of festivals named in Leviticus. It is, however, mentioned in the Book of Numbers as a day on which a special offering was to be brought. The Mosaic Code, indeed, besides the seventh day of the week, instituted only seven other annual holidays. We are justified in assuming that the feast of the New Moon had maintained itself among the people as a heritage from pre-Mosaic times. At a subsequent period the custom of abstaining from work on this day died out, and the women's conservative instinct alone preserved a memorial of it. The origin of the Sabbath Lights may be somewhat similar. That the Sabbath itself is a pre-Mosaic institution is expressly declared in Holy Writ. After the

Sinaitic revelation, the precepts in connection with its celebration were inculcated anew, and the Sabbath was appointed a sign of the covenant between God and his people. The Midrashim contain many traditional legends in which the patriarchs figure as Sabbath observers. This, at least, is certain that the division of time into periods of seven days is very ancient.

If, therefore, it be granted that the legendary reason quoted above has an historical foundation, why should we not further assume that fires were kindled and maintained, as a religious rite, from week to week, and that the Sabbath Lights are a relic of this ancient usage. This inference is not a mere hypothesis. It is supported by an Hagadic legend. Among the pious works of our ancestress, Sarah, it is mentioned (Bereshit Rabba, c. 60) that she kept a lamp burning from Friday evening to Friday evening. It will naturally be asked, Why should the eve of the last day of the week have been selected as the time for kindling the weekly light? In order to answer this query we must refer to another mode in which customs originate. Every nation forms its own conceptions of the creation of the universe and of its development in the course of ages. The more youthful a race is, and the richer its imagination, the more poetical will these conceptions be. Their embodiment in suitable forms will find an echo in every heart. The phrase sometimes heard, "Es ist mir wie von der Seele," "it seems to come from my heart"—is nothing else but an admission that a form of embodying a popular conception has found universal acceptance.

Thus, too, a nation's poetry becomes embodied in general customs. When the poetry becomes extinct, the customs drearily drag along for a time, but finally perish, unless some fresh circumstance gives them new life. Happily the poetical idea represented in the Friday Evening Lights has been preserved in its pristine lustre. The Hagadah tells us that when God created the original light on the first day, he resolved to lay it up in his treasures for the

delectation of the saints. It was, therefore, withdrawn on the fourth day when sun, moon, and stars were created. On the sixth day, however, when "God saw all that he had made, and lo! it was very good," he illuminated the young world for thirty-six hours continuously with the dazzling rays of this primal light. On Friday evening, the angels, forming themselves into choirs, sang hymns at the dedication of the world. The Hagadist, R. Levi, with deep insight, points out that while the sentence, "It was evening and it was morning," concludes the history of each day of the Creation, the seventh day is excepted, because no evening had preceded it.

The history of the Creation closes with the words, ויכלו השמים והארץ and ויכל אלהים. These are ordinarily translated "The heavens and earth were finished," "and God finished," in agreement with the rendering of the Jerusalem Targum. Onkelos and the Pesikta, however, understood the first phrase in a different sense. ויכל, Onkelos renders, indeed, ושיצי, "he finished," but ואשתכללו is given as the equivalent of ויכלו. The Pesikta, in harmony with this rendering, expressly remarks אין ויכלו אלא לשון חנוכה. They evidently derived ויכולו from the root כלל, to adorn, to crown; whence the noun כלה, "crowned, adorned one," "bride." On the eve of the Sabbath, man's first day, the youthful world, arrayed like a bride, was given to Adam, its future ruler and possessor. This is the reason why the Synagogue, at the present day, greets the Sabbath by the title כלה, bride. So the world's illumination and consecration have left a memorial behind them in the Jewish custom of lighting a lamp at the approach of the Sabbath.

In the performance of this festive and religious rite, honour is conferred upon woman. This feature of the custom throws a flood of light upon the position assigned to women by Judaism.

When the Creation was completed, Scripture says, "God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was

very good." This judgment was pronounced after Eve—the last work in God's Creation—was called into being. For the love of wife—the foundation of family life—constituted the keystone of the world. When Eve was created, God could declare that his work was good.

Before a helpmeet was given to the first man, God said, לא טוב האדם היות לבדו—"It is not good that man should be alone." This does not mean that solitude is disadvantageous to a human being. That would have been expressed as follows: לא טוב לאדם להיות לבדו. The idea intended to be conveyed is rather that the propagation of the human race without wedlock—as in the case of the brutes—would have been intrinsically bad. So the Talmud understands this text. The phrase, "It is not good," has here a moral as well as a physical application. The optimistic Scriptural doctrine undoubtedly places marriage in the first rank of its institutions. A glance at the opposite system will make the reason at once apparent. Since Schoepenhauer's day, Pessimism has, in its various branches, notoriously gained wide acceptance. The theory, however, is nothing new. Maimonides already devoted several chapters to a refutation of Alrasi, who had written a bulky volume to demonstrate the preponderance of evil over good in human life. The doctrine is of still earlier date; we meet with it in Scripture. Those who fixed the Biblical Canon have left us an instructive work on the subject. This work is called Koheleth. In it the most opposed views are advanced, and a pessimist is also allowed to unfold his opinions. But, by a fine touch, the latter is represented as a misogynist who expresses in the strongest terms his aversion to, and contempt for, the gentler sex. Though he despises the world, he is, at the same time, a Sybarite who indulges himself in luxuries, possesses men-servants and women-servants, male singers and female singers; and, in short, obtains everything that human heart can desire. Yet, all his possessions, he says, are worthless. They fail to make existence pleasurable.

What our philosopher, however, lacks, is a faithful wife and loving children. He, indeed, would not care for them. He dislikes the thought of leaving his hard-won riches to an heir of whom he does not know whether he will turn out a wise man or a fool. Do not all these touches call to mind the modern teacher of Pessimism. But what wonder! To a man who only lives for himself life loses its flavour. Such a man has no hold on existence. "It is not good that man should live alone," is the author of Koheleth's rejoinder to the pessimist. "Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of thy vain life."[1] A child's prattle and an infant's smile make the mother forget her pain, and the father his cares; and both parents find the world good indeed. The Psalmist glorifies God in his creation, and man he exalts as but little lower than the God who crowned him with honour and glory and put all things under his feet. Knowing full well, however, how God is blasphemed, and the joys of life are poisoned, the inspired singer introduces at the beginning of his psalm a verse which at first seems to bear no relation to the whole: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength against thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." The prattle of the little ones is able to disarm an enemy who seeks vengeance, and to stop his design. So wondrously is man formed.

As for the evils that afflict the human race, most of them, Maimonides thinks, we bring upon ourselves. If society generally, and its members individually, were to order their affairs upon a reasonable and moral basis, the large majority of evils would disappear. The residue, caused by physical circumstances, would also, for the most part, be overcome.

If, however, we seek for the ultimate source of most evils, we shall find it in the boundless desire—innate in man

[1] Eccles. ix. 9.

—to assert his authority over all things on earth. The wise limitation of this impulse, and its direction into right channels, are the prerogatives of domestic affection.

A Hagadist once uttered a sentiment which has become a proverb, "Everything comes from the woman." The French Jurist's well-known *mot*, "*Cherchez la femme*," sounds somewhat similar. But while the Gallican lawyer only looks for the woman when investigating crime, the Jewish Rabbi ascribes all virtues to her influence, and illustrates his statement by examples drawn from his personal observations. A pious couple, he tells us, had lived together for a period of ten years. As their union had not been blessed with children, they agreed to separate. Both married again. But while the man's second marriage demoralised and degraded him, the woman, who had married a bad man, improved him, and raised him to her level. The strength of woman's influence could hardly have been better exemplified than in this slight narrative. The Palestinian Targum expresses a similar idea in its paraphrase of the text, "and he shall rule over thee," which ought rather to be rendered "in or by thee": "Through thee—the wife—he shall have the power to become virtuous or vicious." The mystic's saying has a profound meaning: "Woman can quench the light of life; on her, therefore, the mother of the household, falls the duty of kindling the Sabbath Lights. In the story of the Creation man occupies a middle place between the brutes and woman. Whether he is to be lifted up out of the ranks of the bestial world, or whether he is to be thrust back into it, depends entirely upon her. After the creation of woman came the Sabbath, when the young world was consecrated amidst celestial choruses and festive illuminations. Of this consecration the wife's Sabbath Lights are a memorial. The שלום בית of the Rabbis does not mean merely domestic quiet. It has a wider significance. It is intended to express the prosperity and well-being of the household in the fullest sense of the phrase.

Beautiful is the idyllic poem in which the Psalmist

describes such a happy home: "Blessed is every one that feareth the Lord, that walketh in his ways. For thou shalt eat the labour of thine hands: happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee. Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the sides of thine house: thy children, like olive plants, round about thy table. Behold, that thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord."

The vine needs the support of a stouter stock; produces, however, fruit whose juice revives and exhilarates. So the wife clings to her husband, and cheers him with her love.

The Sabbath rest is over, and, again, we hear a blessing pronounced over the lights. This time, however, it is the father who officiates as he returns to his weekly labour, refreshed and strengthened, physically and spiritually, by the Sabbath rest. It is significant that our ancient teachers call the week ששת ימי המעשה. The period of labour and production, has recommenced.

When, at the building of the Tabernacle, Moses forbade work on the Sabbath, he used a remarkable phrase to express cessation from labour: "Ye shall not kindle fire in all your dwelling-houses on the Sabbath day."

Fire is a symbol of human activity—a mark of civilisation. The use of fire raises man above the brutes, none of whom employ it. With its aid he prepares his food, smelts ore, shapes metal instruments for all purposes. But with the use of fire new wants arose; the eager pursuit of gold and silver commenced. The desire of advancing from discovery to discovery and increasing his wealth began to rage in man's heart.

If the gratification of avarice were our highest aim, then, truly, fire would have proved but a doubtful friend. For the appetite for possessions is never satisfied; it only grows by what it feeds on, and the acquisition of wealth is the source of envy and peril. Filled with pessimistic thoughts man surveys the net results of his progress, which, alas! far from satisfying him, prick and fret him. Shall he then, tear himself away from civilisation,

abandon his conquests, and return to the primæval state of nature? This he cannot do. He is chained, so to speak, to the car of progress. This dissatisfaction with his environment—a result of civilisation—has been allegorised in a Greek myth—the well-known legend of Prometheus. Prometheus stole fire from Zeus, and secretly gave it to men. By its aid he taught them arts and sciences. Zeus then sent mankind Pandora, the bringer of misfortune. Prometheus was chained to a rock and an eagle gnawed his liver, which, however, grew again overnight.

According to another legend, it was the goddess Hestia who first taught men the use of fire for domestic purposes. The passage leading to the house, where the hearth usually was placed, was therefore dedicated to her. It is noteworthy that the uses of fire in the kitchen and workshop are here put in the foreground.

Has the genius of Judaism preserved any reminiscence or memorial of the origin of fire?

There is an express law that fire should be continually maintained on the altar. Sacrifices, it seems, had originally no other object than the maintenance of fire by the combustion of fat and fuel of a similar character. Scripture terms sacrifices לחם אשה "Bread of fire," and "לחמי לאשי "My bread for my fire." That Judaism regarded this element as an essentially beneficent agency, a divine gift that increases life and vigour, while in its destructive force it only saw a condemnation of its abuse by man, is indicated in the story of the Burning Bush that was not consumed. This was Moses' initiation into his sacred mission. He was to give Israel a religion which was to render them free and happy; a heavenly flame which was to illuminate, but not destroy.

The German poet sang:

"Wohlthätig ist des Feuers Macht
Wenn sie der Mensch bezähmt, bewacht.
Und was er bildet, was er schafft
Das dankt er dieser Himmelskraft."

From the standpoint of Judaism, one might rather say that the power of fire is beneficent only when man conquers and guards *himself.* But how did man, according to the Hagadah, obtain this divine boon? This we are told in the sequel to the story—already referred to—concerning the illumination of the world on the first Sabbath. For when at the close of day the earth was wrapped in darkness, Adam's mind was filled with alarm. He feared that the darkness which had set in was to be perpetual. The Almighty took pity on him, and endowed him with a divine intuition. Adam took two stones, beat them against each other, and so discovered fire. In another version these stones are given names. One was the "Stone of Darkness," the other the "Shadow of Death." Both were taken from Hell. These names are borrowed from that part of the Book of Job where the discovery of fire is prominently mentioned in the description of human progress. The poet who wrote the book says, "Surely there is a vein for the silver and a place for gold where they fine it. Iron is taken out of the earth, and brass is molten out of the stone. He setteth an end to darkness, and searcheth out all perfection: the *stones of darkness* and the *shadow of death.*" Another legend says that God sent to Adam a pillar of fire, from which he was able to derive means of kindling a flame. All these versions conclude in the same fashion. When Adam saw the artificial light he recited a blessing to the Creator of rays of fire, בורא מאורי האש. The illuminating power of fire is in these legends dwelt upon as its most valuable function. To the Jewish mind the highest advantage derived from its use is its power of dissipating darkness. We have already noted that it was the fire of the Lamp which Sarah, the mother of the Chosen People, tended, and not that of the Hearth. It deserves also to be noticed that fire, in the Jewish account, is God's gift to man. Man had no need to steal it. Fire, as a source of light, cannot bring evil. That detail of the legend which makes hell the quarry whence the stones were taken out of which

fire was struck is also of deep significance. By his divine reason man can overcome evil, and turn it into good.

If it has been allotted to woman to give the home the religious sanctity of the Sabbath, and remind the family of the celestial light of Creation, it was made man's duty, at the expiration of the Day of Rest, when he is about to return to his weekly work, to recall the origin of artificial fire through which humanity has attained its high rank in the order of Creation. Has he made a proper use of this divine gift? He looks at his hands; nothing unworthy clings to them; they are clean, and he praises the Almighty who created the rays of light, בורא מאורי האש.

Light is thus the appointed memorial of remote antiquity. The last historical feast instituted by our ancestors is also a Feast of Lights. So may man ever walk on in light, to whom the first words of God were, "Let there be light."

M. FRIEDMANN.

WHAT IS THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON?[1]

THE ancient trunk of the Bible is surrounded by a luxurious tangle of writings, through which the investigations of recent scholars have only just begun to clear a way. The authorship, origin and tendency of these books, unequal as they are in value, are in nearly every case quite unknown. It is often uncertain whether the original language in which these Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic works were composed was Hebrew or Greek; but, nevertheless, some tests can be established which make a sure decision possible in the majority of cases. There are still extant a large number of Greek translations of Hebrew and Aramaic writings. These translations range from the first renderings of the Pentateuch down to the considerable fragments of the versions made from the age of Hadrian, onwards.

A careful scrutiny of these translations enables us to become acquainted with the methods of their compilers, with the relations between them and the Hebrew text, with their knowledge of Greek literature, their mastery over ordinary Greek idiom, their employment of dialectic, rhetorical, poetical and philosophical turns of expression. So far, however, no systematic attempt has been made at a historical presentation of this material; we possess, *e.g.*, neither Grammar, nor usable Lexicon of the Septuagint itself. Only preparatory studies—valuable in themselves—have been published, by Sturz, Thiersch, Schleussner, Zezsch-

[1] "Was the Book of Wisdom written in Hebrew?" By Prof. D. S. Margoliouth. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April, 1890, pp. 263-297.

witz, Frankel, Hatch, and others. Yet everyone must have formed an estimate of the before-mentioned characteristics of the acknowledged translations if he aspires to answer the debated question as to the original language of an Apocryphal or Pseudepigraphic book.

Though the Greek translations give evidence of differences in skill on the part of the compilers, and in their knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, their fidelity to the Hebrew original or to Greek idiom, yet in one point they are all alike, viz., in their defective *technique*. Every translation from one language into another encounters an obstacle which cannot be altogether overcome; for it attempts to express in terms of one another the incommensurable forms of two languages, and to identify that which defies identification. The power of even partially overcoming this difficulty can only be acquired by long-continued toil; it is, moreover, an acquisition of the modern world; antiquity did not possess it. Greek, Latin, and Semitic translators alike failed in this respect, and Cicero himself, with all his surpassing genius for language, was devoid of the faculty, as may be seen from his translation of the "Timæus."

The art of translation, as displayed in Germany by men like Schlegel, Rückert, and Schack, was quite beyond the reach of the translators who produced the Septuagint and the Apocryphal appendages to the Bible. When at their best, they vacillate between fidelity to the thought of the original and regard to their own literary idiom; mostly, however, they sacrifice style for sense. They never dreamed of imitating, without prejudice to the thought, the verbal peculiarities of their original, such as play upon words, paronomasia, or assonance. Biblical names, which are interpreted according to their etymology, referred to special incidents, and regarded as premonitions of the future, lose this effect in the LXX. The compilers evade the difficulty either by translating the proper names, as in Gen. iii. 20; xxviii. 19; xxxi. 48; xxxii. 3, 30, 31; xxxv.

18, etc., or more commonly they altogether abandon the attempt to reproduce the verbal similarity.

Such difficulties as regards the rendering of names are, however, inevitable, even in the best modern translations. In another point the case is different. Where the Bible plays on words, repeats the same sounds, or collocates similar expressions, the LXX. do not endeavour to imitate the peculiar effect of the Hebrew. This omission may even be seen in cases where the translators might easily have avoided it. Thus, the Hebrew of Joshua vi. 1, סגרת ויריחו ומסגרת, might very readily have been turned into something like *ὀχυρὰ καὶ ὠχυρωμένη*, and thus have preserved the assonance ; the LXX., however, write *συγκεκλεισμένη καὶ ὠχυρωμένη*. When Isaiah says, i. 23, שריך סוררים, the rendering *οἱ προστατοῦντες ἀποστάντες* obviously suggests itself ; but in the LXX. we find *οἱ ἄρχοντες ἀπειθοῦσιν*. For Isaiah's play on the words משפט and משפח, צדקה and צעקה (Is. v. 7), the parallel antitheses *ὅσια* and *ἀνόσια*, *δίκη* and *ἀδικία*, or *εὐνομία* and *ἀνομία* offer themselves of their own accord, but the LXX. make no attempt at such imitation. Jer. i. 11, 12, מקל שקד · · · · כי שקד אני, might, without forcing the language, have been turned into *βακτηρίαν καρυΐνην ὁρῶ . . . διότι καραδοκῶ κ.τ.λ.*; the LXX. write *καρυΐνην, διότι ἐγρήγορα.* The same remark applies to other passages, for instance, to Gen. xlix. 16, 19 ; Num. xxi. 9 ; Is. xvii. 1, 2 ; xxviii. 10 ; xxix. 9 ; xxxii. 19 ; xxxiv. 11 ; Jer. iii. 2 ; Hos. x. 1 ; Zeph. i. 15 ; in all of which places the LXX. does not attempt to imitate the Hebrew.

A marked distinction between Greek and Hebrew style may be found in the arrangement in periods which is characteristic of the former and altogether wanting in the latter language. Greek prose after Gorgias, with its rhetorical colouring, usually exhibits a rigorous attention to the relation of principal and subordinate clauses, producing rounded periods ; while Hebrew is content with uniform co-ordinate sentences. The LXX. are consistently faithful to the Hebrew original. Even in poetical and somewhat

rhetorical passages, they imitate every Hebrew particle, and tediously repeat *καὶ, ἀλλὰ, δὲ, γὰρ*, without ever betraying the smallest effort at the easy task of rounding off the sentences. Finally, the translators of the Bible were quite unfamiliar with the language of Greek philosophy. They knew nothing of the Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, or Epicurean terminology. They missed the opportunity of employing philosophical terms, even where the Hebrew text readily admitted of such employment; and expressions to which philosophical usage had long assigned a special meaning, the translators employ in quite another sense.[1]

The facts here adduced apply generally to all the translators of the Bible, to the oldest as well as to the latest, to the translators of the Pentateuch as to those of Proverbs, Job and Daniel. They provide the real key to the problem: In what language was the Book of Wisdom written? Yet Professor Margoliouth, who contends that Wisdom was originally written in Hebrew, ignores all these considerations; apparently he has no suspicion of their existence, for in that case he must, perforce, have taken them into account.

In the *Apocryphal History of Susanna* we read in verse 54 *seq.*: *ὑπὸ σχῖνον. ἤδη γὰρ ἄγγελος θεοῦ σχίσει σε μέσον*, and in verse 58 *seq.*: *ὑπὸ πρῖνον. μένει γὰρ ὁ ἄγγελος . . . πρίσαι σε μέσον.* Those who are acquainted with the method of the LXX. cannot doubt that these instances of Paronomasia are an irrefragable proof of the Greek origin of the book, even though other indications are almost entirely wanting. In Wisdom we find not only two detached cases of similar Paronomasia, but the entire array of stylistic adornments beloved of the Greeks from the epoch of Gorgias and Isocrates. We meet instances of equality of clauses (*ἰσοκωλία*), like endings (*ὁμοιοτέλευτα*), of Paronomasia, Alliteration, Assonance, Antithesis, *χίασμα*, of Accumulation and other rhetorical figures. See *e.g.*, vi. 11: *ὁσίως . . . ὅσια . . .*

[1] See *Jewish Quarterly Review*, II., 205 seq.

ὁσιωθήσονται; xii. 15: δίκαιος . . . δικαίως . . . καταδικάσει; xii. 25: παισὶν . . . ἐμπαιγμὸν . . . παιγνίοις; v. 10: ἄτραπον . . . τρόπιος; v. 23: ποταμοὶ . . . ἀποτόμως; vii. 24: πάσης κινήσεως κινητικώτερον; xiv. 5: ἀργὰ . . . ἔργα; xvii. 12: προδοσία . . . προσδοκία; i. 1: ἀγαπήσατε . . . φρονήσατε . . . ζητήσατε, ἀγαθότητι . . . ἁπλότητι; i. 10; οὓς . . . θροῦς; v. 15; ἀσεβοῦς . . . χνοῦς; vi. 22: παροδεύσω . . . συνοδεύσω; xiii. 11: εὐμαθῶς, εὐπρεπῶς; and so forth. The instances of Antithesis are so very frequent that even a partial enumeration is quite impossible. The figure of Accumulation is so familiar to the author of the book that in one place he applies not less than twenty-one attributes to Wisdom (vii. 22, *seq.*). Similar Accumulations are not rare in rhetorical Greek prose and in the writings of the Jewish Hellenists. A case in point is Romans i. 29 *seq.* So, too, Philo assigns thirty-four qualities to ἀρετή and one hundred and forty-eight to the φιλήδονος (*De Merc. Meretr.* II., pp. 267, 268 Mang.).

But what old Hebrew composition exhibits these characteristics? In what work of Hebrew antiquity do we find all the familiar artifices which the school of Gorgias and Isocrates taught the Greeks? And how marvellously gifted must this translator have been, seeing that he accomplished what none of his predecessors or followers succeeding in doing, in that he without apparent effort imitated the most difficult rhetorical figures of a Hebrew text!

Or shall we say that the translator patched these right Grecian beauty-spots on to his Semitic original; that he invented manifold figures of speech which were absolutely wanting in the original before him? Professor Margoliouth seems to adopt this view (p. 288). But then this version would be a unique instance, without analogue in the whole literature of translations, so far as I am acquainted with it. Besides, if this supposition were true, there would not remain much of the original in such a translation. The book would be an independent recension of a Semitic text,

and hardly distinguishable from a Greek original. Professor Margoliouth, for the elucidation of the facts now cited, appeals to Jowett's admirable translation of Plato, in which "most excellences of English style could be illustrated" (p. 286). But the "excellences of Grecian style" are not here concerned; what needs explanation is the reproduction of artistic figures of speech difficult of imitation, and the presence of literary peculiarities, some of which never occur throughout all Hebrew literature. With what right, too, does Professor Margoliouth adduce a translation made in the second half of the nineteenth century, as an indication of the manner in which a Semitic text could be turned into Greek two thousand years ago? Has the art of translating stood still for two thousand years?

Single rhetorical figures, numerous though they be, are nevertheless not the only proof that Greek was the original language of "The Book of Wisdom." The construction of the sentences leads also to the same conclusion. The character of his work and the fiction of a Solomonic authorship permit the author, in the bulk of the book, to closely restrict himself to simple, co-ordinate sentences, and adopting the parallelism which is more Hebrew than Greek, to base his style on that of the LXX. But we also find numerous subjunctive clauses, constructions with the participle and relative, Sorites, such as we meet neither in Hebrew works nor in Greek translations of them, and which accordingly betray the Greek origin of the book. The LXX. rendering of Isaiah xliv. 12 *seq.* was the model for Wisdom xiii. 11 *seq.* It is only necessary to set the passages side by side to recognise that the latter is a Greek original, while the former is a translation from the Hebrew. Or take the short sentence, viii. 21: *γνοὺς δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλως ἔσομαι ἐγκρατὴς ἐὰν μὴ ὁ θεὸς δῷ, καὶ τοῦτο δ' ἦν φρονήσεως τὸ εἰδέναι τίνος ἡ χάρις, ἐνέτυχον τῷ κυρίῳ*; or ix. 6: *κἂν γάρ τις ᾖ τέλειος ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ σοφίας ἀπούσης εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται*; or xii. 1-7, 15, 22, 24, 27; xiv. 15-17, and many others. Is it conceivable that these Greek

constructions are derived from a Semitic original? And how with the Sorites vi. 18-21? Would a Semite of olden time have employed such a chain of propositions on which to erect a regular syllogism?

There has been no one in recent times possessed of greater mastery over Hebrew than Naphtali-Herz Wessely. Yet in his Hebrew translation of Wisdom the reader readily detects the difficulty that Wessely experienced in seeking to provide satisfactory Hebrew equivalents for peculiar Greek usages, figures of speech and thoughts; one perceives how often he only succeeded in giving his translation a Hebrew colouring by the sacrifice of the meaning and of the literary form of his original; how often he was utterly powerless to imitate the peculiarities of the Greek. All these considerations leave no room for hesitation in rejecting the hypothesis of a Hebrew original to "Wisdom."

And now let us examine the contents of a number of particular verses. In viii. 7 we read: *σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν.* Here we have the four cardinal virtues of Plato side by side. What reading in the Hebrew text could have moved the Greek translator to this collocation? Wessely employs here the term עצה, but the use of this very word shows that he knows of no satisfactory Hebrew equivalent for *σωφροσύνη.* In point of fact, *σωφροσύνη* is a notion for which no equivalent exists in Hebrew or neo-Hebraic speech; it is absent from the LXX., and together with other ethical ideas first makes its appearance in purely Hellenistic writings, in the second book of the Maccabees, in the Letter of Aristeas, and in the New Testament. From which it follows that in the "Wisdom" the use of *σωφροσύνη* betrays a Greek author and not a translator. Moreover, the LXX., as I showed on a previous occasion, were not familiar with the meaning of simple philosophical terms, and similarly there is no work emanating from ancient Hebrew or Aramæan circles which contains more than some isolated philosophical expressions which had forced their way into popular use. Since, then,

we find in "Wisdom" a clear enunciation of one of the fundamental principles of Platonic or Stoic ethics, it is evident that the book could only have been written in Greek by an Hellenistic Jew.

Professor Margoliouth endeavours to forestall the effect of this argument by altering the Greek text to make it accord with the corrupt Syriac version. The Syriac renders *οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί* by לותה הי תמיהא (where we ought obviously to read לאותה with Eichhorn). Professor Margoliouth, however, retains the faulty reading as a correct rendering of the original, "With her (wisdom) is the whole of it (righteousness)"; without indicating what the *whole* of righteousness can mean. Besides, this idea entirely disturbs the context, for a reference is intended to the collective virtues enumerated in the previous clause. It surely needs no demonstration that *δικαιοσύνη*, belonging as it does to the list of cardinal virtues, must not be deleted from the list here given, because it is omitted in the Syriac version.

According to xi. 17, God formed the world *ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης*. This is again a distinctively Platonic thought, just as *ὕλη* is entirely a Greek conception, to which there is no corresponding idea in Hebrew or Aramaic.[1] Professor Margoliouth, indeed, is at no loss for the Hebrew equivalent and original which he finds in תהו ובהו (p. 287). Unfortunately for this identification, we know from the LXX. that Jewish Hellenists rightly considered תהו ובהו as adjectives. There is no Hebrew equivalent for *ὕλη*, and the Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages were compelled to invent or re-coin a word (חמר) for the purpose. Equally Greek is the idea of the *πνεῦμα νοερόν* (vii. 22); of the world-soul; of the idea of a *πνεῦμα χωροῦν διὰ πάντων* (vii. 23 *seq.*); of the *στοιχεῖα* (vii. 17), so that no Hebrew or neo-Hebrew parallel can be found for these or for many

[1] Wessely evades the difficulty by substituting an entirely opposite thought with the words, אשר בראה תבל מאין.

others of the epithets used in vii. 22, 23, and elsewhere in the book. Professor Margoliouth, however, seizes upon certain of these terms, and, for instance, regards *στοιχεῖα* as a translation of מזלות, because the Peshitto renders מוזלתא, and the Aethiopic translator "sun, moon, and stars." But what these renderings really show is the embarrassment of the Semitic translators in their endeavour to faithfully represent the meaning of the Greek; they give no evidence of the existence of an imagined Hebrew original. For what could have induced a Greek translator to render מזלות by the thoroughly unsatisfactory *στοιχεῖα*, when *ἄστρα* would have been far more suitable, and is actually found in vii. 19?

The books of the Bible make no mention of the immortality of the soul, the place of this principle being supplied in one or two places by the doctrine of a bodily resurrection. The thought that the human soul lives on after the death of the body is equally strange to the LXX. and to Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic writings of Hebrew origin. The oldest of the Talmudical compilations, the Mishnah, the Mechilta, Sifra and Sifri, speak indeed of the עולם הבא, the *αἰὼν ὁ ἐσόμενος*, and also refer to the ימות המשיח. By these terms, however, a definite state of the *earthly* life is intended; and the books just cited knew nothing of the immortality of the soul. For this dogma passed over into Jewish Hellenism from Greek literature. The first book of Maccabees, which was written in Hebrew, is accordingly ignorant of it, while on the other hand in the Hellenistic second book of Maccabees, as well as in the fourth, it is pointedly accentuated. So, too, the Book of Wisdom develops the doctrine with considerable fulness (ii. 23[1]; iii. 1 *seq.*, etc.). How would Professor Margoliouth explain this fact?

Concurrently with the doctrine of the soul's continued life after death, the mystical notion of its pre-existence

[1] We must here read *εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας αἰδιότητος* with Cod. 248.

found its way into Jewish Hellenism. This conception is also wanting in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic writings of Hebrew origin, as well as in the LXX. and in the older Talmudical literature. But "Wisdom" alludes to the idea, having borrowed it from Plato (viii. 19).

In close connection with its eschatology stands the un-Jewish doctrine of dualism, which also finds expression in Wisdom. With Plato and the neo-Pythagoreans, it teaches that the mortal body presses down the soul, and that the earthly frame confines the spirit that muses on many things (ix. 15). Is this doctrine to be found in antiquity elsewhere than in works of Greek origin? Or did the supposed translator interpolate this as well as all other un-Jewish doctrines, and present them garnished with numerous Greek verbal and syntactical ornaments? Professor Margoliouth is bold enough to say so, maintaining that "the Greek ideas which the book contains, come mainly from the translator" (p. 295). But if besides using Greek words and figures of speech, the translator also borrowed Greek ideas, how much of the original "Wisdom" remains in a version so miserably mutilated? And where else do we find a similarly violent procedure on the part of an ancient translator? Nowhere.

But I must cease from offering further proofs of the completely Greek colouring of a book which is as much saturated with Greek characteristics as any other Jewish Hellenistic work. If more evidence is needed, enough will be found collected in the introductions of Grimm, Farrar and Deane to satisfy the most rigorous demands for a complete logical demonstration. Professor Margoliouth in one place (p. 286) remarks that the use of the one word διαθήκη in the epistle to the Hebrews "is irrefragable evidence of the Greek origin of that work," yet inconsistently enough rejects the numberless indications making for the Greek origin of Wisdom. But I will say no more on the point, lest I be betrayed into speaking too severely.

But Professor Margoliouth has adduced a number of counter-instances, the force of which must be destroyed

before the Greek origin of the "Wisdom" can be said to be established beyond dispute. Do not the numerous Hebraisms, and the faulty renderings which Professor Margoliouth holds responsible for so many peculiarities of the text, argue a Semitic original as decisively as the specially Greek expressions, constructions, rhetorical figures and philosophical turns of thought suggest that "Wisdom" was originally compiled in Greek? I answer as follows: Hebraisms in a Greek work prove its Hebrew origin as little as the Gallicisms in Bacon's Essays prove that this master-piece was translated from the French, or as little as the Græcisms in Horace prove that his poems were translated from Greek.

Professor Margoliouth enumerates eleven such Hebraisms, some of which, however, might be disputed. Other scholars have collected an even larger number. But what do these Hebraisms prove? Probably everyone agrees that the letter of Aristeas was originally written in Greek. The writer is specially concerned to give his letter—claiming, as it does, to emanate from a high-placed official in the Court of a Ptolemy—a thoroughly Greek dress, and this end he seeks to attain by the use of stylistic and rhetorical artifices. But are there no Hebraisms in this letter? Are there no Hebraisms in the second book of the Maccabees? Do Demetrius, Artapanus, and other Jewish Hellenists always avoid Hebraisms? Are there none in the New Testament, in the Gospels and Pauline Epistles? Was "Revelation" translated from the Hebrew, because the book contains the most inelegant sentence: *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (i. 4)? Professor Margoliouth says that Wisdom is "full of Hebraisms, which, of course, can only be rarely found in original Alexandrian writers, *such as Philo*" (p. 286). Certainly Hebraisms are very infrequent in Philo; but then Philo, who marks the culminating point of Jewish Hellenism, is not the only representative of that literature. An examination of other Hellenistic works would show Professor Margo-

liouth the propriety of modifying his very sweeping statement.

Let us now see what result we arrive at by comparing certain of the Hebraisms of "Wisdom" with the other characteristics of the book which I have indicated above.

If one assumes with Professor Margoliouth that Wisdom was translated from new Hebrew into Greek, then, as I have already argued, one must either attribute to the translator an extraordinary capacity for dealing with difficult word-plays, and almost inimitable figures of speech; or supposing that he, of his own motion, introduced these rhetorical fireworks, one must at least credit him with a desire to produce a work in exact accord with the laws of rhetoric. In this view, however, the many unpolished barbarisms of his style are inexplicable. A writer cannot be suspected of aspiring to rank as an accurate stylist when he employs such Hebraisms as i. 1, *ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας ζητήσατε αὐτόν*; ii. 9, *αὕτη ἡ μερὶς ἡμῶν*; iv. 15, *οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ*; *ibid.*, *ὅσιοι τοῦ θεοῦ*; xi. 1, *κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους*; *ibid.* *ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ*; ix. 8, *εἶπας οἰκοδομήσαι ναὸν ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ σου*; ix. 9, *τί ἄριστον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ*; xi. 1, *εὐώδωσε τὰ ἔργα ἐν χειρὶ προφήτου*. One who could write such Greek as this would hardly have troubled himself to find corresponding Greek imitations of Hebrew Paronomasias, Assonances, and other figures, or to impress the stamp of the Platonic and stoical terminology on to his Hebrew original.

The inconsistency vanishes if we retain the belief in the primitiveness of the Greek text.

No extant translation from the Hebrew is marked by such an intermingling of stylistic ostentation and poverty as Professor Margoliouth's hypothesis necessarily ascribes to the assumed translator of the "Wisdom." Independent Hellenist works, however, do present this very combination of a straining after artificial elegancies, with frequent lapses into barbarism. Greek was not the mother-tongue

of a large section of Jewish Hellenists; they only acquired the language by dint of laborious reading. Cut off from intercourse with educated Greeks, they copied a number of stylistic devices from the Rhetoricians and their writings. They sought to adorn themselves with coloured patches of Greek decorative style, but failed effectively to cover their nakedness; the barbarian always betraying himself, despite his utmost endeavour to pass as a Hellene. For they were under the influence of the Greek Bible, replete with its amazing Hebraisms, and these continually break in upon the Greek flourishes and rhetoric. To this class Philo does not belong. Sprung from the best circles of Alexandrian Jewry, Philo wrote as correct and elegant a Greek as any of his Grecian contemporaries. But the other writers, whom I have named above, must be included under the category just defined, and the author of "Wisdom" must also be ranked with them. He knew Greek literature and philosophy; but, piously-minded Jew as he was, he felt deep respect for the Greek of the LXX., which was believed to have been dictated by the Holy Spirit itself. He could the less disregard the language of the LXX., seeing that he placed his utterances in the mouth of King Solomon, and often consciously imitated passages from the Solomonic Proverbs. With the Hebrew thoughts he also imitated their Hebrew expression.

There remains one class of arguments in favour of the Hebrew origin of Wisdom, which would establish the theory beyond the possibility of dispute—if the arguments were sound. Professor Margoliouth enumerates a dozen passages in which he finds the Greek text hard to understand, unsuited to intelligible thought, or otherwise objectionable. These difficulties, according to Professor Margoliouth, would vanish, if we refer the Greek words to a new-Hebrew original, which was mistranslated in the rendering. If this be so, then we must certainly hold the Greek text to be a translation, despite the long array of proofs already adduced to prove its originality. That this

argument from supposed mistranslations is, however, quite untenable, I shall now proceed to show.

1.

One passage which Professor Margoliouth considers to be a specially strong confirmation of his view runs thus (xiv. 10): *καὶ γὰρ τὸ πραχθὲν σὺν τῷ δράσαντι κολασθήσεται. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν εἰδώλοις ἐθνῶν ἐπισκοπὴ ἔσται.* The Anglican version gives: "For that which is made shall be punished together with him that made it." So rendered, the verse presents no difficulty whatever; Professor Margoliouth, however, maintains (p. 265) that "this the Greek would not allow," and he therefore translates: "For that which is done shall be punished with the doer," which appears to him "unsatisfactory." He suggests that the primitive text read עובד and נעבד, erroneously translated "doer" and "done," instead of "worshipper" and worshipped." "Of course, the first is the Aramaic, the second the Hebrew sense of the words." To all of which one must reply that the Greek translator, if he were merely such, allowed himself considerable license, and displayed much art in his rendering. For in this passage he translates the same word עבד alternately by *δρᾶν* and *πράσσειν*. If he shows himself thus untrammelled by the bonds of literal accuracy, why should he just select words which, according to Professor Margoliouth, are meaningless? Why did he not write *ποιεῖν* and *ποιηθέν*, since in Aramaic עבד is sometimes the equivalent of *ποιεῖν*? It is, therefore, impossible to accept Professor Margoliouth's assumption. The simplest interpretation of the Greek text would be to take *πραχθέν* as identical in meaning with *ποιηθέν* in this place, for the distinction between the verbs *ποιεῖν* and *πράσσειν* is not sharply drawn even in good Attic prose, as may be seen from Xen. *Cyr.* v. 5, 35; Demosth. xix. 6; xxi. 41; Aristot. *Poet.* 3, 1448 b. 1; and from other quotations collected by Franke in his note to Demosth. iii. 15. Seeing that

good Attic authors used the verbs in this indiscriminate way, we may expect a more ready indifference on the part of Jewish Hellenists, who only too frequently show a want of vivid perception of the true meaning of Greek words. (See Cobet's remarks relative to the subject in *Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς*, vol. I.) A similar lack of refinement is shown in other words used by the author of Wisdom. He employs words like *ἐλέγχειν*, i. 3, 5, 8, etc.; *ἔλεγχος*, i. 9; *δοκιμάζεσθαι*, i. 3; *ζήλωσις*, i. 15; ii. 9; *μερίς*, i. 9; *κλῆρος*, ii. 9; *αἰών*, viii. 4; *ὁσιόω*, vi. 11; xiii. 9; *ἐπισκοπή*, xiv. 11; *σκάνδαλον*, xiv. 11; *δικαιοσύνη*, xv. 3, and many others in a way quite foreign to the usage of good prose writers. It would not be at all far-fetched, therefore, to suppose a similar freedom in the use of *πραχθέν* in the passage before us. But this supposition is by no means necessary. The author of Wisdom, like other Hellenistic Jews, writes an ornate, uncommon, and even bombastic Greek. Hence he speaks here, not of the "maker" and of "made" images (*ποιήσας* and *ποιηθέν*), but of the "evil-doer" (*δράσας*), and the "sinful deed" (*πραχθέν*). This language seems to him more solemn, and hence more satisfactory. For this use of *δράσας* it is scarcely necessary to quote parallels yet compare Plato, *Legg.*, ix. 878*e*: *καὶ τῶν ξυγγενῶν τοῦ δράσαντος μηδένα δικάζειν*; while the instances given by Stephanus *s. v.* demonstrate that the past participles of *πράσσειν* (*τὰ πεπραγμένα* and *τὰ πραχθέντα*) were commonly used in the sense here assigned. Any hesitation that might be felt in accepting this metonymy will be removed by noting that a similar instance occurs in the preceding verse, where it is said of the idol and the idol-maker, *ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ μισητὰ θεῷ καὶ ὁ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἡ ἀσέβεια αὐτοῦ.*

Even less justice is there in Professor Margoliouth's assumption of a mistranslation in verses 7 and 8 of the fourteenth chapter of Wisdom. The passage runs: *εὐλόγηται γὰρ ξύλον δι' οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη· τὸ χειροποίητον δὲ ἐπικατάρατον αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτό, ὅτι ὁ μὲν εἰργάζετο, τὸ δὲ φθαρτὸν θεὸς ὠνομάσθη.* This passage

is, according to Professor Margoliouth, undoubtedly faulty. For a useful tool is also a χειροποίητον, and, on the other hand, many an idol was not wrought by human hands. Why then should τὸ χειροποίητον be ἐπικατάρατον? Here too, the original must have read נעבד and עובד; here, too, the ignorant translator substituted his χειροποίητον and ἐργαζόμενος in place of σεβόμενος and σεβαστόν. But what would Professor Margoliouth say if one were to treat the LXX. to Lev. xxvi. 1, in the following manner: "We read here οὐ ποιήσετε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς χειροποίητα οὐδὲ γλυπτά. How can the lawgiver forbid us to produce 'anything made by the hand'? Is not an axe, a house, a garment, also a χειροποίητον? The LXX. must obviously have had in the original Hebrew text, the reading לא תעשו לכם עבדה *sc.*, עבדה זרה. This the translator misunderstood, and instead of εἴδωλον wrote χειροποίητον." Yet this unfounded suggestion is as strong an argument as Professor Margoliouth adduces to prove the misrendering in Wisd. xiv. 10 and 8. Grimm, Deane, and Farrar have already shown that the LXX. use χειροποίητον as a technical equivalent for אלילים. This the LXX. do in Levit. xxvi. 1, 30; Is. ii. 18; x. 11; xix. 1, and in many other places. The wording of verses 7 and 8 is therefore as little open to objection as that of verse 10.

In passing, some of Professor Margoliouth's grammatical and literary comments, as well as his exegetical remarks, need emendation. He says (p. 266): "The first (*to do*) is the Aramaic, the second (*to worship*) the Hebrew sense of the word" (עבד). But the primitive meaning of the Hebrew (עבד) is not to "worship," but "to cut," "to plough" "to work," and on the other hand, the word also preserves in Aramaic the signification to "worship," as may be seen from Daniel iv. 32, Ezra vii. 26. The common Talmudical phrase, עע"ז, is also a striking example of the same usage.— In the Tanchuma occur the words (ed. Buber) כשם שנפרעין מן העובד כן נפרעין מן ע"ז עצמה, which Professor Margoliouth calls a citation of the passage in Wisdom, "and that fact alone would make it probable that the book existed in

Hebrew." But the Midrash itself quotes Exodus xii. 12 as the passage explained; and the citation from Tanchuma in no way corresponds with the passage in Wisdom. Besides, Wisdom is nowhere quoted in Jewish literature until the time of Nachmanides, and this fact might be turned, by one who does not weigh his conclusions too carefully, into an argument for the originality of the Greek text. For while Ben Sira is often cited in the Talmud and Midrash, Wisdom is neither named nor known.

If this is the result of an examination of Professor Margoliouth's criticism of a passage which "in itself seems sufficient to create a fair presumption in favour" of his hypothesis, it is ominous for the fate of his remaining citations.

2.

i. 12. *μὴ ζηλοῦτε θάνατον ἐν πλάνῃ ζωῆς ὑμῶν. Do not emulate death in the error of your life.*

"Mr. Deane has interesting notes on all the words in the text, but fails to show that the sentiment is a natural one, or is naturally expressed. The second clause is, 'nor attract destruction by the works of your hands.' The violation of the antithesis (the key to the true explanation of some quarter of Ben-Sira's verses) in two out of the three words of the first clause also suggests that there is some error." So far Professor Margoliouth, who, in order to prove that "the sentiment is no natural one," and to be able to impute an error to the translator, himself mistranslates the passage. The compiler of the Anglican version renders "Seek not death in the error of your life," being aware that *ζηλοῦν*, even in classical Greek, signifies not only "to emulate," but also "to seek," "to search after." There is nothing bizarre or unnatural in the sentence thus rendered. Besides, even if a thought, or its expression, be unnatural in Wisdom, is that a reason for jumping to the conclusion that a translator's error has crept in? In

Hellenistic Greek, *e.g.*, in the second, third, or fourth books of the Maccabees, in the Letter of Aristeas, or even in the writings of Philo himself, the most accomplished literary artist of the whole circle of Jewish Hellenists, there is frequently a studied avoidance of simple and natural thoughts, as well as simple and natural modes of expressing them. What such writers most strenuously aimed at was point and originality, their first thought was to match the brilliant style of contemporary Greek orators. Wisdom in particular, is full of far-fetched thoughts, of distorted, and even unnatural expressions. Is it natural to apply twenty-one epithets to the spirit of Wisdom, to cast the greater part of the book in the form of a prayer? Is it natural for Solomon to say of himself, "*ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον*?" Was not Buddeus right when he said of Wisdom: "Dictio phalerata et rhetora flosculis ad nauseam usque exornata, uti a stili, quo scriptores sancti utuntur, simplicitate ac majestate longissime abest?" If one were to pronounce as corrupt every passage in Hellenistic writings in which the sentiment or style is unnatural, then one-half of the whole Hellenistic literature would be liable to the same charge.

But another objection raised by Professor Margoliouth to the passage before us, is that there is "a violation of the antithesis." This criticism is rather obscure. The text runs:—

μὴ ζηλοῦτε θάνατον ἐν πλάνῃ ζωῆς ὑμῶν,
μηδὲ ἐπισπᾶσθε ὄλεθριν ἐν ἔργοις χειρῶν ὑμῶν.

Every word of the second sentence corresponds to a word in the first; *ἐπισπᾶσθε ὄλεθρον* to *ζηλοῦτε θάνατον*; *ἔργοις* to *ἐν πλάνῃ*; *χειρῶν ὑμῶν* to *ζωῆς ὑμῶν*; where then is the "violation of the antithesis"? The parallelism, so beloved of Hebrew poets and so carefully imitated by Jewish Hellenists, is here most exactly reproduced. Must a text in Wisdom be altered because antithesis—as understood by Professor Margoliouth—is the "key to the true interpretation of some quarter of Ben-Sira's verses"?

Now compare what Professor Margoliouth substitutes for the reading that he rejects. "שטה when pointed with a *sc'hin*, means 'fool,' but when pointed with a *sin*, means 'wandering'" (p. 267). The phrase πλάνη ζωῆς has its analogue in πλάνη ὁδῶν (Wisd. xii. 24). Professor Margoliouth, however, refers it to the Hebrew, שטות רוח, which is justified as a "possible phrase" by the well-known passage in the Midrash: אין המנאפים נואפים עד שתכנס בהם רוח שטות. ζηλοῦν, adds Professor Margoliouth, "is a regular rendering of קנא, *to emulate*, which also means *to acquire*" (p. 268). The whole clause is then to be restored. אל תקנו מות בשטות רוחכם; "Acquire not death by the folly of your mind." Surely it was hardly worth expending so much learning to obtain this commonplace sentiment. In place of the truly rhetorical and sharply pointed thought, "Strive not after death in the error of your life," we get, "Acquire not death by the folly of your mind"! Does this make the antithesis more marked, or correspond better with the rhetorical character of the book? Let him believe it, who can. Besides being pointless, this suggested reading is not even grammatical. Because רוח שטות occurs in the Midrash, is שטות רוח therefore also "a possible phrase"? The Bible speaks of רוח זנונים, רוח אלהים, רוח שקר; are we forsooth to argue that זנוני רוח, שקר רוח, אלהי רוח are likewise "possible phrases"? Prof. Margoliouth also explains the ἄφρονες of Wisd. iii. 12, as a mistranslation of שׂטוֹת, to which he assigns the signification "adulteresses," a meaning that סוטה never bears in the Talmud.

3.

i. 16: "But the wicked have invited death by their hands and their words;" φίλον ἡγησάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐτάκησαν: "*Thinking him a friend they melted*, and make a covenant with him that they are worthy to be of his portion." "Bretschneider observed that *they melted* was absurd"; therefore Prof. Margoliouth conjectures that the original Hebrew text read

נתפשרו which has the twofold connotation "to melt" and "to make friends." The correct translation accordingly is "Thinking him a friend, *they made friends with him*" (p. 269).

Against this I must urge that there is no absurdity in the Greek if it be properly rendered, as in the Anglican Version: "When they thought to have it their friend, they consumed to nought." τήκεσθαι is used in this sense elsewhere in Wisdom itself, xvi. 29, ἐλπὶς τήκεται, while the lexicons show that this employment of the word was quite common with the best Greek writers as well as the Jewish Hellenists.

Not only, however, is the Greek reading correct, but Prof. Margoliouth's emendation is impossible. נתפשר or פשרה does not mean simply "to make friends with somebody," but "to effect a mutual reconciliation between opposites," "to enter into a compact." How can such an idea be applied in this context to the sinner and death? By Prof. Margoliouth's suggested rendering of the words that he inserts in the text, we should moreover substitute a lame tautological utterance in place of the fine antithesis presented by the Greek.

4.

iii. 14: "And blessed is the *eunuch* who did no wrong with his hands, nor thought any evil against the Lord; for there shall be given to him a choice recompense *for his faith.*"

In the previous verse reference is made to the barren woman, the στεῖρα ἀμίαντος who "will find the fruit of her virtue in the recompense of souls." In clear continuation of the idea, verse 14 (on the basis of Isaiah lvi. 3 *seq.*) promises the childless man, the righteous eunuch, a like reward for his "fidelity towards God," his constancy in virtue (πίστις). This meaning of πίστις—"fidelity towards God and man"—is illustrated in such passages as Sirach xv. 15; xxii. 23; xl. 12; xlvi. 15; 1 Macc. x. 27; xiv. 35;

3 Macc. iii. 3; v. 31; 4 Macc. xv. 21; xvi. 22; xvii. 2, and in numerous others. Prof. Margoliouth, however, maintains (p. 269) "that it is not clear why *πίστεως, faith,* should be the merit referred to." But our critic's difficulty is caused by his failure to understand the meaning of the word. And whether it be "faith," "virtue," "constancy," the sense is clear; and there is not the slightest ground for assuming that instead of *εὔνουχος* the original text read מהימן, which in Syriac means both "faithful" and "eunuch," and, further, that the author of Wisdom intends a play upon the double signification. Such a play on the twofold meaning of a word is without parallel in the book. Moreover, one is tempted to ask, out of how many languages was the original text of the Wisdom compiled? Sometimes it is Hebrew, then Aramaic, then Syriac and lastly Arabic. The author of Wisdom must have been as skilled a master of languages as Prof. Margoliouth himself; or we are to suppose that the Semitic languages were regulated by limits of meaning which could be overpassed at will.

5.

iv. 10: *εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη. Being well-pleasing to God, he was loved.*

"This is a tautology," says Prof. Margoliouth. This is only true if the distinction is overlooked between *ἀρέσκειν* and *ἀγαπᾶν*, which Grimm has correctly explained. Moreover, the person referred to is Enoch (Gen. v. 24: *εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ*); *εὐάρεστος* therefore simply describes the pious conduct of the patriarch, and *ἀγαπήθη* the consequences of it. In Chaldee, מתרחם, which Prof. Margoliouth suggests as the original reading, is merely another *nuance* of *ἀγαπᾶσθαι*, but the proposal of the Arabic מרוחם, in the sense of "the late," as an explanation of the passage before us, would be quite unacceptable even if the meaning of the word were more common in Arabic than it actually is.

6.

iv. 3: πολύγονον δὲ ἀσεβῶν πλῆθος οὐ χρησιμεύσει. *And the prolific multitude of the impious shall not be of use.*

In connection with this verse, Prof. Margoliouth proceeds to amend Ecclus. xiii. 4, where the words ἐὰν χρησιμεύσῃς ἐργᾶται ἐν σοί represent, according to his view, a mistranslation of אם תצלח, and should be altered into "if thou shalt prosper" (p. 270). In fact, no emendation is here necessary; for the sense is quite unstrained if we interpret thus: "So long as thou canst be useful to the rich, he will busy himself with thee; but if thou have nothing, he will forsake thee." In the passage of Wisdom, Prof. Margoliouth also supposes χρησιμεύσει to have arisen from a mistranslation of יצלח, which must be rendered "shall not prosper." This suggestion overlooks one thing, namely, that precisely the words "shall not be of use" are needed for the context, for they are further developed in verse 5. There we read: κλῶνες ἀτέλεστοι καὶ ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῶν ἄρχηστος, which is only a poetical paraphrase of οὐ χρησιμεύσει. Prof. Margoliouth must either amend also verse 5 or leave verse 3 intact. We also find, Wisd. ii. 11: τὸ γὰρ ἀσθενὲς ἄχρηστον ἐλέγχεται; and verse 12: ἐνεδρεύσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστιν. Must these passages also be amended?

7.

xvii. 12: ἔνδοθεν δὲ οὖσα ἧττων ἡ προσδοκία πλείονα λογίζεται τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν βάσανον αἰτίας.

That this sentence is difficult every reader of Wisdom knows. But no one will, with Prof. Margoliouth (p. 270), pronounce it "unintelligible," if he be familiar with the far-fetched, inaccurate, stilty style affected by many Jewish Hellenists, and occasionally by the author of the Wisdom himself. The context is: The Egyptians imprisoned in darkness suffered groundless anguish, which arose from their own fanciful delusions (vv. 3—9), since

the unrighteous are terrified by phantoms which their own evil conscience produces (v. 10), for fear arises from the abandonment (*προδοσίᾳ* for *προδοσία*) of the help which clear reason supplies (v. 11). Verse 12 continues: "And the all too feeble expectation (of help) coming from within, counteth the ignorance as worse than the true cause of the trial." This is a perfectly accurate psychological explanation of the characteristic state of mind into which trivial occurrences are wont to throw the man who is tortured by a troubled conscience.

But what does Prof. Margoliouth make of the sentence? Verse 10, which without some textual emendation is indeed unintelligible, Prof. Margoliouth leaves unexplained, since his usual means fail him. But he proposes as the original of v. 13 the reading כי · · · מלפנים · · · תשגה שגיאה מעלה מצעירה. He does well to mark the remaining words of the sentence with dots, for these omissions need only to be supplied to prove the impossibility of the suggestion. The full sentence would be כי [חרדה] מלפנים [קטנה] תשגה שגיאה מעלה מצעירה which is taken to mean: "*For an expectation (of evil) though originally slight, grows great from a trifling cause.*" Here, then, the author of the Wisdom, who had formerly used Chaldean, Syriac, and Arabic, again writes Hebrew. But what strange Hebrew it is! Such expressions as תִּשְׁגֶּה שְׁגִיאָה, מִלְּפָנִים, מֵעֶלָּה, and the whole construction, would be surely unintelligible to a Hebraist who had not already heard from Prof. Margoliouth what they ought to mean. Added to which, the trivial thought thus substituted for the Greek ill suits the context.

8.

xii. 24: *θεοὺς ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ καὶ ἐν ζῴοις τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἄτιμα. Thinking to be gods the dishonourable among the beasts of the enemies.*

There is absolutely no difficulty here if we regard *ἐν ζῴοις τῶν ἐχθρῶν* as written from the point of view of the author, not of the grammatical subject; thus: "They held

as gods what among the beasts of [our] enemies is despised." This is a usage that often occurs also in good Greek, and is in the present passage the less objectionable seeing that in vv. 20 and 22 ἐχθροὶ bears the very same signification. If another instance is required from Wisdom, it will be found in xv. 15, where the ἐχθροὶ τοῦ λαοῦ are mentioned. Verse 16 continues: ὅτι καὶ πάντα τὰ εἴδωλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐλογίσαντο θεούς. Here τὰ ἔθνη the "strange peoples" (הגוים), are identical with the ἐχθροί; but it is the author, not they themselves, who would so designate them.

What is Prof. Margoliouth's device for solving the supposed difficulty? In Ecclus. xxxix. 30 occurs the phrase θηρίων ὀδόντες, which originates from Deut. xxxii. 24, and is there used for שן בהמות. But, argues Prof. Margoliouth, this שן בהמות or שני חיות is equivalent to חיות הַשְּׂנִים "wild beasts"; the translator however read הַשְּׂנְאִים for הַשְּׂנִים and hence the ζῷα τῶν ἐχθρῶν of the Greek text. In other words, because it is possible to speak of the "teeth of beasts," it is also possible to speak of "beasts of teeth"! Because in Ps. iii. 8 we find שני רשעים ὀδόντες ἁμαρτωλῶν, we may therefore take רשעי הַשְּׂנִים ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὀδόντων in the same sense!

9.

vi. 2.: ἐνωτίσασθε οἱ κρατοῦντες πλήθους καὶ γεγαυρωμένοι ἐπ' ὄχλοις ἐθνῶν. *Hear, ye who rule the multitude, and glory in crowds of nations.*

"As in verse 1 the synonyms for 'ruler' are all simple, 'kings,' 'judges,' γεγαυρωμένοι seems out of place." This is Prof. Margoliouth's comment; but in i. 1 there are no synonyms whatever, and κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν stands quite isolated. Cannot then γεγαυρωμένοι ἐπ' ὄχλοις be endured by the side of κρατοῦντες πλήθους? Only a misconception of the nature of the parallelism used by Hebrew and Jewish Hellenistic writers could raise a doubt but that a fine-sounding variation was intended by the words.

10.

vi. 15 : ὁ ὀρθρίσας ἐπ' αὐτὴν οὐ κοπίασει· πάρεδρον γὰρ εὑρήσει τῶν πυλῶν αὐτοῦ. *He that goeth after her shall not toil; for he shall find her seated at his gate.*

Prof. Margoliouth thinks the mention of the dawn inappropriate here (p. 272). The original reading, he suggests, was שחר, which should have been rendered by "to seek," and not by ὀρθρίζειν "to go early after." This is untenable. The usage of the LXX. is the standard regulating that of Wisdom, and in the LXX. the verb ὀρθρίζειν has precisely the sense "to seek." *Cf.* Hosea vi. 1 : ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρός με λέγοντες; Ps. lxii. 1 : θεὸς, ὁ θεός μου, πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω, where ἐδίψησέ σοι ἡ ψυχή is a parallel clause; lxxvii. 34 : ἐπέστρεφον καὶ ὤρθριζον πρὸς τὸν θεόν, to which ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν is parallel; Job viii. 5 : σὺ δὲ ὄρθριζε πρὸς τὸν κύριον. Prof. Margoliouth must have overlooked these and other passages.

11.

xvi. 21 : ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασίς σου τὴν σὴν πρὸς τέκνα γλυκύτητα ἐνεφάνιζε. *For thy sustenance declared thy sweetness unto thy children.*

This is a sentence which alone would go to prove that the tone of the Wisdom is originally Greek. For ἡ ὑπόστασίς σου cannot without forcing be referred to any Semitic word, while it is good Greek for "thy essence" or "substance." In the Epistle to the Hebrews ὑπόστασις is used just as in Wisdom. In i. 3 it is said of the υἱὸς θεοῦ : ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, that is to say, "the very image of his substance," in the language of the Revised Version. Patristic Greek uses the word on innumerable occasions as equivalent to "person" in the regular formula of the Divine Trinity : τῇ ὑποστάσει τρία. But in the general Greek literature of the later period the word is common in the sense of "essence" or "personality." *Cf.* Ps. Aristotle 395 *a* 31; D. L. ix. 91; S. E.

Pyrrh. *Hyp.* ii. 199; Adv. Math. ix. 338. Therefore it is that Suidas explains: *ὑπόστασις κυρίως τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ἰδιοσυστάτως ὑφιστάμενον.* Equally good Greek is *γλυκύτης* for "friendliness." *Cf.* Plut. *Mor.* p. 67 B.: *τῇ γλυκύτητι τοῦ νουθετοῦντος ἐπιτείνων τὸ πικρόν.* Prof. Margoliouth, however, finds in *ὑπόστασις* the new-Hebrew סעודה or סעד, which word represents both "column" and "bread;" while in *γλυκύτης πρὸς τέκνα* he detects an original reading ממתקים לבנים, which may equally mean "sweetness to children" and "a sweet white thing," which latter phrase the author had intended to apply to the manna. This exegetic suggestion is indeed a "sweet thing for children," but hardly a theory for matured consideration.

To complete the dozen instances of supposed but non existent mistranslations or Hebraisms, Prof. Margoliouth concludes his examination of the Greek text with—

12.

xv. 19 : *οὐδ' ὅσον ἐπιποθῆσαι ὡς ἐν ζῴων ὄψει καλὰ ὄντα τυχάνει. Nor do these (most hateful creatures) chance to be beautiful, so that in comparison even with other animals men should yearn towards them.*

This excellent rendering by Farrar meets any possible objection to the Greek text, which, though it be after the usual fashion of Wisdom's ornamental style, is still quite intelligible. But Professor Margoliouth finds it necessary to assume that the passage is marked by mistranslation and Hebraisms. *ὡς ἐν ὄψει* he regards as a faulty rendering of כנגד, which "means no more than 'as'" (p. 272), and should have been translated simply by *ὡς*. So *ἐπιποθῆσαι* "is of course another Hebraism." Can Professor Margoliouth cite instances in which the LXX. renders כנגד by *ὡς ἐν ὄψει*? Moreover, Dr. Farrar's translation shows that the sense requires the stronger phrase, *ὡς ἐν ὄψει.* Nor is it accurate to say that כנגד "means no more than 'as,'" for it can never be rendered simply "as" in any of the places in which it occurs in the Bible.

Finally, ἐπιποθῆσαι is no Hebraism (cf. Plato, 329 D, and in numberless other passages), and if it were a Hebraism it would prove nothing, as I have already shown.

After this attempt to prove from an examination of the Greek that the original text was an odd medley of Semitic languages, Professor Margoliouth next sets himself to confirm his thesis by a further discussion of certain versions, and especially of the Syriac, Latin, Armenian, and Coptic renderings. I am not qualified to enter into this discussion, for I have no knowledge of the majority of these versions. Nay, more; even if I possessed this knowledge I would decline the examination of Professor Margoliouth's arguments, and this for many reasons. His previous treatment of the material on which the decisive settlement of the question must be based, has hardly been such as to invite a criticism of his method of dealing with less conclusive evidence. Besides, a glance at his comments on the Syriac and Latin Versions, which to a certain extent I might be able to judge, detects the same mistakes as those which marked Professor Margoliouth's criticism of the Greek text. To give one or two instances, it is not the case that מרדות can mean in new-Hebrew both "rebellion" and "education," as Professor Margoliouth would have it (p. 273). He cites in proof המונע בנו מן המרדות (*Exod. Rabbah* ad init.); but the word there clearly means "chastisement." On p. 276 Professor Margoliouth constructs a sentence, ידין צדיק המת לרשעים חיים, and explains that המת can mean "he shall destroy," which is surely an impossible rendering.

These versions, however, have no bearing on the solution of the question. They were without exception derived from our Greek text, as Professor Margoliouth himself does not deny. "That the Peshitto version of Wisdom is not independent of the Greek is too clear to need demonstration," Professor Margoliouth allows. "The Vetus Latina version was made from the Greek, though from a very independent recension" (p. 264); while a Greek MS.

"formed the basis of the Armenian version" (p. 284). Of the other versions it need scarcely be said that they were not made from any Hebrew original, while he confesses that they are very corrupt, and in part are mere untrustworthy paraphrases. Professor Margoliouth nevertheless attempts to reconstruct the text by their aid. At least a portion of the variations in these versions, he contends, can be explained by supposing them to have been indeed made from the Greek, but then corrected according to a Hebrew text. But, on the other hand, he admits (p. 280) that the original Hebrew "perished early." Was it then again brought to life merely to serve as a secondary aid to the translators of the Greek? What a series of improbabilities! And if the Greek original prove inadequate, if a Semitic text must be called in to account for the peculiarities of these versions, why may it not have been an Aramaic translation of the Greek? At least so much is now certain, that the Syriac translation of the Bible is not infrequently derived from the Chaldee.

The variations in the Greek MSS. are also used by Professor Margoliouth in support of his theory of a Hebrew origin (p. 281). He refers to variations like these: *σοφίας* for *παιδείας*, *ἀνομίας* for *ἀδικίας*, *ἀϊδιότητος* for *ἰδιότητος*, *ἀτιμίαν* for *ἐπιτιμίαν*. But these variations present no unusual features, and are of the kind quite familiar to those who have worked at the collation of Greek MSS., or studied critical editions of the LXX.

The stock of Professor Margoliouth's arguments is not yet exhausted. Near the opening of his essay he remarks: "It would be natural to suppose that the Book of Wisdom, which bears so close a relation to those Proverbs [of Ben-Sira], which enlarges on so much that Ben-Sira suggests, and endeavours to be deep where he is shallow, appealed to the same public, and was composed in the same language, *i.e.*, in some kind of Hebrew" (p. 263). Even if the Wisdom were akin to Ben-Sira in contents, why would that fact favour the view that the two were written in the

same language? Must the second Book of the Maccabees have been written in Hebrew because the first book—closely similar in contents—was so written? Was the original language of Chalcidius necessarily Greek because the works of Theon and Proclus were so? And the relation between Ben-Sira and the Wisdom is by no means so close as Professor Margoliouth maintains. In the one is presented a purely Hebrew philosophy, in the other numerous equally distinctive Greek doctrines. The one is composed in the simple style of the Bible, the other with the rhetorical finish of the school of Isocrates. The one, an easily comprehensible, moral book, lived constantly in the heart of the Jewish people; while the other, a heterogeneous product of the Jewish and Greek spirit, remained for a thousand years out of the ken of Jews. There could not be a stronger contrast.

Professor Margoliouth concludes his inquiry with an attempt to show that the author of the Wisdom was a Palestinian, and not an Alexandrian Jew. This, however, had no relevancy to the question of language. As I have tried elsewhere to prove, works were composed outside Alexandria, even in Palestine, which were impregnated with the spirit of Jewish Hellenism. (See *Hellenist. Studien*, p. 127 *seq.*) Professor Margoliouth, on the other hand, maintains that an Alexandrian might have written a Hebrew treatise—an assumption for which there is no parallel. If the writer were an Egyptian, the presumption is very strongly in favour of his having written in Greek. Therefore I may devote a few remarks to Professor Margoliouth's arguments on this point.

Grimm adduced many points in support of his view that the author of the Wisdom was an Alexandrian Jew. He did not, as Professor Margoliouth implies, solely rely on the "bitter hate which he evinces towards the Egyptians." Against this argument Professor Margoliouth urges that Wisdom displays no acquaintance with Egypt beyond what the Bible supplies. As an Egyptian he would have con-

trasted the peculiarly "luminous atmosphere" of the country with the plague of darkness; in describing the plague of rain he would naturally have referred to the *rainlessness* of the country; while he would have cited the fame of Egyptian physicians when recounting the plague of ulcers. Had he been an Egyptian, Professor Margoliouth continues, the author would have learnt from the Alexandrian temples how idols were made, and would not have needed to go to Isaiah. He would not have described the Nile as a "perennial stream," ποταμὸς ἀέναος—which Professor Margoliouth takes as a translation of נחל איתן. It is really astonishing that Professor Margoliouth does not strengthen his contention by the author's omission to refer to the Pyramids, obelisks and sphinxes, crocodiles and mummies, the museum and the Pharos. As to the other omissions adduced by Professor Margoliouth, the author does indeed allude to the rainlessness of Egypt, for he speaks of ξένοι ὗετοι, "rare rain-showers" (xvi. 16). An Egyptian might well have called the Nile ποταμὸς ἀέναος, since ὁ ποταμός is the standing term with Egyptians for the Nile, and he would naturally call it "perennial." Certainly the Nile is not a נחל, but it is Professor Margoliouth and not the Wisdom that so designates it. The only place, says Professor Margoliouth, of which the author speaks with affection, is Jerusalem, calling it πόλις κατασκηνώσεως, עיר שכינתך, while an Egyptian would have referred also to the Temple of Onias. In answer to which it is only necessary to remark that the author of the Letter of Aristeas describes the Temple of Jerusalem in the most high-flown terms, and yet neither this Egyptian nor Philo refers to the Temple at Tell-el-Yehudiyya. It is unnecessary to prove that one need be no Palestinian to glorify Jerusalem, or to describe it in Biblical phrase as the "dwelling-place of God."

The author of the Wisdom, says Professor Margoliouth, "has probably seen the Pillar of Salt, and knows the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea; for the description x. 7: ἧς

ἔτι μαρτύριον τῆς πονηρίας καπνιζομένη καθέστηκε χέρσος καὶ ἀτελέσιν ὥραις καρποφοροῦντα φυτὰ ἀπιστουσης ψυχῆς μνημεῖον ἑστηκυῖα στήλη ἁλός, is meant for that of an eye-witness, for here are details which he could not find in the Bible; and by saying *there still stands* the author is testifying to a fact of his own time" (p. 295). This knowledge, however, does not prove that the writer was an inhabitant of Palestine. Philo makes similar statements (*De Abr.* II., p. 21, Mang.), and adds the remark, καὶ μέχρι νῦν καίεται. Was Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 7) an inhabitant of Palestine, or Tertullian (*Apolog.*, c. 40), or Clement of Rome? (Cor. i. 11). From Ritter's or Robinson's description of the Dead Sea it is moreover clear that in Wisdom the account is not that of one who personally knew the locality, but consists of legendary exaggerations of the actual phenomena.

One can far more easily argue for the Egyptian origin of the book from the omissions, which make it hard to believe the author an inhabitant of Palestine. A Palestinian, in relating the history of Israel, would have introduced something about Palestine, the wonderful conquest of the land, its physical features, some details concerning Jerusalem, the Temple, the graves of the patriarchs, and so forth. A Palestinian would not have contented himself with a mere announcement of the building of the Temple, but would have described its glories and the splendours of the Holy City, which he beheld every day. A Palestinian would not have concluded the history of Israel with an account of the Exodus and of the fate of the Egyptians. In such considerations may be found an unanswerable argument in favour of the view that Wisdom was composed in Egypt.

Another point is regarded by Professor Margoliouth as of more consequence, viz., the familiarity of the author with the Midrashic interpretations, a fact which points to the Palestinian school (p. 296). But many years ago it was demonstrated that Palestinian exegesis had an

influence on the Alexandrian; that numerous Midrashim which we read in later new-Hebrew collections, were already known to the Jewish Hellenists in Egypt; that there was an independent Hellenistic Midrash, which in its turn also reacted on specifically Jewish literature; so that the relationship between Wisdom and the Midrash proves nothing as to the place in which the former was written. There is no need for me to prove this here; it has been proved already.[1]

The foregoing is the criticism I have to offer of Professor Margoliouth's hypothesis. May it convince the propounder of this strange view that his theory was adduced on insufficient grounds.

J. FREUDENTHAL.

---

[1] See Frankel, *Vorstudien zur LXX.*, Leipzig, 1841, *passim; Einfluss der Palästinischen Exegese auf die Alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, Leipzig, 1851, *passim; Ueber Palästinische und Alexandrinische Schriftforschung*, p. 32 *seq.*, Breslau, 1854. Freudenthal, *Ps. Josephus Ueber die Herrschaft der Vernunft*, pp. 45, 64, 67 *seq.*, Breslau, 1869; *Hellenistische Studien*, p. 67 *seq.*, Breslau, 1874; Siegfried, *Philo v. Alexandrien*, p. 143 *seq.*, Jena, 1875; and Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha*, Leipzig, 1879.

THE LAW AND RECENT CRITICISM.[1]

PROFESSOR TOY'S new work, *Judaism and Christianity*, gives an admirable conspectus of the results of the modern critical school on the genesis of Christianity. The author takes various important doctrines of Christianity, traces them back to their origin in Israelitism, pursues their course through their various phases in Judaism, until they reach their final development in the teaching of Jesus and his disciples, which, in the author's judgment, is the consummation of that which the prophets and their successors had to give to the world. Laying so much stress as Professor Toy does on the saying, "By their fruits shall ye know them," he ought also, perhaps, to have told us what, in the course of time, has become of these several doctrines. For when, for instance, with regard to the doctrine of original sin, he remarks that "in certain systems of Christian theology the human race is involved in the condemnation of the first man" (p. 185, *n.* 1); or that, in the New Testament, "the demand for a mediating power between God and humanity is pushed to the farthest point which thought can occupy consistently with the maintenance of the absoluteness of the one Supreme Deity" (p. 121), he is rather evading a difficulty than answering it. Such elaboration would, however, have been outside the scope of Professor Toy's book, which claims only to be a sketch of the progress of thought from the Old Testament to the New. For his own solution of the indicated difficulty, Toy, to judge from his liberal standpoint, would probably refer us to Dr. Hatch's Hibbert lectures; the issue of such an appeal must, I imagine, remain for long doubtful and disputed.

---

[1] *Judaism and Christianity, a sketch of the progress of thought from Old Testament to New Testament*, by C. H. Toy, Professor in Harvard University. London, 1890.

A delightful characteristic of Toy's book is its transparent clearness and sobriety, which will make it interesting reading, even to those who are acquainted with the writer's authorities in their original sources. Almost entirely new, as well as most suggestive, is the justice which Toy does to the law in recognising it as a factor for good in the history of religion. In this point Toy is not only up to his date, but beyond it. It is true that even the Pharisees have made some advance in the estimation of the liberal school. They are no longer condemned *en masse* as so many hypocrites. It is even admitted that there were a few honest men among them, such as Rabban Gamliel, the teacher of Paul, or R. Akiba, the patriot of Bethar. We are now too polite to be personal. But with regard to the law, on the other hand, there is at present a markedly opposite tendency. The general idea seems to be that, as the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ must be loosely interpreted in a spiritual sense, it must logically have been preceded by a universal spiritual death, and the germs of the disease which brought this death about are to be sought for in the law. Hence the strained efforts to discover in the law the source of all religious evil, —cant, hypocrisy, formalism, externalism, transcendentalism, and as many "isms" more of bad reputation.

It was probably with a view to this current representation of the law that Toy, when speaking of the Levitical legislation, and of its fixing "men's minds on ceremonial details which, in some cases, it put into the same category and on the same level with moral duties," asks the question: "Would there not thence result a dimming of the moral sense and a confusion of moral distinctions? The ethical attitude of a man who could regard a failure in the routine of sacrifice as not less blameworthy than an act of theft cannot be called a lofty one" (p. 186). The answer which he gives is more favourable than such a leading question would induce us to expect. He tells us that, "in point of fact, the result was different (*ibid.*). The Levitical law is not to be looked on as a mere extension and organisation of the ritual. . . . Its ritual was, in great part, the organised expression of the consciousness of sin" (p. 226). Of the law

in general Toy says that it had "larger consequences than its mere details would suggest," for it "cultivated the moral sense of the people into results above its mechanical prescriptions," and "it developed the sense of sin, as Paul points out (Gal. iii. 19), and therewith a freer feeling, which brought the soul into more immediate contact with God" (p. 227); whilst in another place he reminds us "that much of the law is moral, and that no one could fail to feel a spiritual significance beneath its letter" (p. 245), and he even admits that "the great legal schools which grew up in the second century, if we may judge by the sayings of the teachers which have come down to us, did not fail to discriminate between the outward and the inward, the ceremonial and the moral" (p. 186).

These and similar passages will suffice to show that Toy's estimate of the law is a very different one from that of Smend and his school. However, it must not be supposed that he is not on the look-out for the germs of the disease. He must find these germs somewhere, or else the progress, which his book is intended to illustrate, would be difficult to detect. And thus he repeats the old accusations, though not without modification.

Professor Toy's objections may, perhaps, be summed up in the passage in which he represents the Jewish law as "an attempt to define all the beliefs and acts of life" (p. 239), or as "the embodiment of devotion to a fixed rule of belief and conduct" (p. 237). Toy does not entirely condemn this system, and even speaks of it as a "lofty attempt" (p. 239); but, on the whole, he considers that it must have resulted in bad theology, as well as in doubtful conduct. Without following Professor Toy over the whole area of his investigations, which would require a volume for itself, I will only take the opportunity of making a few general remarks upon the nature and character of this legal system, which seems to hold the key to the spiritual history of Judaism.

First, as to its theology, Toy's description of the law as an attempt to define all the *beliefs* of life—an assertion which is also made by Schürer—is not wholly accurate. For such an attempt was never made by Judaism. The few dogmas

which Judaism possesses, such as the Existence of God, Providence, Punishment and Reward—without which no revealed religion is conceivable – can hardly be called a creed in the modern sense of the term, which implies something external and strange to man's own knowledge, and only acceptable through the weight of authority. To the Jew of the Christian era, these simpler dogmas were so self-evident that it would have cost him the greatest effort *not* to believe them. Hence the fact that, whilst there have come down to us so many controverted points between the Sadducees and Pharisees with regard to certain juristic and ritual questions, we know of only one of an essentially dogmatic character, viz., the dispute concerning the Resurrection.

It is thus difficult to imagine to what Professor Toy can be alluding when he speaks of the "interest they (the Jews) threw into the discussion and determination of minutiæ of faith" (p. 241). Discussions upon *minutiæ* of faith are only to be read in the works of the later schoolmen (as Saadiah, Maimonides and their followers), in which such subtle problems as *creatio ex nihilo*, the origin of evil, predestination, free will and similar subjects are examined; but this period is very distant from that with which Toy is concerned. The older schools and the so-called houses of Shammai and Hillel, most of whose members were the contemporaries of the Apostles, show very little predilection for such *minutiæ*. Their discussions and differences of opinion about ritual matters are very numerous, scattered as they are over the whole of the ancient rabbinic literature, but I can only remember two of a metaphysical character, or touching upon the *minutiæ* of faith. The one dealing with the efficacy of certain sacrifices discusses whether it only extends to the suppression of the pending punishment for sins, or also includes their purification and washing away (see *Pessikta*, ed. Buber, 61*b*, and parallels); the other considers the question whether it would not have been better for man not to have been created (*Erubin*, 13*b*). But this latter controversy, which is said to have lasted for two years and a-half, by no means led to any big metaphysical or theological system,

but only to the practical advice that, as we have been created, we ought to be watchful over our conduct. It is, indeed, a noteworthy feature of Judaism that theological speculations have never resulted in the formulation of any imposing or universal doctrine, but usually in divers ceremonial practices. To give one illustration : according to Prof. Toy (p. 210) the conclusion which the author of 1 Tim. ii. 11-14 draws from the fact that woman was the immediate agent of the introduction of sin was the subordination of her sex. The Rabbis also noticed the same fact, and in their less abstract language speak of woman as having brought death and grief into the world, but the conclusion which they drew was that since woman had extinguished the "light of the world," she ought to atone for it by lighting the candles for the Sabbath (Jerushalmi, *Sabbath*, 5*b*). Nor is Toy quite correct when he maintains that the conception of the Memra as Creator and Lord, etc., and as "representative of the immediate divine activity," did not keep its hold on Jewish thought, having been discarded in the later literature (p. 104). For the Shechinah of the Talmud, the *Metatron* of the Geonaic-mystical literature, the Active Intelligence of the philosophical schools, as well as the Ten Sephiroth (Emanations) of the Cabbalists, all owe their existence to the same theosophic scruples and subtleties in which the Logos of Philo and the Memra of the Targumim originated. Thus, they always kept—though under various forms—their hold on the Jewish mind. Judaism was always broad enough to accommodate itself to these formulæ, which for the one may mean the most holy mysteries, and for the other empty and meaningless catchwords. The objection—in fact, the active opposition—of the synagogue began when these possible or impossible explanations of the universe tended to transgress the bounds of abstract speculation, and passing over into real concrete beings, to be worshipped as such. An instance from comparatively modern times might be found in one of the vagaries of the followers of the Pseudo-Messiah, Sabbathai Zebi. For many generations the controversy had raged among the Cabbalists, whether the first of the above-mentioned Ten Emanations (called by some *Adam Kadmon*, by

others, *Kether*) is to be considered as a part of Dthe eity or as something separate, and so to speak, having a reality in itself. The danger of establishing a Being near the Deity having an existence of its own and invested with divine attributes could not have escaped the thoughtful, and there are indeed some indications to this effect. The Synagogue as such, however, remained during the whole controversy strictly neutral, and allowed these theosophists to fight in the air as much as they liked. But the moment that the sect of Sabbathai Zebi identified the incarnate Adam Kadmon with their leader, and worshipped him as a sort of God-Messiah, the Synagogue at once took up a hostile attitude against those who separated God from his world, and declaring Sabbathai Zebi and his followers to be apostates, excluded them from Judaism for ever.

Nor can it be proved that legalism or nomism has ever tended to suppress the spiritual side of religion, either in respect of consciousness of sin, or of individual love and devotion. With an equal logic quite the opposite might be argued. Professor Toy tells us himself that it is no "accident that along with this more definite expression of ethical-religious law we find the first traces of a more spiritual conception of righteousness in the 'new heart' of Jeremiah and Ezekiel" (p. 235), whilst in another passage we read that "a turning point is marked by the Deuteronomist Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who announce the principles of individual responsibility and inwardness of obedience" (p. 184). Now, two things are certain ; first, that Ezekiel urges the necessity of the new heart as well as of individual responsibility more keenly than any of his predecessors ; secondly, that in Ezekiel the legalistic tendency is more evident than in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. The logical conclusion would thus be that the higher ideals of religion are not only not inconsistent with legalism, but are the very outcome of it, and the so-called Priestly Code, by the very fact of its markedly legalistic tendency, should be considered as a step in the right direction. The latter assertion sounds like a paradox, but it will seem less so when the prevailing characteristic of this portion of the Pentateuch, as given even by Kuenen, who is by

no means a champion of the Law, is borne in mind. "The centre of gravity," according to the great Dutch critic, "lies for the priestly author elsewhere than for the prophet; it lies in man's attitude not towards his fellow-men, but towards God; not in his social, but in his personal life" (Hibbert Lectures, p. 161.) It is here that we seem to strike the keynote of the *Weltanschauung* of the Priestly Legislation. In it man is more than a social being. He has also an individual life of his own, his joys and sorrows, his historical claims, his traditions of the past, and his hopes for the future—and all these have to be brought under the influence of religion, and to become sanctified through their relation to God. Hence, the work of the Priestly narrator and legislator opens with a cosmogony of his own, in which we find the grand theological idea of man being created in the Divine image; hence, too, his religious conception of the history of the nation and his claimed control over all the details of human life, which became with him so many opportunities for the worship of God. To him, God is not a mere figurehead; he not only reigns, but governs. Everywhere, in the temple, in the judge's seat, in the family, in the farm, and in the market-place, his presence is felt in exacting the laws bearing his *imprimatur*, "I am the Lord thy God." By this diffusion of religion over the whole domain of human life—not confining it to the social institutions which are represented only by a few personages, such as the king, the princes, the priests, the judges or elders—it became the common good of the whole people, and the feeling of personal responsibility for this good became much deeper than before. Thus it came to pass that whilst, during the first temple, the apostasy of kings and aristocracy involved the entire people, so that the words "And he (the king) did evil in the sight of the Lord" embrace the whole nation, during the second temple it was no longer of much consequence which side the political leaders took. And both during the Hellenistic persecutions, as well as afterwards in the struggles of some Maccabæan kings with the Pharisees, the bulk of the people showed that they considered religion as their own personal affair, not to be regulated by the con-

science of either priest or prince. It is true that this success may largely be ascribed to such contemporary religious factors as the Synagogue with its minimum of form, to the Scribes with their activity as teachers, and to the Psalmists with their divine enthusiasm, but the very circumstance that these factors arose and flourished under the influence of the Priestly Code would suffice to prove that its tendency was not so sacerdotal as some writers would have us believe. Jewish tradition indeed attributes the composition of the daily public prayers, as well as of others for private worship, to the very men whom biblical criticism holds responsible for the introduction of the Priestly Code. Now this fact may perhaps be disputed, but there is little doubt that the age in which these prayers were composed was one of flourishing legalism. Nor is there any proof that the synagogues and their ritual were in opposition to the temple. From the few documents belonging to this period, it is clear that there was no opposition to the legalistic spirit by which the Priestly Code was actuated. This would prove that legalism meant something more than tithes and sacrifices for the benefit of the priests.

Nor is it true that the legal tendency aimed at narrowing the mind of the nation, turning all its thoughts into the one direction of the law. Apart from the fact that the Torah contained other elements besides its legalism, the prophets were not forgotten, but were read and interpreted from a very early age. It was under the predominance of the law that the Wisdom literature was composed, which is by no means narrow or one-sided, but is even supposed by some to contain many foreign elements. In the book of Job, the great problems of man's existence are treated with a depth and grandeur never equalled before or since. This book alone ought partly to compensate the modern school for the disappearance of prophecy, which is usually brought as a charge against the Law. Then, too, the Psalms, placed by the same school in the post-exilic period, are nothing but another aspect of prophecy, with this difference, perhaps, that in the Prophets God speaks to man, while in the Psalms it is man who establishes the same communion by

speaking to God. There is no reason why the critical school, with its broad conception of inspiration, and insisting, as it does, that prophecy does *not* mean prediction, should so strongly emphasise this difference. If "it is no longer as in the days of Amos, when the Lord Yahveh did nothing without revealing his counsel to his servants the prophets," there is in the days of the Psalmists nothing in man's heart, no element in his longings and meditations and aspirations, which was not revealed to God. Nay, it would seem that at times the Psalmist hardly ever desires the revelation of God's secrets. Let future events be what they may, he is content, for he is with God. After all his trials, he exclaims, "And yet I am continually with thee; thou hast taken hold of my right hand. According to thy purpose wilt thou lead me, and afterwards receive me with glory. Whom have I (to care for) in heaven? and possessing thee, I have pleasure in nothing upon earth. Though my flesh and my heart should have wasted away, God would for ever be the rock of my heart and my portion" (Ps. lxxiii. 23—26). How an age producing a literature containing passages like these—of which Wellhausen in his *Abriss* (p. 95) justly remarks, that we are not worthy even to repeat them—can be considered by the modern school as wanting in intimate relation to God and inferior to that of the prophets is indeed a puzzle.

Now a few words as to the actual life under the Law. Here, again, there is a fresh puzzle. On the one side, we hear the opinions of so many learned Professors, proclaiming *ex cathedrâ*, that the Law was a most terrible burden, and the life under it the most unbearable slavery, deadening body and soul. On the other side we have the testimony of a literature extending over about twenty-five centuries, and including all sorts and conditions of men, scholars, poets, mystics, lawyers, casuists, schoolmen, tradesmen, workmen, women, simpletons, who all, from the author of the 119th Psalm to the last pre-Mendelssohnian writer—with a small exception which does not even deserve the name of a vanishing minority—give unanimous evidence in favour of this Law, and of the bliss and happiness of living and dying under it,

—and this, the testimony of people who were actually living under the Law, not merely theorising upon it, and who experienced it in all its difficulties and inconveniences. The Sabbath will give a fair example. This day is described by almost every modern writer in the most gloomy colours, and long lists are given of the minute observances connected with it, easily to be transgressed, which would necessarily make of the Sabbath, instead of a day of rest, a day of sorrow and anxiety, almost worse than the Scotch Sunday as depicted by continental writers. But, on the other hand, the Sabbath is celebrated by the very people who did observe it, in hundreds of hymns, which would fill volumes, as a day of rest and joy, of pleasure and delight, a day in which man enjoys some presentiment of the pure bliss and happiness which are stored up for the righteous in the world to come, and to which such tender names were applied as the "Queen Sabbath," the "Bride Sabbath," and the "Holy, dear, beloved Sabbath." Somebody, either the learned Professors, or the millions of the Jewish people, must be under an illusion. Which it is I leave to the reader to decide.

It is also an illusion to speak of the burden which a scrupulous care to observe 613 commandments must have laid upon the Jew. Even a superficial analysis will discover that in the time of Christ many of these commandments were already obsolete (as for instance those relating to the tabernacle and to the conquest of Palestine), while others concerned only certain classes, as the priests, the judges, the soldiers, the Nazirites, or the representatives of the community, or even only one or two individuals among the whole population, as the King and the High-Priest. Others again, provided for contingencies which could occur only to a few, as for instance the laws concerning divorce or levirate marriages, whilst many—such as those concerning idolatry, and incest, and the sacrifice of children to Moloch—could scarcely have been considered as a practical prohibition by the pre-Christian Jew; just as little as we can speak of Englishmen under the burden of a law preventing them from burning widows or marrying their grandmothers, though such acts would certainly be considered as crimes.

Thus it will be found by a careful enumeration that barely a hundred laws remain which really concerned the life of the bulk of the people. If we remember that even these include such laws as belief in the unity of God, the necessity of loving and fearing him, and of sanctifying his name, of loving one's neighbour and the stranger, of providing for the poor, exhorting the sinner, honouring one's parents and many more of a similar character, it will hardly be said that the ceremonial side of the people's religion was not well balanced by a fair amount of spiritual and social elements. Besides, it would seem that the line between the ceremonial and the spiritual is too often only arbitrarily drawn. With many commandments it is rather a matter of opinion whether they should be relegated to the one category or the other.

Thus, the wearing of Tephilin or phylacteries has, on the one hand, been continually condemned as a meaningless superstition, and a pretext for formalism and hypocrisy. But, on the other hand, Maimonides, who can in no way be suspected of superstition or mysticism, described their importance in the following words : "Great is the holiness of the Tephilin ; for as long as they are on the arm and head of man he is humble and God-fearing, and feels no attraction for frivolity or idle things, nor has he any evil thoughts, but will turn his heart to the words of truth and righteousness." The view which R. Jochanan, a Palestinian teacher of the third century, took of the fulfilment of the Law, will probably be found more rational than that of many a rationalist of to-day. Upon the basis of the last verse in Hosea, "The ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them, but the transgressors shall stumble therein," he explains that while one man, for instance, eats his paschal lamb for the sake of the *Mizvah* (that is, to do God's will who commanded it), and thereby commits an act of righteousness, another thinks only of satisfying his appetite by the lamb, so that his eating it (by the very fact that he professes at the same time to perform a religious rite) becomes a stumbling-block for him (*Nazir* 23 *b*.). Thus all the laws by virtue of their divine authority—and in this there was in

the first century no difference of opinion between Jews and Christians—have their spiritual side, and to neglect them implies, at least from the individual's own point of view, a moral offence.

The legalistic attitude may be summarily described as an attempt to live in accordance with the will of God. But, nevertheless, on the whole this life never degenerated into religious formalism. Apart from the fact that during the second temple there grew up laws and even beliefs, which show a decided tendency towards progress and development, there were also ceremonies which were popular with the people, and others which were neglected. Men were not, therefore, the mere soulless slaves of the Law ; personal sympathies and dislikes also played a due part in their religion. Nor were all the laws actually put upon the same level. With a happy inconsistency men always spoke of heavier and slighter sins, and by the latter—excepting, perhaps, the profanation of the Sabbath—they mostly understood ceremonial transgressions. The statement made by Professor Toy (p. 243), on the authority of James (ii. 10), that "the principle was established that he who offended in one point was guilty of all," is hardly correct; for the passage seems rather to be laying down a principle, or arguing that logically the law ought to be looked upon as a whole, than stating a fact. The fact was that people did not consider the whole law as of equal importance, but made a difference between laws and laws, and even spoke of certain commandments, such as those of charity and kindness, as outweighing all the rest of the Torah. It was in conformity with this spirit that in times of great persecution the leaders of the people had no compunction in reducing the whole Law to the three prohibitions of idolatry, of incest, and of bloodshed. Only these three were considered of sufficient importance that men should rather become martyrs than transgress them.

These, then, are some of the illusions and misrepresentations which exist with regard to the Law. There are many others, of which the complete exposure would require a book by itself. Meanwhile, in the absence of such a book to

balance and correct the innumerable volumes upon the other side, Professor Toy has done the best he could with existing materials, and produced a meritorious work deserving of wide recognition and approval.

S. SCHECHTER

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Pseudo-Aristoteles über die Seele. Eine psychologische Schrift des 11. *Jahrhunderts und ihre Beziehungen zu Salomo ibn Gabirol* (*Avicebron*). Von Dr. A. LOEWENTHAL (Berlin, 1891).

Scholastic philosophy had a special interest for Jewish philosophy in Spain and in Provence in the thirteenth century ; the Jews assisted in the translation from Arabic into Latin through the medium of Hebrew translations, not only of philosophical works, but also of those on science and medicine. Dr. Loewenthal traces this influence to the twelfth century for philosophy ; as to medicine, we know that the Hebrew MS., No. 1190, 4 of the Paris library, contains translations from the Arabic written between 1197 and 1199. A little earlier Judah ibn Tabbon (Tibbon) began his translations of the philosophico-ethical work of Saadyah, Bahya ben Joseph and Judah Halevy, but there is no trace yet of such an early translation of an Arabic work of the Mussulman school relating to philosophy. A full account of the literature translated into Hebrew will be found in Dr. Steinschneider's forthcoming work on the subject, which is in the printer's hands, and has got as far as p. 836. We shall pass over the chapter on the migration of the philosophical literature from Greece to Spain, and mention at once that, according to our author, Dominicus Gundisalvi compiled from Arabic sources a treatise in Latin on the soul, which is still in MS. On the other hand, we possess a Hebrew fragment of a treatise on the soul attributed to Aristotle, which is to be found in the work שער השמים, a philosophical encyclopædia by Gershom, son of Solomon, of Arles. About the date of this compilation critics are divided ; whilst in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii., pp. 589 *seqq*, it is assigned to about the year 1250, Drs. Steinschneider and Gross (Steinschneider's unpublished work, p. 9) say that Gershom's compilation was made towards the end of the thirteenth century. Dr. Loewenthal shows that the preface to Gershom's fragment is identical with that of Gundisalvi ; Gershom thus made use either of Gundisalvi's Latin text or of a Hebrew translation of it. To the first our author makes the following objections :

Gershom did not know Latin enough to make use of Gundisalvi's original; indeed from all other extracts in Gershom's work we can see that he uses Hebrew translations; a Hebrew translation of Gundisalvi's Latin text, on the other hand, is, according to Dr. Loewenthal, out of question about 1250 (our author, we suppose, accepts the date given in the *Histoire Litteraire?*), since Hebrew translations from the Latin only began at the end of the thirteenth century with but one exception, viz., Berachiah, the Naqdan, who in 1260 translated the *Quæstiones naturales* of Adelard, of Bath. Neither of the two objections seems to us striking. Gershom might have been helped in a translation of the Latin by a Christian friend, even if it were proved by evidence that he did not know Latin, which is not the case. As to Berachiah, it is now proved beyond any doubt that he made his translation at the latest towards the end of the twelfth century (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 520). Thus it is not absolutely certain that Gershom worked upon a Hebrew translation, although such a translation was possible in 1250. That Gershom attributes the treatise on the soul to Aristotle would rather argue that he made his extracts from a MS., Latin or Hebrew, which had not the name of the author, and he attributed it to Aristotle, as such a work by the Stagirite was known. But the importance of our monograph is that the author has shown clearly that Gundisalvi is not only familiar with Gabirol's philosophy, but that he gives passages from Avicebron's Treatise on the Soul. Indeed, Munk already found out that Gabirol had written such a treatise, and Dr. Loewenthal tries to prove that it contained ten chapters, and that it was translated from the Arabic by Johannes Hispalensis, about 1130, the translation of which Gundisalvi made use. Our author in giving in an Appendix all the passages which are borrowed by Gundisalvi from Gabirol, is right not to attempt from these fragments a reconstruction of Gabirol's psychological work. In another Appendix Dr. Loewenthal gives Gershom's extracts from the Treatise on the Soul attributed to Aristotle, in a corrected form according to MSS., and which have much connection with Gabirol's philosophy. We hope that Dr. Loewenthal's important monograph is only a forerunner of an elaborate work on Gundisalvi and Gabirol.

We take the opportunity to correct an erroneous statement, which we made concerning Berachiah (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., p. 326), to the effect that Elijah does not mention his father's ethical work. It is indeed enumerated in the colophon of the Vatican MS. No. 14, according to Dr. Berliner's investigation. On the last leaf of the MS. (fol. 292), which is much mutilated, Dr. Berliner reads as follows:—

הוא עשה פירוש [לעשרים] זה הספר
וארבעה ספרים לר׳ אשר בר
והוא עשה משלים שולחנו ערוך
והוא עשה המוסר לזמן ארוך כי
והוא עשה ספר ענייניו ענתה בו
והוא עשה תשוב[ות] אחר מעורב בו
רבות עמו כי הוא נאמן
והמלאכה וירא אלהיו וסר מרע
אשר קמתי מאשר שמנה לחמו יהי
זה הספר אלהיו עמו אשר נדב לבו לעש[ות]
ספר בזה ׳ וסיימתיהו ביום ג׳ כ״א בחדש אב שנת צ״ט לפרט
אלף חמישי ש״ל ואשא משלי ואומר
השר אשר אשר בין בכסף
אוסף כי כל בינות ?
ויבחר לו מענל צדק
באשר בחר . . . .

It results from these mutilated lines that Elijah copied for R. Asher, son of ? and that Berachiah composed a commentary on the twenty-four books of the Bible, Fables, an ethical treatise, a book [on precious stones?], and Answers (probably the translation of Adelard's *Quæstiones naturales*).

A. Neubauer.

מדרש תהלים המכונה שוחר טוב, *Midrasch Tehillim* (Schocher Tob). *Sammlung agadischer Abhandlungen über die* 150 *Psalmen*. . . . Von Solomon Buber. Wilna : 1891. 8vo.

Herr Solomon Buber has nearly monopolised the editing of Midrashim. After having brought out critically and exhaustively the *Pesikta*, attributed to R. Kahna, in 1868, the *Tanhuma* in 1885, the *Midrash on the Book of Esther* in 1886, and the *Lekah Tob* of Tobiah ben Eliezer on Genesis and Exodus in 1880, he now follows up his series with the *Midrash on the Psalms*. This edition is based upon eight manuscripts extant in public and private libraries (as far as is known, no other MS. exists of this Midrash), collated with the early editions, and with the quotations in the *Yalkut* ; besides, notice is taken of the glosses by Abraham Provenzale. If the learned editor has not supplied all missing passages, it is not his fault, for he could

only give what he found in the MSS. Possibly some lacunæ will be supplied by the edition of the important *Yalkut Makhiri* on the Psalms, of which there is a MS. in the Bodleian Library. Herr Buber has applied to the present edition the same method as in his previous ones, viz., he gives the variations from MSS. and early editions, the references to the Talmudical literature, with his own commentary, and the explanation of foreign words in the copious notes. In the preface, which fills not less than sixty-four pages, he discusses the titles of the Midrash, the name of the compiler, when and where the compilation was made, but he arrives at no certain result. This Midrash was most likely compiled in Southern Italy, and during various centuries, for the work is not done by one hand. In a following chapter the editor tries to explain the contents and aims of our Midrash—subjects which are more difficult to define than the name of the author and the date of the compilation. The alphabetical list of the Tanaim and Amoraim, quoted in our Midrash, is of immense value for comparative study ; so also is that of the foreign words, and of the quotations borrowed from other Midrashim. Of bibliographical imp ortance is the eleventh section, where the editor indicates the Rabbis who made use of our Midrash, the earliest of whom seems to be R. Nissim Gaon (lived about 1040), and the last is Jacob ibn Habib (about 1500). As to later quotations, they are too numerous to give them in a preface. Herr Buber winds up with the description of the MSS. of which he made use, and of the previous eleven editions. He then indicates the additional passages he was able to produce, and, finally, gives the list of quotations from our Midrash in the *Yalkut*, and his short analysis of the present edition will give the reader an idea of the care and of the skill of this experienced editor. Only when we have similar editions of the *Rabboth* and of the *Midrash hag-Gadol* of Yemen, which Mr. Schechter has taken in hand, together with minor Midrashim, printed as well as from MSS., specialists will be able to revise Zunz's results laid down in his incomparable book, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, and complete the literary and critical data concerning Midrashic literature. Unfortunately, we have lost the chief pioneer in this task, in the lamented Dr. Nehemiah Brüll, who prepared a new and revised edition of Zunz's work.

A. Neubauer.

Censur und Confiscation hebräischer Bücher im Kirchenstaate. Auf Grund der Inquisitions-Akten in der Vaticana und Vallicellana dargestellt von Dr. A. BERLINER. (Frankfurt a.M., 1891. 8vo.)

IF the censorship of books deserves a history, Dr. Berliner has made a very good beginning, by giving the official lists of Hebrew books which were confiscated after searching for them in private houses at Rome, Urbino, Ancona, Sinigaglio, Pesaro, Lugo, Ferrara, and Avignon, from 1753 to 1754. In the introduction, Dr Berliner gives a sketch of the decrees against the spread of heretical and suspicious books from 1542 to 1753. A complete history of this matter can only be made when all Hebrew books and MSS. of Italian origin in various libraries shall have been examined, and the names of the censors who gave permission to keep the books after having blotted out the so-called blasphemous passages shall have been noted, as well as the titles of the works. Will it ever be done? We doubt it.

A. N.

Judenthum und Christenthum und ihre Zukunft. Von DR. A. F. BERNER, Professor an der Universität Berlin (Leipzig, 1891).

AN old friend in Berlin has sent me a pamphlet bearing the above title, with the suggestion that it should receive, as in his opinion it deserves, a sympathetic notice in the pages of this REVIEW. The importance of Professor Berner's pamphlet, or rather lecture—for it was originally delivered at the *Berliner Unions-Verein* on Jan. 30th, 1891—lies, I should imagine, less in its contents than in the fact of its authorship. For that a full-blown *ordentlicher* German professor should speak words of thoughtful recognition concerning modern Judaism, and even urge that modern Christianity would in one direction be the better for a Judaising purification, is, I fancy, a strange and unusual phenomenon.

For its own sake, too, the pamphlet is worth reading and noticing, as one more expression of the numberless religious voices which are now making themselves heard throughout the civilised world. That it is a reprint of a lecture perhaps accounts for its extraordinary arrangement. It consists of a number of comparatively isolated jottings, which form anything but an artistic whole. Of its thirty-six pages the first twenty-three are introductory to the last thirteen. But these twenty-three, though they are, of course, more or less connected with the essential thirteen, do not lead up to them so necessarily that one cannot well conceive their place being taken by another

twenty-three pages of cognate, but by no means identical import. This is their table of contents :—

We get first of all (1) a short characteristic of Judaism at the age of Christ. Then (2) the close connection of early Christianity with Judaism is briefly alluded to. Next (3) follow citations from M. Renan's views upon the two religions, culled first from an article of his in the *Revue des deux Mondes* of 1860, and then from two pamphlets of the year 1883. Professor Berner shows how in 1883 Judaism was more highly estimated by M. Renan than in 1860. We next have (4) a four-page jotting upon the way in which polytheistic accretions found their way into adolescent Christianity, and this is followed (5) by an equally brief account of the injury brought to the religion by scholasticism, with its endless *Dogmatik*. The section is concluded by the words :—

Das ewige Christenthum ist die christliche Religion, nicht die Dogmatik (p. 22).

In the penultimate introductory jotting (6) we hark back to the M. Renan of 1860, and a long passage is approvingly quoted concerning the abiding supremacy of the religious teaching of Jesus. Then, finally (7), it is asserted that the religious instinct is not quenched in Germany, as the war of Liberation and the war of 1870 sufficiently prove. Religion is an eternal need, and the idea of God a permanent necessity. A wave of atheism is possible, but it will not, and cannot, conquer in the end. Nevertheless, if atheism spread it may lead to catastrophes, which will show the world by sermons of blood that it cannot get on without God (p. 27). Thus the introductory portion of the lecture concludes with the statement : religion we must have, and the innermost sanctuary of religion is faith in God (p. 28).

What, then, is the religion of the future to be? It must be an historical religion with its roots in the past. This position is maintained by Professor Berner in the following weighty paragraph (p. 28) :—

For a struggle in the living world's arena *historic* powers are necessary. It is impossible to bring down, as it were, a pure religion of reason out of the clouds on to the earth. The idea of a religion of pure reason is just as unreal an Utopia as was the idea of a purely rational State, which the old philosophy of natural law (*das alte Naturrecht*) wanted to substitute in place of the actually existing State.

Now, for the civilisation of the West there are two historical religions at the most, which need, or can, be taken into account in forecasting the religion of the future—Judaism and Christianity. Towards the progress of that phase of religion of which our author desires the triumph in times to come, Judaism has this one, but signal, advantage—its conception of God is purer, more monotheistic. The

function of Judaism in modern society is admirably and sympathetically indicated.

> It is Judaism wherein the oldest and most powerful historic roots of monotheism lie hidden, and which has preserved monotheism most purely to the present hour. This oldest and strongest exponent of pure monotheism, to which the immortal merit pertains of having given to humanity the faith in One God, is especially calculated and called to take up the fight against the atheistic tendencies of to-day (p. 28).

Yet Judaism cannot hope to be the universal religion of the future. It is still only a national religion, and a national religion it must ever remain. Remove its national elements, and the religion will tumble to pieces. Attempted reform does not build up—it is mere disintegration. As many Jews themselves recognise, a denationalising reform can only lead to dissolution and decay.

The true and lasting reformed Judaism was, and still is, Christianity. In what form, then, can, or should, Christianity be preserved as the religion of the future? It must get back from Judaism the pure and simple Monotheism of the latter. Such a harmonising or combination (*Verschmelzung*) of the Christian conception of God with that of Judaism would not be hard (p. 31). For the Jewish conception of God is both high and deep, while many of the current oppositions between it and the conceptions of Christianity are exaggerated and false (p. 31, 32).

On the other hand, Christianity has in some respects undoubtedly gone beyond and excelled Judaism, and these religious superiorities must be maintained. It possesses (1) a higher, more spiritual and more catholic conception of the kingdom of God (p. 33), and (2) a higher conception of general morality; for Christian love and freedom may be fairly opposed to the law and bondage (*Gebundenheit*) of Judaism (p. 35).

So far, so good. But now comes the *crux* of the whole problem. What is to become of the faith in the person of Christ in the Judaised Christianity of the future? Professor Berner puts forward one suggested solution, only to reject it as inadequate and impossible. That solution would be to abandon the person of Christ—since the true lineaments of the historical Jesus can never be pourtrayed with complete exactitude—and to confine the Christian religion to the collective teaching attributed, more or less accurately, to Jesus in all the four Gospels indifferently (p. 37). But such a violent separation of Christianity from the person of Christ would be unsatisfying, and even impossible (p. 38). Yet men cannot wait till criticism has drawn the true picture of the historical Christ, and, moreover, as aforesaid, criticism will never be able to accomplish that task. What, then, is to be done? How is the antinomy to be got over? There

is no other possibility, replies Professor Berner, than, in spite of real or apparent contradictions, to cling and hold on to the Christ of the entire New Testament. We then get a Christ who is admittedly not a purely historical person. The figure is an ideal, partly *Wahrheit* and partly *Dichtung;* but, nevertheless, it is the Christ who as a fact lives in Christianity to-day, and who, if all dogma and dogmatism about him are wholly abandoned, will ever abide in the hearts of men as the archetype of humanity and the sun of the spiritual world.

So, this is the solution; yet, before it is summed up in a final sentence, there is interjected a significant N.B. :—

Concerning the belief in miracles, not a word: this phantom Science has scared away.

And now the conclusion :—

The religion of the future will be a Christianity freed from faith in miracles, strengthened in its conception of and belief in God by the reintroduction of Judaism, and purged and purified of all dogmatic scholasticism and polytheistic accretions.

This purified Christianity is to be the religion of all. Jews will embrace it as well as Gentiles. As things now are, Jews are right not to become Christians. It would not be desirable. Once more the author shows his intelligent sympathy with the Jewish position in words for which the Jews of Germany, and not of Germany only, must be frankly grateful to him :—

A conversion of the Jews to a Christianity still coloured by polytheism and disfigured by dogmatic scholasticism, is not only not to be wished, but even to be prevented. It would deprive the development of religion to higher purity and truth of its most active propelling force. The vocation of Judaism was, and still is, to maintain unchangingly pure monotheism. Only those Jews can be of service to us who refuse to enter upon any religious bargaining, and with unsurrendered conscience offer to the heathen and scholastic elements of Christianity an unshaken opposition (p. 30).

But when Christianity, following the example of Judaism, becomes monotheistic once more, how great would be Judaism's gain if it were to incorporate itself in such a purified Christianity!

It would then at last be able to escape from its mournful isolation, to free itself from the historic ghetto in which, since the Talmudic reaction, it has sat, and still sits, imprisoned (p. 31).

The above is a fair analysis—and should not a review, above all things, be an analysis?—of Professor Berner's interesting lecture. The questions which it raises and the answers which it suggests, are too large and complicated for criticism in this place and at this time. Professor Berner has certainly put his finger upon divers sore and tender spots in both Judaism and Christianity; yet one feels at once

how much easier and more convincing is the recital of their weaknesses than the attempted reconstruction of either religion, and the prophecy of their respective futures which follow upon the exposure. Would such a Christianity as the Professor sketches in his last dozen pages be teachable to children, and even if they learnt it from parents who had been real Christians once, would it not be a still more watered-down Christianity which would be taught by them to the next generation in its turn? Professor Berner's future Christianity seems a form of Unitarianism too Christian, on the one hand, for the Theistic left; not Christian enough, upon the other, for the Unitarian right. It is at any rate more than doubtful whether Jews could ever accept it, even if, as is not improbable, they come to recognise more liberally than now the advance which, in some elements of religion, has been effected by Christianity. How could people who have no inherited associations, no tender, youthful memories connected with the person of Christ, accept as the central conception of their religion an ideal figure who is confessedly composed both of *Dichtung* as well as *Wahrheit*, in proportions alike unknown and unknowable?

Meanwhile, no Jewish reviewer can take leave of Professor Berner's *brochure* without expressing to the author—a citizen of a land where the religious claims of Judaism are usually ignored or misunderstood—most grateful thanks for his keen recognition of the Jewish position and its rights in the present religious order—or chaos. The future of Judaism is, indeed, full of difficulty; yet it may possibly, under the varying conditions of the future, shape itself to a new and more potent life. Its denationalisation—which a liberal Jew, at any rate, must still regard as its only religious hope or chance for the days to come—is truly a problem of the utmost complexity, and with but a small logical display, it can easily be made to assume the aspect of self-contradiction and delusion. M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, in his second article upon *Les Juifs et l'Antisémitisme*,[1] justly remarks, "Rarement l'histoire religieuse a présenté pareil problème." And yet, as he goes on to say—

> Bien téméraire, cependant, qui le dirait insoluble. Les religions ont un art à elles de passer à travers les antinomies; elles possèdent un instinct merveilleux de s'adapter aux lieux et aux temps. Le judaïsme, en particulier, est déjà sorti, sans y succomber, de deux ou trois crises qui semblaient lui devoir être mortelles. Il a une vitalité étrange; il en a donné tant de preuves qu'il serait en droit de nous en vouloir de paraître inquiet de son sort.

C. G. Montefiore.

---

[1] *Revue des Deux-Mondes.* 1er Mai, 1891, p. 198.

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

ANGLO-JUDAICA.

Three Centuries of the Hagin Family.

PROF. KAUFMANN'S discovery of a Hebrew colophon containing a long pedigree of a member of the Hagin family, as I called them in the somewhat elaborate genealogy I gave of them in my lecture on *The London Jewry*, is very interesting, more interesting even than Prof. Kaufmann is in a position to know. It is true that at first sight it seems only to add a number of names of English Jews to the many thousands already known from the Records. But these names, as we shall see, are very early ones, and connect the Hagin family with the important German line of R. Simeon the Great (*i.e.* the early). Its chief interest to me, however, is that it affords material for certain hypotheses relating to the connection between the German and English Jews of the twelfth century which will serve to explain many points in the early history of English Jews.

But first let us have before us in English the notice to which I refer :—

This calendar was composed by, (1.) Moses, son of (2.) the *Nadib** R. Jacob son of (3.) Rabenu Moses of London, son of (4.) the Rav Rabenu Yomtob who composed *Sepher Tanaim*, son of (5.) the *Nadib* Moses of Bristou, son of (6.) R. Isaac ben (7.) R. Simeon, brother of R. Abraham ben R. Simeon, sister's son of (8.) R. Simeon, and he was the son of (9.) R. Joseph, son of (10.) R. Simeon the Great, who rests in the graveyard at Mayence.

Here we have ten generations filling up the three centuries 1000—1300—and seven of these were English, as I shall proceed to show.

1. Moses ben Jacob the calendar maker, was an Oxford Jew, who is mentioned in 1279, the very year when the Calendar begins, as having bought a tenement in Oxford from Philip Stowell (*Rot. Hundred*, ii. 792 *ap.* Neubauer *Jews in Oxford*, p. 306). This was probably in the parish of St. Aldate, for when the Jews of England were expelled in 1290, the house of Moss fil Jacob in that parish was given by the King to the Provost of Wells (*Rot. Orig.* 75, cf. Neubauer *l.c.*

* On *Nadib* (= Mæcenas) see Zunz, *Ges. Schr.* iii.

312). This shows that Moses was still living at Oxford at the time of the expulsion.

2. Jacob ben Rabbenu Moses was also in the latter years of his life an Oxford Jew. Deeds relating to him are contained in Dr. Neubauer's admirable catena of documents of the Jews of Oxford in the *Collectanea* II., of the Oxford Historical Society (Nos. xlix., li., liv., lvi., lix., lx.[m], [n], [o], lxiv.[e], lxvi). From these it appears that Jacob built for himself a beautiful hall (*pulcram aulam*) in St. Aldate's, out of materials carried into the city from a house of Walter Long's, which fell into Jacob's hand as an unredeemed pledge (lx[o]). Can this be the "Jacob's Hall" mentioned in Oxford tradition (Anthony à Wood) ? It was probably the very house vacated by his son Moses in the same parish, for Jacob did not live to see the expulsion, dying about the year 1285 (lxiv[e]). One of the deeds (liv.) shows that Merton College was built on ground bought from our Jacob and his brother Cresse, (cf. xlix., li.) the father of the Hagin fil Deulacret le Evesk to whom Dr. Neubauer attributed the Hebrew translation of the *Image du Monde*. Attached to this important deed there is or was Jacob's seal, which, as it is almost the only extant one of an English Jew of the pre-expulsion period, we may give here from Tovey, p. 183.



As Tovey somewhat quaintly remarks, " the graven image on this seal can't be thought a breach of the Second Commandment, for it is the likeness of nothing that is in heaven, earth or water.'' Its technical name is a wyvern rampant. Attached to this deed, the title deed of Merton as it might be called, is a Hebrew Shetar, which, as it gives the name of Jacob's wife and Moses' mother, may be repeated here.

אני יעקב בן רב משה דלונדרש מודה כל שכתוב למעלה בלשון לטין בל ימחק והנה הודיתי בעבורי ובעבור יורשי שיהיה שריר וקיים וגם בעבור אשתי הודיתי שיהיח שריר וקיים ומה שהודיתי כתבתי וחתמתי בעבורי ובעבור אשתי חנה :

Jacob thus married Anna (*Lat.* Henna), who may possibly have been his niece Henna, the daughter of the great Elyas le Evesk, who certainly married a Jacob.

3. R. Moses ben Yomtob of London is probably, as I have endeavoured to show (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I., 182), the author of the דרכי הנקוד still attached to all the Rabbinic Bibles as the authoritative treatise on Hebrew accentuation. He would also be the author of some notes on Joseph Kimchi's ס' הזכרון and was certainly the master of Moses ben Isaac, who quotes him as such in

his ס' השהם (p. 37, ed. Collins). In the English records his sons are always called "fil Magistri Mosse," which seems to show he was a doctor as well as a grammarian.

4. R. Yomtob was certainly not R. Yomtob of Joigny, as his father's name was Moses, while the Joigny Yomtob's father was Isaac. I have already withdrawn this identification in the revised edition of my genealogy of the Hagin family in the *Révue des études juives* (xviii. 259.) I there suggested that our Yomtob was identical with a Yomtob given by Zunz as an eminent legal authority in London about 1175, in his *Zur Geschichte*, p. 193. Unfortunately Zunz does not give any reference for his statement. Our pedigree informs us that Yomtob was author of a work entitled ס' התנאים, which combined with Zunz's statement might imply that this was an halachic work of some kind. But I forgot: Prof. Kaufmann does not like hypotheses unless they are his own.

5. R. Moses, of Bristou, the old name for Bristol, was also an Oxford Jew. He is mentioned in the following deed given by Dr. Neubauer (No. lxx.).

Carta de diversis terris et tenementis concessis Laurentio Kepeharm. . . . Notum sit omnibus quod ego Johannes de Eofleia et ego Helena ejus uxor . . . concessimus . . Laurentio Kephram has subscriptas terras nostras in Oxonia et in suburbio . . . et terram que fuit Gaufridi Balby . . et est inter terram que fuit Radulphi Wautir et terram Copini de Wirecestre in Judaismo Oxoniæ et illam terram que fuit Mossei Judei de Brist. et terram que fuit Deodati Judei . . . ei hee due terre sunt inter terram que fuit Sewini child et terram que fuit Beniamin Judei in Judaismo Oxonie. . . . . .

Unfortunately this deed is one of those "of uncertain date." Yet we can conjecture (if Prof. Kaufmann will allow us), that it was of the end of the twelfth century. For it refers to Benjamin of Oxford as lately dead (that is the significance of "*quæ fuit*") and we know that he died in 1184. (See my *Notes from Pipe Rolls*, Arch. Rev., ii., p. 403, No. 73, quoted by Dr. Neubauer, No. v.) As Mosse de Brist. is also referred to with "*quæ fuit*," he also must have died about that date. I may here venture to assure Prof. Kaufmann that it is unnecessary to find any mark of omission of a final letter in ברישטו as this is a quite adequate transliteration of Bristou, the ordinary twelfth century name of the town. Moses of Bristou was, then, an inhabitant of Oxford at the time of his death, and could not have been buried in London, as Prof. Kaufmann suggests. If I might indulge in hypothesis, he left Bristol when the conquest of Ireland in 1171 put an end to the extensive slave-trade between that Kingdom and the port of Bristol. Jews were at that time the great slave-merchants of Europe.

6. Isaac, Moses' father, does not occur in the English records, but his

brother Abraham ben Simeon occurs, if I mistake not, as Abraham fil Simonis in a deed granting him land belonging to St. Paul's of London (*Hist. Com. Rep.* ix. 68). This again is without date, but is signed by Richard, Archdeacon of Middlesex, who became Bishop of London in 1152, so it is therefore anterior to that date.

7. Simeon, the father of Isaac and Abraham does not occur, indeed, in the Latin records of the time, but I am much mistaken if I cannot identify him with a German Jew found in England at this period. For in Ephraim of Bonn's martyrology it is said, "In the Month of Ellul (11 August—8 September, 1146) R. Simeon Chasid of Triers came back from England, where he had been for many years, and betook himself to Cologne to go by boat to Triers." He was martyred on the way by the Crusaders. Here we have a R. Simeon, from Germany, who had lived in England many years. Even Prof. Kaufmann, with all his horror of hypotheses, will allow that we have here the link with Germany that is needed to account for the relationship with R. Simeon the Great (the Elder). I would even go further and imagine I can identify R. Simeon as the Jewish interlocutor in a most interesting *Disputatio Judæi cum Christiano* addressed to St. Anselm, who died in England 1109, by Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster Abbey. In the introduction to this very interesting discussion, which is marked by great fairness on both sides, Crispin remarks of his Jewish friend and opponent (in *Anselmi Opera*, ed. 1744, ii. 255): "I know not where he was born, but he was educated at Mayence." This would exactly answer to R. Simeon, born at Treves, and, if my identification above is justified, connected by marriage with the family of R. Simeon the Great, who lies buried in the graveyard of Mayence. It is worth while to notice that both the father and the uncle of R. Simeon the Great were called Chasid, just like R. Simeon, of Treves: the epithet and the ascetic custom seems to have been in the family.

Not alone do we thus find a German Jew in England, but likewise an English Jew in Germany, for Vives, the English Jew, bought a house at Cologne, which afterwards came into the possession of the celebrated Jewish Minnesinger Süsskind von Trimberg (cf. *Regest. zur Gesch. der Juden in Deutschland*, Nos. 293, 353, 354). It is doubtless due to this intercourse between English and German Jews, that we find among both the curious office of Jewish Bishop, who does not seem to have existed among French Jews.

8, 9, and 10 scarcely belong to Anglo-Judaica, so I will content myself with saying that (8) R. Simeon is probably the one mentioned by Zunz (*Litt. syn. poes.*, 112), as having died in 1096 at Mayence just before the *émeute* there; that (9) R. Joseph is an additional son

of R. Simeon the Great to be added to the Isaac and Elchanan given in Zunz's genealogical table (*l.c.*, p. 111) ; and that finally (10) R. Simeon the Great is generally considered to be Rashi's maternal uncle, so that R. Simeon's father Isaac would be a common ancestor to the Hagin family, and to Rashi's numerous descendants, most of whom I have traced to England in the fourth generation (see *Was Sir Leon ever in London*, extract from *Jewish Chronicle*, 25th January, 1889).

Thus we have been able to identify all the English Jews mentioned in Prof. Kaufmann's interesting "find." The new information it gives us is not so much in adding to our knowledge any important figures in Anglo-Jewish annals, but rather in linking together some of those already known. It also enables us, to some extent, to distinguish between seeming homonyms. This is especially desirable, as by a curious coincidence, the early celebrities of the English Jewry seem to run in couples. Thus there are two Yomtobs, Yomtob b. Isaac of Joigny, and Yomtob b. Moses of Bristol ; there are two Moses, Moses b. Yomtob, and Moses b. Isaac, and even two Moses ben Isaac, one b. Simeon of *our* family, and the other ben Hanassiah, the author of the *Onyx Book*. Curiously enough, the two greatest financiers of the epoch were both Aarons, Aaron of Lincoln in the twelfth century, and Aaron of York in the thirteenth. Amid this confusing perplexity, a definite pedigree gives useful criteria for distinguishing between conflicting hypotheses.

Prof. Kaufmann, in his joy at the discovery he has made, has said some rather severe things about the use of hypothesis in historical investigations. All sciences use hypothesis, and history if it is to be a science, must use them too. Indeed, what we call history is mainly hypotheses of the historian put forth to give life and colour to the dry-as-dust details, to which Prof. Kaufmann would alone give the name of history. By all means let us have facts out of which to make hypotheses, and then more facts to check and correct hypotheses, But when we come to the end of our facts, we are obliged to use hypotheses to connect and interpret them ; the difference between the good and the bad historian is not that the one puts down facts, while the other puts down hypotheses, but rather that the good historian propounds fertile hypotheses leading to fresh indications of facts while the bad historian produces only bad and infertile hypotheses. I feel sure Prof. Kaufmann is too good an historian to confine himself only to facts.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Judæo-Christian Polemics in the Zohar.

As a production of the thirteenth century, which witnessed in France and Spain the first great religious disputes between the representatives of Judaism and Christianity, it is not to be expected that the Zohar should be entirely free of all traces of Judæo-Christian polemics. But I am not aware that they have heretofore received attention, and I therefore propose to give a short summary of them here.

1. Three Questions.—R. Abba relates in the name of the Holy Light, *i.e.*, of Simon b. Jochai, that a Gentile philosopher once came to R. Eleazar, and asked him the three following questions:—(1.) 'You say that another sanctuary will again be built for you, but where is there in the Scriptures any mention of a third temple? Is it not expressly said of the second temple: 'The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former?' (Haggai ii. 9). (2.) You say further, that you stand nearer God, the Supreme King, than all other nations; but ought not those who are near the king to be rich in joys, and permanently free from grief, fear, and oppression? You, on the contrary, live constantly in suffering and oppression, more than all other men. It is we, rather than you, who stand near the Supreme King, and you are far from him; therefore we are free from oppression and suffering, whilst you are constantly troubled and oppressed. (3.) Lastly, you assert that you abstain from forbidden kinds of food in order that you may be healthy, and that health may be given to your bodies. But in reality it is we, who eat whatever we please, that are healthy and strong, while you are weak and afflicted with illnesses and bodily infirmities more than all other nations." R. Eleazar became wroth at the questions, and stared hard at the questioner, until he became an inanimate "heap of bones."[1] When his anger had subsided, R. Eleazar wept and prayed, and then he told how he had once put these same three questions to the prophet Elijah, who had given him the answer which the questions had received in the heavenly "House of Learning." The answers were to the following effect:—"As regards the first question, the two sanctuaries, which, according to Exodus xv. 17 (מכון מקדש), were to be built by God himself, are not identical with the two historical temples. Both the temple of Solomon, and the temple built after the Babylonian exile,

[1] This is an incident borrowed from various Talmudic legends ונעשה גל של עצמות. *Berachoth*, 58*a*, *Sabbath*, 34*a*, *Baba Bathra*, 75*a* (*Sanhedrin* 100*a*).

were human handiwork, and had therefore no stability. The real sanctuaries, which were promised to Israel, will be God's own creation, and descend upon the new Jerusalem the one visible to all, the other above it, but hidden and invisible, enveloped in the clouds of the divine glory. For this true temple we still are waiting." To the second question he answered, "Undoubtedly we stand nearer than all other nations to the Supreme King, for God has appointed Israel to be the heart of the world. Israel bears the same relation to the other nations as the heart does to the limbs; it is the heart alone which feels pain, suffering, and oppression while the other limbs know nothing of them."

Then as to the third question:—"Israelites, unlike the Gentiles, abstain from all unclean food, just as the tender and delicate heart, on which the welfare of all the limbs depends, only absorbs the purest elements of food, leaving all coarser nutriment for the stronger limbs." (*Zohar*, פנחת IV. 220 *b*, 221 *b*.) If we remove from this passage its dramatic and legendary environment, we get a specimen of Judæo-Christian polemics, as they may actually have taken place in Spain during the thirteenth century between the representatives of Judaism and Christianity. If one pursued these investigations, the three questions would probably be met with in the polemic literature of the period. The answer to the first question has a purely mystical character, and rests upon the old idea of a heavenly sanctuary. The answers to the second and third questions are based upon a thought, which is borrowed from Jehuda Halevi. In one of the most beautiful and well-known passages of the *Kusari*, Israel's suffering is deduced from its resemblance to the human heart, and this comparison is carried out still further. (Cassel, in his edition of the *Kusari*, 2nd Ed., p. 143, refers to our passage of the *Zohar*, but does not notice that R. Jacob Emden, in his criticism of the *Zohar*, had already drawn attention to the loan of this image from the *Kusari*. Compare Grätz, *Geschichte*, Vol. VII., 1st Ed., p. 494.)

2. Truth is everlasting.—R. Chiya relates to R. Jose:—"I was once walking with R. Eleazar when we met a Gentile,[1] between whom and R. Eleazar the following conversation took place:—The Gentile: 'You are well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures of the Jews?' Eleazar: 'Yes.' Gentile: 'You say, do you not, that your belief is Truth, and your Holy Scripture Truth, whereas our belief and our Holy Scripture are lies? How then do you understand Proverbs

[1] He is also called הגמון, which, in the middle ages stood for bishop. But it is possible that in the *Zohar*, corresponding to the style of the story, הגמון is used in the Talmudic sense of Roman General (ἡγεμών, dux)

xii. 19 : "The lip of truth shall be established for ever ; but a lying tongue is but for a moment?" Is it not our kingdom which has been established of old, and which is not taken from us, whereas your kingdom was taken from you after a short time? Therefore, the lip of truth, which is everlasting, refers to us, and to you the lying tongue which passes away?' Eleazar : 'I see that you are well versed in Holy Scripture, but you do not understand this passage correctly. You would have been right had not the word תכון disproved your argument. For it does not say בוננה (has been established), but תכון (will be established) ; so the verse can only mean, Truth will in the future be established, even if it is not established now. At present, lies stand erect, and Truth lies on the ground. But in the future, Truth will stand firm.' The Gentile : 'You are right, and that people is right which possesses the doctrine of Truth.'" After some time (so the story ends), we heard that the questioner became converted to Judaism. (*Zohar*, כי תישא II., 188 *b*.)

This story also displays the character of Judæo-Christian polemics, even if we pay no attention to the name הגמון which is given to the Gentile speaker. It is sufficient to point to the accentuation of the contrariety between the "faith" and the "Holy Writ" of either creed. The corresponding passage in the original reads :— לית אתון אמרין דמהימנותא דלכון קשוט ואורייתכון קשוט ואנן דמהימניתא דולן שקר ואורייתא דילן שקר :

By אוריתא we must not understand "instruction" generally, because this idea is already contained in מהימנותא, but in a concrete sense, as religious scripture, therefore the Old Testament on the one side, and the New Testament on the other.

3. Commenting on Jer. x. 7, R. Simon b. Jochai tells his son, Eleazar :—"One day a Gentile philosopher came to me and said, 'You say that your God rules over all the heights of heaven, and that the hosts of heaven do not know His dwelling-place. Why then does the Scripture in this verse of Jeremiah, "Among all the wise men of the nations, and in all their kingdom, there is none like unto Thee," compare him with transitory mortals? You say, further, that while according to the words of Scripture (Deut. xxxiv. 10), "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses," it is true that no prophet arose like unto him in Israel, among the other nations there did arise a prophet who was like unto him.[1] So would I also explain the words of Jeremiah, "Among the wise men of the nations there is none like unto God, but there is among the wise men of Israel." Therefore, the God whose like there is among the wise men of Israel, would

[1] *Viz.*, Bileam, see Sifrê.

not be the Almighty and sovereign God. אי הבי אלהא דאית 'Reflect upon this passage,' concludes the philosopher, 'and you will find that my explanation is correct.' The answer which Simon b. Jochai gave is to the effect that, in reality, the wise men (prophets) in Israel, through the miracles they wrought, are indeed comparable with God, and that God himself has commanded Israel to walk in his ways and to become like him in everything."

After he had received this answer the philosopher went away, and was converted to Judaism in the township of Kepher Schichlaim.[1] He was called Jose Ketinaa,[2] taught much Torah, and was numbered among the pious and wise men of that town (*Zohar*, Introd. I. g. b.).

This story has this feature in common with the preceding one, that the Gentile interlocutor eventually becomes a proselyte. That he is described as a "philosopher" rests upon numerous polemic passages in the Talmud and Midrash, where the word "philosopher" is practically equivalent to "Christian." His subtle explanation of the verse in Jeremiah, which he slyly strengthens by a recognised canon of interpretation in the Midrash, reaches a result which reminds one of the fundamental conception of the gnostic systems, according to which the God of the Old Testament is different from the Almighty God of the universe. The dialogue is possibly taken from some older source, from which also the information respecting the residence and name of the converted philosopher may have been borrowed. But it is also possible that the point of the argument from Jeremiah x. 7, is to show that there has been one among the wise men of Israel who was like God—namely, Jesus.

4. Israel's Poverty.— The passage in the Talmud that God found no better quality to bestow on Israel than poverty (*vide Chagiga*, 9*b*), is explained in the following manner :—Other nations, when they are hungry, become angry, and utter imprecations against their king and their God (according to Isaiah viii. 21), while Israel, in poverty and misery, holds fast to the Divine Covenant, and does not repudiate his God. Therefore redemption will be his reward, because of his constancy (II. Sam. xxii. 28 ; *Zohar* עקב, IV. 273*d*.). This remark has clearly a polemic edge, for it places the pious resignation of the Jews, even under distress, in contrast to the insolence of other nations, who do not even shrink from blasphemous curses. A closer investigation of the *Zohar* would perhaps bring to light some more particulars of this kind, in which the source of the Kabbala supplies also materials for the literature of mediæval polemics.

W. Bacher.

---

[1] *Vide* Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, p. 71.

[2] *Vide* Seder Haddoroth, s.v. יוסף קטנותא.

A Contribution to the History of the Term "Massorah." —In the first chapter of his *Commentarius Massoræ Historicus* (Tiberias, Part I.), Buxtorf says that the pronunciation now generally in use among the Jews of the name of the Tradition that dealt with the biblical text is מָסוֹרָה (after the form of בְּגוֹדָה Jer. iii. 7), and as *samech* has a sharp sound, the word is written with a double *s*, Massorah. This manner of spelling the word, although it was not adopted by Buxtorf himself, is still everywhere in vogue ; at the same time, however, one generally recalls the possibility referred to by Buxtorf that the form of the word may be מַסּוֹרָה (with a dagesh in the ס). Buxtorf also mentions that the word was by many read מְסָרָה or מַסָּרָה and even מִסָּרָה (by Pagninus), while he himself adduces the form מְסוֹרָה (compare בְּשׂוֹרָה עֲבוֹדָה) as possible. This remarkable fluctuation in the pronunciation of a word of such frequent use, as well as in the grammatical explanation of its form, still prevails. Compare F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1891), page 95 *seq.* The very foundation upon which the use of the word itself rests is extremely uncertain. In the oldest sources (Talmud and Midrash) it is not to be found at all, as in these only its equivalent מסורת is to be met with. Similarly, later authorities speak only of the מסורת, which expression is very often employed to indicate the Massorah in its written form, as, for example, by Abulwalîd (see quotations in my *Life and Works of Abulwalîd, Merwan Ibn G'anah*, etc., p. 52). *Elias Levita* speaks onstantly of the מסורת not of the מסורה, both in the title and in he body of his great work dealing with the subject ; the Massorites are with him, as with Ibn Ezra, אנשי המסורת. I am not in possession of the requisite data to be able to explain how, in spite of all this, the expression מסורת, for which alone there is foundation in ancient usage and literature, has been displaced by the other terms. Elias Levita himself makes use of the other expression, מסורה, (mostly written *defective*, מסרה), in order to indicate both the Massorah as " written down by the sages of the city of Tiberias," as well as the written Massorah which is to be found in Bible MSS. (see beginning of the Third Introduction ed. Ginsburg, p. 103, ומהם לחכמי טבריה אשר כתבוה וקראו לה מסרה, and towards the end of the same Introduction, p. 138, המסרה הגדולה and מסרה קטנה *seq.*)[1]. He thus appears to recognise the name מסרה as applicable

[1] Instead of Ginsburg's כל המסורה הנדפסת p. 138, the edition 1538, p. 28, line 4, has כל המסורת הנדפסת.

only to the concrete form of the written Massorah, not to the Massorah in general.[1] Jacob ben Chayim, the first editor of the Massorah (in Bomberg's Bible, 1518), speaks in the Preface as well as in the prefatory remarks to the Massorah finalis, mostly of מסרה (always without ו), but also of מסורת, while he calls the written Massorah consistently מסרה, *defective*. His example will certainly have been of the greatest influence in the further use and general adoption of the word מסרה. As regards its pronunciation, the word מסורת, resting, as it did, upon better testimony, was decisive, both words being considered as similar substantive forms, distinguished only by the feminine endings ת and ה; and, as Buxtorf asserts, the word was pronounced מָסוֹרָה. The question, however, arises whether this was the original pronunciation of the form of the word written with ה. This may be doubted, since both Jacob ben Chayim and Elias Levita, unquestionably relying upon MS. sources, always write the word without a ו; while מסורת is always written with a ו. This doubt is strengthened by several very significant facts in the cognate literature. I have already pointed out (*Life and Works of Abulwalîd*) that one of the two Oxford MSS. of *Kilâb-al'-Luma* (No. 1,462) very often instead of מסרת (or מסורת) writes מוסרת, which spelling is also found in an exegete of the fourteenth century. Since then I have discovered that this variant spelling of such a well-attested word as מסורת can be explained by the influence of the form מוֹסָרָה. This form of the word is used almost exclusively to indicate the Massorah in the so-called "Massorah from Teman," which Ginsburg has edited in the third volume of his great work on the Massorah (p. 53 *seq.*). Here מסורת is only now and then to be met with (in Gen. xliv. 6; Exod. xxix. 15), elsewhere, המוסרה, also מוסרה רבתא and מוסרה קטנה. This pronunciation is attested from very ancient times. The Karaite exegete, Japheth ben Ali (end of the tenth century) says in his commentary on Daniel ix. 29 (ed. Margoliouth, p. 101, line 3), וצבטת במוסרות "it is fixed in the M."; and the same plural form of the word is also to be found in the renowned St. Petersburg *Biblecodex* of the year 1010, where in the superscription of a Massoretic section, the expression occurs ולא נאמר בְּמָסֹרוֹת גדלות ולא במָסְרוֹת קטנות, the vocalisation being as here given, where, however, strange to say, the word is written once with cholem and once with kometz (see Baer and Strack, *Dikduke Ha-Teamim*, p. xxvi.).

---

[1] In Tishbi sub voc. מסר he does not mention the form מסרה at all, but only says in reference to Aboth iii. 13, והיא המסורת הכתובה סביב ספרי המקרא.

A further proof of the age of the form of spelling מוֹסֶרָה is furnished by the circumstance that the Karaite lexicographer *David ben Abraham*[1] calls the Massorah in Arabic אלמאסרה, מאסרה (see my treatise: *The Grammatical Terminology of Jehudah ben David ibn Chajjag*, p. 36); he thus forms the participle of the first conjugation of the verb מסר after the Arabic manner, corresponding to the Hebrew construction מוסרה as Kal participle. The Massora Magna he also calls in Arabic אלמאסרה אלכבירה (see Pinsker, *Sikkute Kadmonijoth*, p. 140 of the text). It is therefore proved that the word מסרה has been pronounced מֹסֶרָה since the tenth century, and one may assume that this is not an arbitrary pronunciation, but that it was the original pronunciation of the form מסרה, which grew up in addition to the older form מסורת. The above-mentioned lexicographer, David ben Abraham, also uses the Hebrew form מסרה (אל) without ו (see Neubauer: *Notice sur la Lexicographie Hebraïque*, p. 100, l. 13), as in the St. Petersburg *Biblecodex*.

It follows from the preceding that the form מסרה is not a later invention of the Massorah-scribes, but is to be regarded as an ancient term of the Massorites. I believe that the employment of this ending was determined by the fact that one of the encampments of Israel in the wilderness was called מוֹסֶרָה (Deut. x. 6), and מֹסֵרוֹת (Numb. xxxiii. 30 and 31). Nothing was more natural than that this name should be used as a synonym for מסורת, whose plural מסורות also occurs.[2] It is, however, remarkable, that מסרה is written *defective*, while מוסרה in Deut. x. 6 is *plene;* but perhaps this is owing to מסרות being *defective* in Numb. xxxiii.[3]

---

[1] Formerly regarded as belonging to the tenth century. A later date has, however, been assigned to him. (See P. F. Frankl, Article "Karäer" in *Ersch und Grubers Allgemeine Encyclopædie*, 2 Section, xxxiii. 17.)

[2] Ibn Ezra in one place calls Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali שני שרי המסורות (see my *Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker*, p. 38, note 13), and his contemporary, the Karaite, Jehudah Hadassi, likewise speaks, referring to Ben Asher, of the מסורות (see Baer und Strack, *Dikduke Ha-Teamim*, p. xiii., note 14; comp. *Ibid.*, p. xxviii., line 6 from the end; *Ibid.* page 79, line 8). In *Midrash Tanchuma*, ואתחנן, *fin.*, R. Jonathan (third century) says · · · · ניטלו מסורות החכמה ממשה, for which passage the Midrash Petirath Mosheh (Jellinek's *Beth-Hamidrash*, vol. i., p. 127) has ניטלו אוצרות החכמה, perhaps a mistake in transcription from מוסרות החכמה. See also *Bab. Megillah*, 3a; *Nedarim*, 37b; אלו המסורות, for which *Jerus. Megillah*, 74d, *fin.* has זה המסורת.

[3] It should also be observed that מוֹסֵרוֹת, מוֹסֶרָה in the sense of *vinculum*, band (*comp.* Psalm ii. 3; cvii 14; cxvi. 16), was a very general

The pronunciation of מסורת is likewise not free from doubt. True, Buxtorf (Tiberias, *loc. cit.*), referring to the spelling מַסּוֹרֶת, says, "*Quæ pronunciatio itidem communis est*," and at the present day also this mode of spelling is almost universally adopted as the correct one. Levy (*Neuheb. Wörterbuch*, iii. 178) adopts this punctuation, so also Strack in the *Dictum of Akiba*, *Aboth*, iii. 13 (*die Sprüche der Vater*, 2, Auflage, p. 38). But in reality the spelling מָסוֹרֶת, which has been emphasized by Buxtorf, and which is based upon the expression בְּמָסֹרֶת הברית (Ezek. xx. 37), appears to be more accurate. For although the word in Ezekiel is not exactly derived from מסר, but from אסר, to bind to fetter (=מַאֲסֹרֶת), as Abulwalîd already perceived (*Kilâb-al'-Luma*, p. 244, line 17; *Rikma*, p. 146), and as, following him, David Kimchi explains, yet the traditional rendering of the word seems to have assigned to it the meaning "Tradition, Handing down," in agreement with which Rashi explains בברית שמסרו לכם. As a fact, the Targum retains the Hebrew word, together with the corresponding Aramaic term (במסורת קימא), and Theodotion translates, ἐν τῇ παραδόσει τῆς διαθήκης (see Field, *Hexapla II.*, 820a). Aquila, it is true, translates ἐν δεσμοῖς τῆς διαθήκης, and, following him, Hieronymus in *Vinculis Fœderis*. Still, for the dominant conception of the word in the time of the Tanaim and Amoraim, the Targum, when it is unopposed by any other explanation in the literature of tradition, is sufficiently convincing, especially as its translation is supported by Theodotion, and as Rashi gives evidence for the maintenance of the traditional view.

It is now more than probable that if the Tanaim employed the expression מסורת, not only for the text of the Scripture but also for the traditions relating to it, they did not introduce a newly-formed word into the terminology of the schools, but adopted the word from the Book of Ezekiel as a welcome substantive to the verb מסר, which latter occurs only twice in the Bible (Numb. xxxi. 5 and 16), but has passed from Aramaic into New-Hebrew, and which became, in *constructio pregnans*, an expression in common use in the schools (see Mishnah, *Aboth*, i. 1). For it is difficult to see why, for the purpose of expressing the idea of "Tradition," a word of such rare occurrence, even in biblical Hebrew, as מַפֹּרֶת (after the model of פַּצֹּרֶת, בַּפֹּרֶת), should have been formed from the verb מסר[1] instead of

---

expression in the language of the Mishnah (see *Levy*, iii., 53b), and was even brought into connection with מסר by the Babylonian Amorah Raba (see *Baba Meziah*, 8b)

[1] In New-Hebrew there is no substantive of this form so far as I know, and Siegfried, in his *Lehrbuch der Neuhebraïschen Sprache* (1884) is only

מְסִירָה or מְסוֹרָה; even מְסֹרָה (comp. עֲבֹדָה), מְסוּרָה (comp. סְעוּדָה), and מְסָרָה (comp. דְּרָשָׁה), would have been more conformable to analogy. The linguistic process probably took the following course: on the one hand מסר, having become a familiar verb, led to Ezekiel's word מָסֹרֶת being used in the sense of Tradition.[1] On the other hand, the word was admitted into the terminology of the schools in order to form a substantive corresponding to the verb מסר. Had the word in Ezekiel not reached us with the Massoretic punctuation, it could certainly have been read מַסֹּרֶת quite as well as מָסֹרֶת, after the analogy of מַכֹּלֶת (from אכל), 1 Kings v. 25, as indeed Abulwalîd also remarks (*loc. cit.*) that in מסרת the א of the root has become softened, quiescent, but has not assimilated with the ס. As, however, we must assume that the word in Ezekiel was already read in the manner in which we find it punctuated in the earliest periods of the transmission of the text, it follows that the New-Hebrew expression based upon the word in Ezekiel must also be so pronounced, viz., מָסוֹרֶת. He who speaks and writes מַסּוֹרֶת is therefore guilty of no inaccuracy, as the word in Ezekiel might also sound thus, but he has against him the facts as above presented in their historical development. Under no circumstances may מַסּוֹרֶת be regarded as a direct noun-form derived from מסר, and independent of the biblical word.

I wish further to draw attention to the interesting fact that Elias Levita, in the explanation of the word מסרות, at the beginning of the third introduction to his *Masoreth Hamasoreth*, points only to the verb מסר, but makes no mention whatever of the passage in Ezekiel,[2] no doubt because he explained the biblical word according to its right meaning of fetter, band, and he therefore saw in it no connection with the end-form מסורת.

The following may serve as a brief summary of the results of the above investigations into the history of the name of the Massorah :—

1. From Ezek. xx. 37 the noun מָסוֹרֶת, as if it was derived from

---

able to adduce as examples of the ground-form *qattôl* the "Fem. מַסּוֹרָה, מַסּוֹרֶת" (p. 44.) The form had long lost its propagative power, and even among the Payetanim, who had the courage to revive many a rare form, it is not represented by a single example. See the register of noun-forms in Zunz, *Die Synag. Poesie des Mittelalters*, pp. 383-409.

[1] Comp. opinion of Raba referred to above, p. 787 note 3.

[2] What Levy (*Wörterbuch*, iii. 179 b) cites in the name of Levita appears to rest upon some confusion with another author.

the verb מסר, was adopted as the expression to designate oral tradition,[1] but especially the tradition fixing the pronunciation of the biblical text. (Compare specially the expression אם למקרא אם למסורת.) The term is also used in the plural.

2. In post-Talmudic times another substantive, also a biblical word, was applied with a similar meaning to the verb מסר, viz., מַסֹרָה, pl. מַסֹרוֹת. It was regarded as participle *kal*, and accordingly was cast in Arabic form. Under the influence of this word arose also the form מוסרת instead of מסורת.

3. The form מסורת remained until modern times, and even with Elias Levita, as the usual term to designate the Massorah. The form מסרה or מסורה, its pronunciation מָסוֹרָה being copied from מָסוֹרֶת, gradually became the customary designation of the Massoretic discussions (first edited by Jacob ben Chayim), and displaced the expression Mâsôreth.

4. The pronunciation מַסוֹרֶת has no historical justification.

5. For מסרה the pronunciation מוֹסֵרָה alone is attested from ancient times; the forms of spelling מָסוֹרָה and מַסוֹרָה rest only upon the analogy of the two styles of spelling מסורת.

6. The transliteration Massorah or Masorah owes its right to further existence only through its having been long naturalised in scientific literature.[2]

W. Bacher.

---

[1] It is to be observed that halachic tradition is never indicated by this expression. See the examples in Levy, iii. 178 *seq.*

[2] So also one may continue to write "Agadah" as the transcription based upon long and general usage for הגדה=אגדה (Haggadah, Aggadah) just as foreign proper names are retained in the transliteration in which they have become usual, although they be not scientifically correct. Zunz, in his great work on the history of the Aggadah (*Die Gottesdienslichen Vorträge*) writes Hagada (with one *g*), and similarly in his later works which is even less correct than Agada, as one may suppose a root אגד for אגדה, and may punctuate the word אַגָּדָה.